



Simulation
Australasia

2016 Awards

**In recognition of important contributions to simulation in
Australia and/or New Zealand**

Project/Innovation Award Assessment Form



Project Innovation Award Judging Process

JUDGING PANEL	An Award Review committee, including a committee Chair, will be appointed prior to the nomination deadline. Judges will comprise of professionals in the simulation community from Australia, and other nominated by Simulation Australasia.								
SCORING	Points from 0 to 10 are assigned to each criterion. Projects are not to be rated against one another. Points should be assigned as follows: <table><tr><td>* Average</td><td>0 – 2</td><td>* Excellent</td><td>6 - 8</td></tr><tr><td>* Good</td><td>3 – 5</td><td>* Outstanding</td><td>9 – 10</td></tr></table>	* Average	0 – 2	* Excellent	6 - 8	* Good	3 – 5	* Outstanding	9 – 10
* Average	0 – 2	* Excellent	6 - 8						
* Good	3 – 5	* Outstanding	9 – 10						
CONFLICTS OF INTEREST	In the event of a conflict of interest between a judge and an entry in the competition, the entry will be assigned to only those judges without a conflict. Should a judge in his/her opinion believe that a fair, impartial judging of an entry cannot result due to conditions or circumstances not immediately obvious, the judge shall excuse himself/herself from judging that entry.								
AUTHORITY OF THE PANEL	The authority to recommend the grant awards of any type, or not to grant awards, rests solely with the collective judgment of the panel of judges. Decisions rendered by the panel of judges are final.								
SPECIFIC GUIDANCE	Simulation Australasia has established the Project Innovation Award Program to recognise excellence and innovation in simulation projects carried out by teams. It is the judges' responsibility to identify those entries which best satisfy this goal. Each judge will assess each project against the five criteria according to his/her own experience. However, the following guidance is provided to assist the judges in their evaluation of the projects. At most one project will receive an award. No award will be granted if the judges view is that no entry scores highly enough.								
AWARD CATEGORY	Small Projects are limited to a total cost of less than AUD\$2.5 million. Large Projects are those with a total cost of AUD\$2.5 million or more.								

Performance objectives vary with each category; examples of performance benchmarks for each follow:

Applied Research	Research of an applied nature that advances the state of the art in simulation technology, including research leading to new simulation products or processes. Research will have broadened the use of simulation, or enhanced the effectiveness of simulation. The primary proof of performance is the testimony of peers regarding the adequacy and relevancy of the research as well as the advance(s) it generates.
Development	Design and development of a new simulation system that has demonstrated benefits to the community need that it was developed to address. Proof of performance is evidenced by several attributes: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Project completed on time and within budgeted.- Proof that performance promised is, in fact, delivered; e.g., if a facility is expected to achieve certain cost reductions or improvements in outcomes, then proof of such performance is needed. Other proof is provided by customer or end user statements of meeting or exceeding expectations.
Operations & Management	Projects that demonstrate innovative approaches to acquiring and utilising simulations, or making better use of already existing simulations. Successful operation and management of a facility or program needs to have evidence of its success. Examples of evidence which can be used are: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Statements from regulatory officials regarding ongoing compliance by a facility- Public testimony that program management has achieved specified goals or requirements- Media accounts documenting specific accomplishments- Other awards for the project
Education	Design and development and implementation of extended education programs - including units of competence for the VET sector; university subjects of at least one semester duration, programs for accreditation of specific simulation competencies, which have addressed a skills gap in the simulation community.

Project Innovation Award

PROJECT NAME: _____

Name of Assessor: _____

Project achievement category (based on form details, circle all that apply):

Applied Research	Development	Operations or Management	Education
------------------	-------------	--------------------------	-----------

Project Award Category: Small Project (<AUD\$2.5m) Large Project (≥AUD\$2.5m)

Project Location (Australia or New Zealand): _____

Responsible Organisation Location (Australia or New Zealand) : _____

Project Completion (not less than 6 months nor more than 5 years): _____

Score Average 0 – 2, Good 3 – 5, Excellent 6 – 8, Outstanding 9 – 10

Originality and Innovation

	Does the entry represent a clear "break" with previously established methods or processes, or is it a simple adaptation of existing techniques?
	Does the project solve a problem, or achieve an outcome, that was considered to be unachievable?
	Does the entry radically simplify or improve something? Or does the "innovation" simply consist of novelty?

Future Value to the Profession & Community

	Does the project provide lasting benefits to the simulation community, and the community as a whole?
	Is the project one which highlights the benefit that simulation brings to the community?
	Does the entry advance a positive public image of excellence?
	Is the project likely to establish a new industry standard practice or approach?
	Is the project outcome viable and sustainable in the longer term?

Addressing of Social, Economic or Sustainability Issues

	The extent to which the project addresses social or economic issues in society.
	Does the project reduce the impact of an activity or system on the environment, or provide other environmental benefits?

Complexity

	Were there a number of different technical or organisational problems that needed to be solved in delivering the project?
	Did the project involve integrating or interfacing with a large number of differing systems?
	Were there environmental, social or political difficulties to be solved in completing a project?
	Complexity of finance or business arrangements (where appropriate)?
	Were there a large number of organisations to be co-ordinated in delivering the project?

Meeting or Exceeding Expectations

- Degree to which the customer/sponsor's expectations were demonstrably met or exceeded.
- Has the project improved the sponsor organisation's performance?

Schedule and Budget

- Was the project completed on or ahead of schedule?
- Was the project delivered on or below budget?

Integrity & Ethics

- Was the project carried out in an ethical manner?
- Does the project demonstrate environmental and social responsibility in the way development was performed?
- Did the project team demonstrate integrity and consistency in working with collaborators, peers, employees, other related organisations, including competitors where applicable?

Leadership & Decisiveness

- Does the project demonstrate an ability to persuade others to "buy into" a change or a new initiative
- Does the project team show an ability to work with diverse teams and sets of skills
- Did the project involve an element of risk, either technically, commercially, or in some other form, which required courageous decision making?

Strategic Vision

- Is there evidence of a long-term, coherent set of aspired goals
- Evidence of a planned series of steps leading to achievement of the vision
- Evidence of real transformation as a result of the "vision"

Commercial Viability

- Potential for financial success, or longer term viability in other ways.
- Overall practicality and usefulness
- Adaptability to market

Proven

- Has the outcome been subjected to extensive stress and other testing,
- Has the project been proven to be reliable and dependable in operation?

Overall Assessment: Suitable / Not Suitable

Additional Comments:

Signature and Date:
