Module 4 – 12A
Module Title: Good Food/Bad Food

Name: Brittany Brumley  Period: 3

Please have the following items in the following order in your portfolio.

MT 1 - Vocabulary Activity (quiz and key; or 4 definition essays)

MT 2 - Rhetorical Précis for each article

MT 2 - Choice Activity One: SOPHISTICATED

MT 2 - Choice Activity Two: CHARTING THE TEXT

MT 3 - Highlighted and labeled on Argumentative essay: 4 sentence patterns

MT 4 - Argumentative Essay Rough Draft

MT 4 - Completed Peer Review Sheet #1

MT 3 - Completed Peer Review Sheet #2

MT 4 - Final Draft of Argumentative Essay

MT 5 - Selection for memorization and recitation with LF Signature
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module Title:</th>
<th>Date Begun:</th>
<th>Date Finished:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT 1: Vocabulary Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT 2: Reading &amp; Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT 3: Syntax &amp; Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT 4: Argumentative Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT 5: Range of Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Choose 1 task**

**Choose 2 tasks, PLUS**

**REQUIRED: Rhetorical Précis for each Text**

**Choose 3 Sentence Patterns**

**Must complete timed argumentative prompt**

**Choose 1 task**

---

**Create-Your-Own Quiz with 8 module-specific terms**

*May be matching, multiple choice, fill-in-blank, crossword, or combination of your choice*

- Must be 8 terms from readings, required for module understanding and useful for collegiate reading and writing
- Must include both quiz and answer key
- Must be legible
- Must show comprehension of all 8 terms

**Ethos, Pathos, Logos and Bias for each article**

- Must use 3 quotes utilizing every article
- Must use provided worksheet template
- Must be in complete sentences
- Must analyze ethos, pathos, logos, bias/tone in each quote

**Charting the Text for each article**

- Must chart every paragraph (or section, if “chunking”)
- Must have 2 or more bullets in each section
- Must begin with a present tense verb using academic language
- May be done directly on the texts or on separate sheet of paper (if paragraph #s are given)

**Definition paragraph for 4 important module-specific terms**

- Must include thinking map
- Must include topic sentence, thesis, and conclusion
- Must fully define term and use examples from both articles and personal context

**Dialectical Journal discussing all articles together**

- Must use 5 quotes utilizing every article
- Must be in complete sentences
- Must provide fully-developed personal response
- Must involve at least 1 other student

**SOAPSTone Summary for each summary**

- Must be in complete sentences
- Must provide fully-developed personal response
- Must use at least 2 quotes from articles to support subject and/or purpose summaries

**Rhetorical Modes Essay (definition, compare/contrast)**

- Must use a mode to elaborate upon one or more aspects of the module topic
- Must cite articles or build upon what they say in some way
- Must be legible
  - Counts as one of your rhetorical modes essays

**REQUIRED: Rhetorical Précis for each article**

- Must be specific
- Must meet format of an academic summary
- Must use verbs from academic summary guidelines

**For timed, in-class essay:**

- Analyze the prompt
- Thesis Planning
- Essay Organizer or Outline
- Peer Review #1
- Peer Review #2
- Final Copy, Revised after Peer Reviews
- Include sentence patterns

**You must demonstrate proficiency in your 4 sentence patterns in ALL of the following:**

- Each one somewhere in MT 2 evidence
- Argumentative Essay
- Highlight and label usage in each of the above

**Choose a 20 sentence passage and memorize and recite**

- Must be 20 sentences that include some of the vocabulary you identified in MT 1
- Must be recited with intonation and fluency

**Deliver an oral summary of one of the articles**

- Must be accurately summarize entire content of article
- Must be delivered with minimal errors and fluency
- May be written beforehand, but must be memorized

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1</th>
<th>Evidence #1:</th>
<th>Evidence #2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>Evidence #1:</td>
<td>Evidence #2:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bad Food? Tax It, and Subsidize Vegetables

By Mark Bittman


1. What will it take to get Americans to change our eating habits? The need is indisputable, since heart disease, diabetes and cancer are all in large part caused by the Standard American Diet. (Yes, it’s SAD.)

2. Though experts increasingly recommend a diet high in plants and low in animal products and processed foods, ours is quite the opposite, and there’s little disagreement that changing it could improve our health and save tens of millions of lives.

3. And—not inconsequential during the current struggle over deficits and spending—a sane diet could save tens if not hundreds of billions of dollars in health care costs.

4. Yet the food industry appears incapable of marketing healthier foods. And whether its leaders are confused or just stalling doesn’t matter, because the fixes are not really their problem. Their mission is not public health but profit, so they’ll continue to sell the health-damaging food that’s most profitable, until the market or another force skews things otherwise. That “other force” should be the federal government, fulfilling its role as an agent of the public good and establishing a bold rational fix.

