|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk Assessment** | | | | |
| **Risk Assessment for the activity of** | **Film/Television Screenings** | | **Date** | **16/07/2019** |
| **Club/Society** | **Fandom Society** | **Assessor** | **Lily McDermaid** | |
| **President or Students’ Union staff member** | **Lily McDermaid** | **Signed off** |  | |

| ***PART A*** | | | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **(1) Risk identification** | | | **(2) Risk assessment** | | | | **(3) Risk management** | | | |
| Flashing lights | Epileptic seizures | Society members present at the screening | **4** | **2** | **8** | It is not possible to eliminate the hazard totally. It may be better to either ask members to declare a sensitivity to flashing lights or avoid films known to have excessive amounts in. This lowers it as far as reasonably practicable. | **2** | **2** | **4** | Further controls would involve consulting members with epilepsy before screenings as each person is different and may not have any issue. This may help to forewarn the members and assist them in making a reasoned decision, or assist committee members in knowing which parts to skip. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PART B – Action Plan*** | | | | | | | |
| **Risk Assessment Action Plan** | | | | | | | |
| **Part no.** | **Action to be taken, incl. Cost** | **By whom** | **Target date** | | **Review date** | **Outcome at review date** | |
| 1 | Action to be taken is largely administrative, including the consultation of members and an assessment of the films to be screened. | All committee members | 1st October | | 31st October |  | |
| Responsible committee member signature: Lily McDermaid | | | | | Responsible committee member signature: Arun Stokes | | |
| Print name: LILY MCDERMAID | | | | Date: 16/07/2019 | Print name: ARUN STOKES | | Date: 16/07/2019 |

**Assessment Guidance**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Eliminate | Remove the hazard wherever possible which negates the need for further controls | If this is not possible then explain why |  |
| 1. Substitute | Replace the hazard with one less hazardous | If not possible then explain why |
| 1. Physical controls | Examples: enclosure, fume cupboard, glove box | Likely to still require admin controls as well |
| 1. Admin controls | Examples: training, supervision, signage |  |
| 1. Personal protection | Examples: respirators, safety specs, gloves | Last resort as it only protects the individual |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **LIKELIHOOD** | 5 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|  | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **IMPACT** | | | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Impact | | Health & Safety |
| 1 | Trivial - insignificant | Very minor injuries e.g. slight bruising |
| 2 | Minor | Injuries or illness e.g. small cut or abrasion which require basic first aid treatment even in self-administered. |
| 3 | Moderate | Injuries or illness e.g. strain or sprain requiring first aid or medical support. |
| 4 | Major | Injuries or illness e.g. broken bone requiring medical support >24 hours and time off work >4 weeks. |
| 5 | Severe – extremely significant | Fatality or multiple serious injuries or illness requiring hospital admission or significant time off work. |

Risk process

1. Identify the impact and likelihood using the tables above.
2. Identify the risk rating by multiplying the Impact by the likelihood using the coloured matrix.
3. If the risk is amber or red – identify control measures to reduce the risk to as low as is reasonably practicable.
4. If the residual risk is green, additional controls are not necessary.
5. If the residual risk is amber the activity can continue but you must identify and implement further controls to reduce the risk to as low as reasonably practicable.
6. If the residual risk is red do not continue with the activity until additional controls have been implemented and the risk is reduced.
7. Control measures should follow the risk hierarchy, where appropriate as per the pyramid above.
8. The cost of implementing control measures can be taken into account but should be proportional to the risk i.e. a control to reduce low risk may not need to be carried out if the cost is high but a control to manage high risk means that even at high cost the control would be necessary.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Likelihood | |
| 1 | Rare e.g. 1 in 100,000 chance or higher |
| 2 | Unlikely e.g. 1 in 10,000 chance or higher |
| 3 | Possible e.g. 1 in 1,000 chance or higher |
| 4 | Likely e.g. 1 in 100 chance or higher |
| 5 | Very Likely e.g. 1 in 10 chance or higher |