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II. Risk Assessment Approach

Sam Houston and Cole Porter conducted this risk assessment. Both Mr. Houston and Mr. Porter are trained and qualified risk managers for the Ramada Inn Hotel. Mr. Houston has 8 years of hotel risk management and Mr. Porter has 8 years as pool safety engineer. We used High Impact/Low Probability analysis along with contemporary documentation for swimming pool risks (A Tradecraft Primer, 2009). This methodology was determined to be the most accurate because it would address the unlikely risks that have high impacts that exist with a swimming pool. Questionnaires and on-site interviews were methodologies not used because they would not develop what we consider to be credible, insurable risks. The Centers for Disease Control (CDC), research on swimming pool injuries, and the U.S. Consumer protection agency were the sources of documentation. The Quality of Information Check was used in the documentation research and enabled us to develop a potential risk scale.

- According to the CDC Vital Statistics, in 2005, 3,582 people accidentally drowned this statistic is for all age groups (CDC, 2010).
- 69% of children who drowned were not expected to be at the pool (U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, 2010)
- Having a life guard on duty decreases the likelihood of drowning by 35% (Branche, 2009)
**III. System Characterization**

- Our first input correlating with attachment one is the situation of having a lifeguard on duty. The input in this situation is the lifeguard itself. The process that is involved is having the lifeguard be on active duty. The output would thusly result in fewer drownings, more specifically it will reduce the amount of drowning by 35 percent.

- Our second input correlating with our diagram is the situation of having proper fencing available. The input is the fencing surrounding the pool or Jacuzzi area. The process that is used is providing a fenced perimeter around your pool. The output then would be a reduction in the amount of unauthorized entries.
• The final input correlating with the number of guests shows that as the number of guests increase, the number of pool facility users will increase. As the pool utilization increases so does the statistical likelihood of a drowning.

Comment [17]: The diversity of these IPO items make this risk assessment scope too broad to be successful. Focusing either on lifeguards (hire, train, audit/text, policies, procedures), OR physical pool security (fences, flotation devices, warning signs, policies, procedures), OR pool usage (monitoring, control, signs, policies, procedures) would be sufficient for a URISK risk assessment.
Figure 1 shows a view of the Ramada Inn swimming pool. In the photo, the fence is visible as well as the pool deck and furniture. To the left is visible the Jacuzzi. The life rings or floatation devices are not visible in this photo.

Figure 2 Pool from the Ramada Inn, State College (http://ramadasc.com/)

Comment [18]: GOOD: Figure/table is cross-referenced using caption title/number in preceding paragraph.
TIP: Select “Cross Reference” from Word “Insert” menu, change “Complete caption” option to title/number.

Comment [19]: GOOD: Fully explain to the reader what they should see in the figure/table.

Comment [20]: GOOD: Image has a numbered caption with a description and an in-text cite for source of image.
TIP: Right-click on figure/table and select Word option “Insert Caption”
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### Grading Rubric

**Grading Rubric - Short Essay**

*Peer Reviewer: Assign total points here for composition, contribution, subject knowledge and citations. Write specific comments into student’s paper.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Reviewer Points</th>
<th>Max Possible Points</th>
<th>Instructor Total Points</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Composition</strong> - Business professional writing with no grammatical or spelling errors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Contribution</strong> - Improves class learning by providing new information or approach to topic under discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subject Knowledge</strong> - Knowledge of course content is illustrated by integrating concepts into the essay. Does it appear that you know what you are writing about? Are you aware of aspects of this covered in class?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Captions, References and MLA Citations</strong> - Reference to article, book, or magazine where new information or approach is provided, and appropriate citation in text. Must follow APA format!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• In-Text: must include page number (assume “1” if not known)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Works Cited: single-spaced (double between citations) with hanging indent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Captions: any tables or figures must include complete captions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(blank)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In-class peer review</strong> - Thorough and complete with specific comments (i.e. NOT &quot;good job&quot; or &quot;great opening&quot;) for what has been done well or what could be done to improve the paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(blank)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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