5. Rather than subsidizing the production of unhealthful foods, we should turn the tables and tax things like soda, French fries, doughnuts and hyperprocessed snacks. The resulting income should be earmarked for a program that encourages a sound diet for Americans by making healthy food more affordable and widely available.

6. The average American consumes 44.7 gallons of soft drinks annually. (Although that includes diet sodas, it does not include noncarbonated sweetened beverages, which add up to at least 17 gallons a person per year.) Sweetened drinks could be taxed at 2 cents per ounce, so a six-pack of Pepsi would cost $1.44 more than it does now. An equivalent tax on fries might be 50 cents per serving; a quarter extra for a doughnut. (We have experts who can figure out how “bad” a food should be to qualify, and what the rate should be; right now they’re busy calculating ethanol subsidies. Diet sodas would not be taxed.)

7. Simply put: taxes would reduce consumption of unhealthful foods and generate billions of dollars annually. That money could be used to subsidize the purchase of staple foods like seasonal greens, vegetables, whole grains, dried legumes and fruit.

8. We could sell those staples cheap — let’s say for 50 cents a pound — and almost everywhere: drugstores, street corners, convenience stores, bodegas, supermarkets, liquor stores, even schools, libraries and other community centers.
This program would, of course, upset the processed food industry. Oh well. It
would also bug those who might resent paying more for soda and chips and
argue that their right to eat whatever they wanted was being breached. But
public health is the role of the government, and our diet is right up there with
any other public responsibility you can name, from water treatment to mass
transit.

Some advocates for the poor say taxes like these are unfair because low-
income people pay a higher percentage of their income for food and would
find it more difficult to buy soda or junk. But since poor people suffer
disproportionately from the cost of high-quality, fresh foods, subsidizing those
foods would be particularly beneficial to them.

Right now it’s harder for many people to buy fruit than Froot Loops; chips and
Coke are a common breakfast. And since the rate of diabetes continues to soar
— one-third of all Americans either have diabetes or are pre-diabetic, most with
Type 2 diabetes, the kind associated with bad eating habits — and because
our health care bills are on the verge of becoming truly insurmountable, this is
urgent for economic sanity as well as national health.

**Justifying a Tax**

At least 30 cities and states have considered taxes on soda or all sugar-
sweetened beverages, and they’re a logical target: of the 278 additional
calories Americans on average consumed per day between 1977 and 2001,
more than 40 percent came from soda, “fruit” drinks, mixes like Kool-Aid and
Crystal Light, and beverages like Red Bull, Gatorade and dubious offerings like
Vitamin Water, which contains half as much sugar as Coke.

Some states already have taxes on soda — mostly low, ineffective sales taxes
paid at the register. The current talk is of excise taxes, levied before purchase.

“Excise taxes have the benefit of being incorporated into the shelf price, and
that’s where consumers make their purchasing decisions,” says Lisa Powell,
a senior research scientist at the Institute for Health Research and Policy at
the University of Illinois at Chicago. “And, as per-unit taxes, they avoid volume
discounts and are ultimately more effective in raising prices, so they have
greater impact.”

Much of the research on beverage taxes comes from the Rudd Center for
Food Policy and Obesity at Yale. Its projections indicate that taxes become
significant at the equivalent of about a penny an ounce, a level at which
three very good things should begin to happen: the consumption of sugar-
sweetened beverages should decrease, as should the incidence of disease and
therefore public health costs; and money could be raised for other uses.

Even in the current antitax climate, we’ll probably see new, significant
soda taxes soon, somewhere; Philadelphia, New York (city and state) and
San Francisco all considered them last year, and the scenario for such
a tax spreading could be similar to that of legalized gambling: once the
income stream becomes apparent, it will seem irresistible to cash-strapped
governments.
Currently, instead of taxing sodas and other unhealthy foods, we subsidize them (with, I might note, tax dollars!). Direct subsidies to farmers for crops like corn (used, for example, to make now-ubiquitous high-fructose corn syrup) and soybeans (vegetable oil) keep the prices of many unhealthy foods and beverages artificially low. There are indirect subsidies as well, because prices of junk foods don’t reflect the costs of repairing our health and the environment.

Other countries are considering or have already started programs to tax foods with negative effects on health. Denmark’s saturated-fat tax is going into effect Oct. 1, and Romania passed (and then un-passed) something similar; earlier this month, a French minister raised the idea of tripling the value added tax on soda. Meanwhile, Hungary is proposing a new tax on foods with “too much” sugar, salt or fat, while increasing taxes on liquor and soft drinks, all to pay for state-financed health care; and Brazil’s Fome Zero (Zero Hunger) program features subsidized produce markets and state-sponsored low-cost restaurants.

Putting all of those elements together could create a national program that would make progress on a half-dozen problems at once — disease, budget, health care, environment, food access and more — while paying for itself. The benefits are staggering, and though it would take a level of political will that’s rarely seen, it’s hardly a moonshot.

