

PURPOSE

To give teachers an example of a “5” level of achievement on a ThinkCERCA assignment.

A “5” level of achievement is the goal students and teachers should be working toward throughout the year. This example represents what a student at Grade 6 could achieve by the **END** (May) of Grade 6.

Text

How Regulation Really Does Change Eating Behavior

CERCA QUESTION

Are the benefits of government regulation of unhealthy food worth the price individuals and companies pay in terms of freedom of choice and freedom of speech?

Example Student Essay

My eating habits, like most people's, are influenced by what looks good and what is available. At school, I choose whatever looks best from what they're serving. At home, my mom cooks balanced meals for the family based on what's on sale at the store and what we like best.

These same factors influence what anyone buys to eat throughout the country: appeal and availability. They're the same factors that some people want governments to regulate in order to promote healthy eating

Regulatory practices for unhealthy food might include limiting where food items are sold, modifying the advertising messages, and making the default choice the healthy choice. These regulations affect the factors of appeal and availability. Such regulations can be compared to the limited advertising of tobacco products and the

Nice transition between your real-life example and the argument you will make.

Good intro to your argument.

Good summary of the ideas in the article.

CERCA Set: Government Role in Health Exemplar, Grade 9

ThinkCERCA

Good evidence and reasoning pair. Evidence is well-cited and ties back to claim and reason (giving an example of a dire consequence)

proposed sales tax on soda. These practices could be effective by making it less appealing to eat unhealthy foods. Such regulations have been criticized, however. These criticisms are unfounded. Governmental regulatory practices concerning unhealthy food are well worth the price paid by consumers and companies in terms of freedom of choice and freedom of speech because the consequences of unhealthy eating are so dire.

Clear, concise claim is explained by a good reason.

According to economists cited in this article, "obesity and its consequences cost our society \$190 billion annually in health care and lost productivity." This means that obesity is not only an issue for an individual dealing with poor health; obesity is also an issue for society at large.

Good use of reasoning for an explanation.

It is not enough to just tell people not to eat unhealthy foods or to maintain a healthy weight. There is a parallel with smoking: telling people that cigarettes caused cancer did not get people to stop smoking, but the government regulations put in place around taxing cigarettes and where people can smoke made it easier for people to quit. Likewise, government regulations on unhealthy food can affect individuals' choices.

Good use of evidence to introduce a paragraph.

Marion Nestle, the author of this article, states that research shows what makes people overeat: "billions of dollars in advertising messages" and "food sold everywhere." Because this is the root of the problem—the advertising that makes junk food so appealing and the nearly universal availability of huge portions of unhealthy foods—this is clearly the place to start when it comes to enacting regulations that will help people live healthier lives.

Good reasoning that ties your evidence back to your claim.

CERCA Set: Government Role in Health Exemplar, Grade 9

ThinkCERCA

Good reason to explain your thinking.

Such regulations will not only take some of the pressure off people to make bad choices; they can even influence people to make better choices. People are more inclined to go with the default choice regardless what it is, so cities and schools should make the default choice the healthy choices. The positive effects of this kind of regulation are shown by the recent study in Pediatrics, which found that kids who live in states where schools do not sell junk food are less likely to be overweight. Additionally, a recent American Heart Association review of evidence-based population approaches cited in this article "supports the value of intense media campaigns, on-site educational programs in stores," and other health-promoting approaches. These two studies, taken together, show that when we make healthy choices appealing and available, people take advantage of them.

Good summary of evidence presented.

Some people, including food and beverage companies, claim that limitations on the availability and advertising of junk food violates their First Amendment right to free speech. They do have a point, but their argument ignores the more important right of people to live healthy lives without extreme pressure from huge companies trying to get them to eat things that could ultimately kill them. The government puts limitations on people's rights all the time for the sake of safety. When it comes to

Good reasoning to address a counter-argument.

advertisements for junk food, especially to children, some limitations seem to be the best course of action.

Good restatement of your claim.

As the author of this article points out, huge portions of food are available everywhere in this country at bargain prices. We know that consuming this much junk food is just not healthy for us, but many people find it difficult to make other choices when that food is widely available and looks so appealing in the ads. Therefore, it is important for the government to step in like it did with cigarettes to

Good conclusion.

regulate advertising and the availability of food if we are going to win the battle
against obesity in this country