The need is dire: efforts to shift the national diet have failed, because education alone is no match for marketing dollars that push the very foods that are the worst for us. (The fast-food industry alone spent more than $4 billion on marketing in 2009; the Department of Agriculture’s Center for Nutrition Policy and Promotion is asking for about a third of a percent of that in 2012: $13 million.) As a result, the percentage of obese adults has more than doubled over the last 30 years; the percentage of obese children has tripled. We eat nearly 10 percent more animal products than we did a generation or two ago, and though there may be value in eating at least some animal products, we could perhaps live with reduced consumption of triple bacon cheeseburgers.

**Government and Public Health**

Health-related obesity costs are projected to reach $344 billion by 2018 — with roughly 60 percent of that cost borne by the federal government. For a precedent in attacking this problem, look at the action government took in the case of tobacco.

The historic 1998 tobacco settlement, in which the states settled health-related lawsuits against tobacco companies, and the companies agreed to curtail marketing and finance antismoking efforts, was far from perfect, but consider the results. More than half of all Americans who once smoked have quit and smoking rates are about half of what they were in the 1960s.
It’s true that you don’t need to smoke and you do need to eat. But you don’t need sugary beverages (or the associated fries), which have been linked not only to Type 2 diabetes and increased obesity but also to cardiovascular diseases and decreased intake of valuable nutrients like calcium. It also appears that liquid calories provide less feeling of fullness; in other words, when you drink a soda it’s probably in addition to your other calorie intake, not instead of it.

To counter arguments about their nutritional worthlessness, expect to see “fortified” sodas — à la Red Bull, whose vitamins allegedly “support mental and physical performance” — and “improved” junk foods (Less Sugar! Higher Fiber!). Indeed, there may be reasons to make nutritionally worthless foods less so, but it’s better to decrease their consumption.

Forcing sales of junk food down through taxes isn’t ideal. First off, we’ll have to listen to nanny-state arguments, which can be countered by the acceptance of the anti-tobacco movement as well as a dozen other successful public health measures. Then there are the predictions of job loss at soda distributorships, but the same predictions were made about the tobacco industry, and those were wrong. (For that matter, the same predictions were made around the nickel deposit on bottles, which most shoppers don’t even notice.) Ultimately, however, both consumers and government will be more than reimbursed in the form of cheaper healthy staples, lowered health care costs and better health. And that’s a big deal.

The Resulting Benefits

A study by Y. Claire Wang, an assistant professor at Columbia’s Mailman School of Public Health, predicted that a penny tax per ounce on sugar-sweetened beverages in New York State would save $3 billion in health care costs over the course of a decade, prevent something like 37,000 cases of diabetes and bring in $1 billion annually. Another study shows that a two-cent tax per ounce in Illinois would reduce obesity in youth by 18 percent, save nearly $350 million and bring in over $800 million taxes annually.

Scaled nationally, as it should be, the projected benefits are even more impressive; one study suggests that a national penny-per-ounce tax on sugar-sweetened beverages would generate at least $13 billion a year in income while cutting consumption by 24 percent. And those numbers would swell dramatically if the tax were extended to more kinds of junk or doubled to two cents an ounce. (The Rudd Center has a nifty revenue calculator online that lets you play with the numbers yourself.)

A 20 percent increase in the price of sugary drinks nationally could result in about a 20 percent decrease in consumption, which in the next decade could prevent 1.5 million Americans from becoming obese and 400,000 cases of diabetes, saving about $30 billion.

It’s fun — inspiring, even — to think about implementing a program like this. First off, though the reduced costs of healthy foods obviously benefit the poor most, lower prices across the board keep things simpler and all of us, especially children whose habits are just developing, could use help in eating differently. The program would also bring much needed encouragement to farmers, including subsidies, if necessary, to grow staples instead of commodity crops.
Other ideas: We could convert refrigerated soda machines to vending machines that dispense grapes and carrots, as has already been done in Japan and Iowa. We could provide recipes, cooking lessons, even cookware for those who can’t afford it. Television public-service announcements could promote healthier eating. (Currently, 86 percent of food ads now seen by children are for foods high in sugar, fat or sodium.)

Money could be returned to communities for local spending on gyms, pools, jogging and bike trails; and for other activities at food distribution centers; for Meals on Wheels in those towns with a large elderly population, or for Head Start for those with more children; for supermarkets and farmers’ markets where needed. And more.

By profiting as a society from the foods that are making us sick and using those funds to make us healthy, the United States would gain the same kind of prestige that we did by attacking smoking. We could institute a national, comprehensive program that would make us a world leader in preventing chronic or “lifestyle” diseases, which for the first time in history kill more people than communicable ones. By doing so, we’d not only repair some of the damage we have caused by first inventing and then exporting the Standard American Diet, we’d also set a new standard for the rest of the world to follow.
Attacking the Obesity Epidemic by First Figuring Out Its Cause

By Jane E. Brody


1. If you have gained a lot of unwanted pounds at any time during the last 30-odd years, you may be relieved to know that you are probably not to blame. At least not entirely.

2. Many environmental forces, from economic interests of the food and beverage industries to the way our cities and towns are built, have conspired to subvert the body’s natural ability to match calories in with calories out.

3. And the solution to the nation’s most pressing health problem — the ever-rising epidemic of overweight and obesity at all ages — lies in the answer to this question: Why did this happen in the first place?

4. That is the conclusion of an impressive team of experts who spent the last two years examining obesity-promoting forces globally. They recently published their findings online in a series of reports in The Lancet.

5. But as has happened with smoking, it will take many years, a slew of different tactics and the political will to overcome powerful lobbying by culpable industries to turn the problem around and begin to bring the prevalence of overweight and obesity back to the levels of the 1970s.

**What Changed?**

6. When I was growing up in the 1940s and ‘50s, I had to walk or bike many blocks to buy an ice cream cone. There were no vending machines dispensing candy and soda, and no fast-food emporiums or shopping malls with food courts. Nor were we constantly bombarded with televised commercials for prepared foods and drinks laden with calories of fats and sugars.

7. Yes, we kids had our milk and cookies after school, but then we went out to run around and play until dark. Television watching (through my father’s business, my family acquired an early TV with a seven-inch screen) was mostly a weekend family affair, not a nightly ritual with constant noshing.

8. Most meals were prepared and eaten at home, even when both parents worked (as mine did). Eating out was a special event. “Convenience” foods were canned fruits and vegetables, not frozen lasagna or Tater Tots. A typical breakfast was hot or cold cereal sweetened with raisins or fresh fruit, not a Pop-Tart, jelly doughnut or 500-calorie bagel with 200 calories of cream cheese.

9. Before a mass exodus to the suburbs left hordes of Americans totally car-dependent, most people lived in cities and towns where feet served as a main means of transportation.
Since 1900, the energy requirements for daily life have decreased substantially with the advent of labor-saving devices and automobiles, yet American weights remained stable until the 1970s. Dr. Boyd A. Swinburn, an obesity researcher at Deakin University in Melbourne, Australia, and his co-authors in one Lancet paper call that decade the “tipping point.”

As more women entered the work force, the food industry, noting a growing new market, mass-produced convenience foods with palate appeal. The foods were rich in sugar, salt and fat, substances that humans are evolutionarily programmed to crave.

“Women were spending a lot less time on food preparation, but the industry figured out ways to make food more readily available for everybody,” Steven L. Gortmaker, a sociologist at the Harvard School of Public Health, said in an interview. “The industry made it easier for people to consume more calories throughout the day.”

As Dr. Swinburn and his co-authors wrote, “The 1970s saw a striking rise in the quantity of refined carbohydrates and fats in the U.S. food supply, which was paralleled by a sharp increase in the available calories and the onset of the obesity epidemic. Energy intake rose because of environmental push factors, i.e., increasingly available, cheap, tasty, highly promoted obesogenic foods.”

During a morning run in Ohio some years ago, I passed five fast-food and family restaurants in one long block, including one that advertised a “Texas-size breakfast” of three scrambled eggs, two fried potato cakes, a buttered croissant and a choice of three sausage links, three ounces of ham or four strips of bacon — enough to produce a Texas-size heart attack, and for $1.99. Americans are not known for resisting such temptations, especially if money is tight.

The Lancet authors reported that to bring the weights of Americans back to 1978 levels, steep reductions in caloric intake are needed: about 240 calories a day less for the average person and double that amount for obese adults, whose body mass index is 35 or higher.

‘Systems Approach’ Needed

Several coordinated, complementary policies are needed to turn the epidemic around, Dr. Gortmaker and his co-authors wrote in one report. He pointed out that four interventions worked together to drive smoking rates down to 20 percent from 40 percent.

First, tobacco advertising was banned from television. Then tobacco taxes were increased, the nicotine patch became available and smoking was banned in more and more public places.

Just as the decline in smoking did not happen overnight, a reduction in the rates of overweight and obesity will take a while, Dr. Gortmaker said. He emphasized the importance of taking action immediately, before the increase in life expectancy that Americans have enjoyed is reversed by obesity-caused diseases.
He and his co-authors listed three of the most cost-saving and health-saving measures: a 10 percent tax on unhealthy foods and drinks (like sugar-sweetened beverages, a proposal defeated in New York State by industry pressure); more obvious nutrition labeling of packaged foods, like a red, yellow or green traffic light on package fronts; and reduced advertising of “junk foods and beverages to children.”

“Marketing of food and beverages is associated with increasing obesity rates and is especially effective among children,” they wrote. Dr. Gortmaker pointed out that “very few children are born obese,” but most American children grow up in an obesogenic environment. For those who become obese by age 10 or 11, he and his co-authors said, family-based programs are needed to keep overweight from carrying over into adulthood. (In Scotland recently, authorities went so far as to remove two children from a family that had failed to control the youngsters’ girth.)

“Children aged 2 to 19 consume seven trillion calories of sugar-sweetened beverages a year. It’s a $24 billion industry just for kids alone,” Dr. Gortmaker said.

He called a tax on sugared drinks a “no-brainer,” noting that it could raise billions of dollars a year for cash-starved states. California, for example, could bring in $1.5 billion a year with a 1-cent-per-ounce excise tax on sugar-sweetened drinks, he said.

But Dr. Gortmaker and his co-authors noted, “Almost all food policies recommended as priority actions, including front-of-pack traffic light labeling, have been heavily contested by the food industry.” Although there has been some reduction in unhealthy food advertisements on children’s television, the decline has been minimal.

Also needed — and less controversial — are school-based programs to encourage healthier eating and exercise habits and to reduce television watching, the authors said. Schools that introduce healthful foods in the classroom have shown that they are more likely to be eaten in the lunchroom and at home.

Of course, the rising overweight and obesity rate is not just an American problem. The effect is being seen globally, even in low- and middle-income countries. This month the United Nations General Assembly will focus on noncommunicable diseases, with the “wicked problem” (as Brian Head, a social scientist at the University of Queensland in Australia, put it) of the global obesity epidemic front and center.
No Lunch Left Behind

By Alice Waters and Katrina Heron


This new era of government bailouts and widespread concern over wasteful spending offers an opportunity to take a hard look at the National School Lunch Program. Launched in 1946 as a public safety net, it has turned out to be a poor investment. It should be redesigned to make our children healthier.

Under the program, the United States Department of Agriculture gives public schools cash for every meal they serve—$2.57 for a free lunch, $2.17 for a reduced-price lunch and 24 cents for a paid lunch. In 2007, the program cost around $9 billion, a figure widely acknowledged as inadequate to cover food costs. But what most people don’t realize is that very little of this money even goes toward food. Schools have to use it to pay for everything from custodial services to heating in the cafeteria.

On top of these reimbursements, schools are entitled to receive commodity foods that are valued at a little over 20 cents per meal. The long list of options includes high-fat, low-graded meats and cheeses and processed foods like chicken nuggets and pizza. Many of the items selected are ready to be thawed, heated or just unwrapped—a necessity for schools without kitchens. Schools also get periodic, additional “bonus” commodities from the U.S.D.A., which pays good money for what are essentially leftovers from big American food producers.

When school districts allow fast-food snacks in the lunchroom they provoke widespread ire, and rightfully so. But food distributed by the National School Lunch Program contains some of the same ingredients found in fast food, and the resulting meals routinely fail to meet basic nutritional standards. Yet this is how the government continues to “help” feed millions of American schoolchildren, a great many of them from low-income households.

Some Americans are demanding better. Parent advocacy groups like Better School Food have rejected the National School Lunch Program and have turned instead to local farmers for fresh alternatives. Amid steep budgetary challenges, these community-supported coalitions are demonstrating that schools can be the masters of their own menus. Schools here in Berkeley, for example, continue to use U.S.D.A. commodities, but cook food from scratch and have added organic fruits and vegetables from area farms. They have cut costs by adopting more efficient accounting software and smart-bulk policies (like choosing milk dispensers over individual cartons), and by working with farmers to identify crops that they can grow in volume and sell for reasonable prices.

Many nutrition experts believe that it is possible to fix the National School Lunch Program by throwing a little more money at it. But without healthy food (and cooks and kitchens to prepare it), increased financing will only create a larger junk-food distribution system. We need to scrap the current system and start from scratch. Washington needs to give schools enough money to cook and serve unprocessed foods that are produced without pesticides or chemical fertilizers. When possible, these foods should be locally grown.
How much would it cost to feed 30 million American schoolchildren a wholesome meal? It could be done for about $5 per child, or roughly $27 billion a year, plus a one-time investment in real kitchens. Yes, that sounds expensive. But a healthy school lunch program would bring long-term savings and benefits in the areas of hunger, children’s health and dietary habits, food safety (contaminated peanuts have recently found their way into school lunches), environmental preservation and energy conservation.

The Agriculture Department will have to do its part, by making good on its fledgling commitment to back environmentally sound farming practices and by realizing a separate program to deliver food, especially fresh fruits and vegetables, from farms to schools. It will also need to provide adequate support for kitchens and healthy meal planning. Congress has an opportunity to accomplish some of these goals when it takes up the Child Nutrition and Women Infants and Children Reauthorization Act, which is set to expire in September.

But the Department of Education should take some initiative, too. After all, eating well requires education. We can teach students to choose good food and to understand how their choices affect their health and the environment. The new school lunch program should be partly financed by the Department of Education, and Arne Duncan, the secretary of education, should oversee it. Vice President Joseph Biden should also come to the table by making school lunch a priority of his White House Task Force on Middle Class Working Families.

Every public school child in America deserves a healthful and delicious lunch that is prepared with fresh ingredients. Cash-strapped parents should be able to rely on the government to contribute to their children’s physical well-being, not to the continued spread of youth obesity, Type 2 diabetes and other diet-related problems. Let’s prove that there is such a thing as a good, free lunch.

Alice Waters is the president of The Chez Panisse Foundation. Katrina Heron is a director of the foundation and a co-producer of civileats.com.
Down:
1) to long for; want greatly; desire eagerly
2) driving or pushing force, something influential
3) to overthrow (something established or existing)
4) deserving blame or censure; blameworthy
5) to put (something) on or in, as a burden, load, or cargo; load
6) of, pertaining to, or characteristic of controversy; polemical
7) interposition or interference of one state in the affairs of another
8) causing obesity

Across:
1) Subvert
2) Culpable
3) Laden
4) Crave
5) Push Factors
6) Obesogenic
7) Interventions
8) Controversial
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Down:</th>
<th>Across:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Crave</td>
<td>2) Push Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Subvert</td>
<td>4) Culpable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Laden</td>
<td>8) Obesogenic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Controversial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Interventions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No Lunch Left Behind
Alice Waters and Katrina Heron in the article, No Lunch Left Behind, explains that the government is investing such a large amount of money into the schools lunches and it is being used to buy unhealthy fatty foods, when with just a little more money, the food can be a much better quality and will be much healthier and safer for the kids today. Waters and Heron support their explanation by describing some of the current uses for the funds being provided and demonstrating the concern and aggravations that some Americans have for this issue, giving a professionals opinion on the matter and offering a plan to the government to fix this issue. The author’s purpose is to inform and persuade the government of the importance of having healthy foods in the schools today so that the children of America do not have to continue to suffer from poor diets and the growing infectious spread of fatty and unhealthy fast foods that are not good for you whatsoever. The author’s tone is informational and serious in attempts to be heard and understood by the government and Americans who care about the health and safety of the children in America today.

Attacking the Obesity Epidemic by First Figuring Out Its Cause
Jane E. Brody in the article, Attacking the Obesity Epidemic by First Figuring Out Its Cause, suggests that obesity can be mostly blamed on the food and beverage industry for pushing and promoting the unhealthy and fatty foods and beverages that have become popular within the last 30 years. Brody supports her claim by explaining that the fast food industry and restaurant industry have grown to much larger levels since she was a child; back then going to a restaurant was a special occasion and “fast foods” were canned fruits and vegetables, not fried hamburgers and burritos. The author’s purpose is to inform the public of the large amount of fast foods and foods that have been made for the convenience of the customer as well as the lack of exercise received in today’s society are working hand in hand to allow obesity to become a continuously growing health issue today, and attempts to persuade them that it is better in the long run to choose healthy foods over the fast and convenient foods offered. The author writes in an informative and persuasive tone to inform and persuade the reader that fast foods and convenience foods are not what they may seem to be.

Bad Food? Tax It, and Subsidize Vegetables
Mark Bittman in the article, Bad Food? Tax It, and Subsidize Vegetables, claims that taxes are one of the most reasonable and logical explanations to reduce the large amounts of health issues related to poor diets and to reduce the amount of uneducated people when it comes to healthy and better food choices. Bittman supports his argument by describing the various habits many Americans have in terms of unhealthy eating habits and compares America to other countries
that have begun to take actions towards the betterment of these issues by imposing additional taxes. The author’s purpose is to inform the people that it is the job of the federal government to protect the good of the public people, including the health of them by suggesting they make it more inconvenient for fast and convenience foods, and make it easier for people to purchase the foods that we should be consuming. The author writes in an informative and persuasive tone in order to convince the audience that this is the best option to stop the unhealthy eating habits most Americans have picked up and developed.
No Lunch Left Behind

- **Paragraph 1**
  - Claims that the 1946 investment was poor
  - Suggests that it should be redesigned to allow the children to be healthier

- **Paragraph 2**
  - Reports the money given to each school for each child per meal
  - Explains that most of the money received doesn’t go directly towards the food as it was intentionally purposed for

- **Paragraph 3**
  - Outlines the types of foods received—fatty and greasy, over-processed, etc.
  - Presents the knowledge that most of the foods are basically leftovers from large companies

- **Paragraph 4**
  - Establishes the knowledge that the schools have a lot of highly similar foods to fast food which are not healthy for kids, especially at school
  - Reports that many of the children receiving these lunches come from low-income households

- **Paragraph 5**
  - Analyzes that many parents are demanding more of the government because of the unhealthy choices it provides
  - Demonstrates how a school has used the government funding to help in their healthy pursuit by using the funding as the push and cooking from scratch with local and fresh produces

- **Paragraph 6**
  - Argues that many nutritionists believe this issue can be fixed with more initial investments now, less investment later
  - States that schools will need cooks and kitchens in order to allow these changes to occur successfully

- **Paragraph 7**
  - Supports that it would only cost $5 per child, $27 billion a year and a one-time investment in real kitchens
  - Acknowledges the cost is expensive, but reminds us that it would bring long-term savings and prevent many health issues

- **Paragraph 8**
  - Explains that the Agricultural Department would have to make good on its part too in order for them to be able to work together to accomplish the healthier goals for the kids.
  - Urges the congress to accomplish some of these goals when opportunity arises
• Paragraph 9
  o Details that the Department of Education would have to take initiative too and do its part—eating well and having the knowledge needed to know whether or not they are eating well requires education
  o Studies the need for students to know how their eating habits affect their health and being able to make the healthier decisions when given a choice
• Paragraph 10
  o Analyzes the need for the governments assistance in stopping the health problems among children by taking this step towards healthier choices
  o Suggests that America make a good free lunch available and possible in the schools

Attacking the Obesity Epidemic by First Figuring Out Its Cause

• Paragraph 1-5
  o Assures the readers that a big cause for the obesity crisis can be blamed on marketing and advertising from the food and beverage industries looking solely to make money and not caring about the health effects
  o Relates and compares the need to reverse the problems with obesity to the need they had to reverse the issues with smoking—years to make the issue known and big enough to fix it or at least “tame it”
• Paragraph 6-9
  o Provides an anecdote on her life during the 1940’s and 1950’s before obesity became a largely spread health issue
  o Compares her life to that of children and teens today by giving examples of breakfasts today and the differences between how she commuted from point A to point B compared to people today
• Paragraph 10-15
  o Outlines how women entered the work force and the industry figured out ways to make cooking more convenient and made it to where it didn’t require as much preparation or cook time as well as provided foods that fit more palates
  o Illustrates that there are far too many restaurants and fast food places—she passed 5 of them in one block and two of them were advertising large quantities of food for only $1.99
• Paragraph 16-19
  o States that it will take a lot of time and planning to turn the obesity crisis around, just like it did with the smoking era they had to change
Presents the studies of professionals and experts who understand how serious the widespread obesity problem can get if there are not precautions taken such as special labeling and extra taxes on unhealthy and sugary foods

- Paragraph 20-21
  - Quotes Dr. Gortmaker in explaining that the marketing is aimed towards teens and children who allow for the most effective advertising and sales
  - Researches show that children from 2 to 19 make up a $24 billion industry alone

- Paragraph 22-25
  - Proposes that putting an additional tax on unhealthy foods would bring in millions of dollars a year with a 1-cent-per-ounce excise tax
  - Urges the people to change the foods in the cafeteria as well in order to help the younger kids with the issues they will end up facing as well as shows the readers that America is not the only country with the rising obesity issues

---

**Bad Food? Tax It, and Subsidize Vegetables**

- Paragraph 1
  - Questions the audience about what it will take to get Americans to change to healthier eating habits
  - Elaborates that America’s eating habits has led to many illnesses including heart disease, diabetes and cancer

- Paragraph 2-3
  - Suggests that experts recommend diets high in plants and low in animal products, but Americans have the opposite diet habits
  - Supports the idea that health care costs will be drastically lowered if the diets of Americans was healthier

- Paragraph 4
  - Defends the food industry in that it is not their job to market and advertise solely healthy foods because they are in the market to make a profit
  - Argues that it is the job of the federal government to protect the public health interests because it is considered to be a “public good”

- Paragraph 5-6
  - Suggests that the unhealthy foods that people shouldn’t be eating have an additional tax put on them and the money raised from that tax be used towards a program encouraging a better diet
  - Researches the amount of sugared beverages the average American consumes and suggests that experts would decide which foods and beverages to tax and not

- Paragraph 7
  - Asserts the fact that taxes would reduce consumption of unhealthy food choices
• Claims that the raised money could be used to subsidize the purchase of staple foods including seasonal greens, vegetables, etc.

• **Paragraph 8-9**
  - Explores the possibility of selling those foods at a much cheaper and affordable rates, influencing those who are on budgets and looking to save money to buy healthier foods instead of fast food and unhealthy food choices.
  - Considers the feelings of both the processed food industry and the people who feel their rights to eating whatever they choose is being taken away, but restates that it is the government's job to protect the good of the people, including making sure the foods available are healthful and beneficial.

• **Paragraph 10-11**
  - Argues that it is more difficult to buy fruit than fruit loops, making chips and soda a common breakfast.
  - States that more than one third of Americans have diabetes or are pre-diabetic, both health issues most commonly caused by poor diet and unhealthy eating habits.

• **Paragraph 12**
  - Illuminates the states that have already considered adding taxes on these products and encourages them to follow through with them.
  - Lists some beverages that have hidden amounts of sugars that are often portrayed as much more health beneficial than actuality.

• **Paragraph 13-14**
  - Explains the need for excise taxes which are added before the sales taxes—shows in the price on the shelf, making it more likely the consumer will re-think the decision.
  - Reports that people are more likely to buy the product if it has a lower shelf price, even if the sales taxes are high because high sales taxes are seen after, not before.

• **Paragraph 15-17**
  - Studies show that with an additional excise tax, three things should occur: decrease in amount of consumption of sweetened beverages, disease and public health costs should decrease, and money raised could fund other issues.
  - Suggests that once governments see that these taxes could bring in billions, they will be more willing to try it out to see if it works and can use the money to provide healthier choices which will save money in the long run.

• **Paragraph 18**
  - Compares America to other countries in which have begun taking action and have already added or are in the process of adding taxes to sweetened beverages and foods with too much sugar, salt, or fats.
  - Examines the issues additional taxes would assist in—disease, budget, health care, environment, food access, and more.
- **Paragraph 20**
  - Reports that the food industry spent millions in marketing their unhealthy yet profitable products to the general public in successful attempts to capture their attention to purchase their products.
  - Explains that education alone is losing against the vast amount of money the food industry is able to invest into marketing, making education more difficult to be successfully shared and spread to the people in need of that information.

- **Paragraph 21-23**
  - Predicts the costs of health care will be $344 billion by 2018 with continuation of current habits and trends in America with poor diets.
  - Compares today’s obesity issues with the issues in America in the 1960’s with the large amounts of smoking and tobacco usage and acknowledges that eating is a necessity when smoking isn’t, and argues that eating unhealthy and fatty foods is not a necessity and can be cut back without harm to the human body.

- **Paragraph 24-25**
  - Defends companies in that they are somewhat making an attempt to make nutritionally worthless foods less so worthless.
  - Acknowledges that many would argue that many jobs would be lost then shows facts of the falsity of that statement with the tobacco settlements and predicts that this situation would end up very similar to that of the tobacco companies.

- **Paragraph 26-28**
  - Presents the findings of studies which show that in only a decade, having the additional taxes on sugary foods would prevent about 37,000 cases of diabetes and bring in over $1 billion annually as well as cut obesity in youth by about 18 percent.
  - Informs that a 20% increase in price on sweetened beverages would lead to a 20% decrease in purchase and consumption which would prevent 400,000 cases of diabetes.

- **Paragraph 29-30**
  - Explains that these changes will lead to better habits in children who are just beginning to develop and would assist them in the future years from making more informed and better choices for themselves.
  - Provides ideas to change refrigerated soda and candy vending machines to fresher options—provides Japan and Iowa as examples of places that have already successfully completed this as well as urges television public-service announcements to promote healthy eating habits.

- **Paragraph 31-32**
  - Suggests that the money raised can be used to fund more community locations such as gyms, pools, jogging and bike trails as well as food distribution centers and supermarkets and other beneficial causes.
Asserts the knowledge that America can be the leader in preventing chronic or “lifestyle” diseases and be an example—repair some of the damages that have been made over the period of the past 30 years.
| **No Lunch Left Behind**  
| Alice Waters and Katrina Heron |
|---|---|
| **Subject** | The government needs to change their funding purpose to fund for more healthy food choices instead of the current choices available at schools |
| **Occasion** | This piece was written because the food being served in schools is not as healthy as it could and should be. |
| **Audience** | The audience is the people and the government. The people need to let the government know what they want and why they should change what they’ve been doing—it isn’t working for the people and needs to change |
| **Purpose** | To inform the people of the truth behind the food served at schools and how it is lacking the needed health benefits for the children today |
| **Speaker** | The authors are president and director of The Chez Panisse Foundation and are concerned with the foods being served to the children in the schools today; trying to inform others of the issues in hopes that changes will be made |
| **Tone** | Academic, informative, reflective, persuasive, argumentative. |

| **Attacking the Obesity Epidemic by First Figuring Out Its Cause**  
| Jane E. Brody |
|---|---|
| **Subject** | The food and beverage industry are to blame (mostly) for the largely spread obesity problem in America due to the large amounts of advertising and marketing of the unhealthy and sugary foods and drinks |
| **Occasion** | Obesity has become a serious problem over the last 30 years; before that, people got too much exercise and couldn’t afford not to eat healthy |
| **Audience** | The general audience, especially those who are interested or affected by the obesity health problems. It is important for them to understand that they are not alone and it can be solved over time |
| **Purpose** | People need to understand the seriousness of this health issue because it is a major problem and is not good for the life span of the human body |
| **Speaker** | The speaker has seen obesity first hand—she grew up in the 1940’s and 50’s and remembers that there wasn’t any way to avoid normal diet and exercise until after the invention of cars and the change in the attitudes of the general people |
| **Tone** | Informative, informal, reflective, persuasive |

| **Bad Food? Tax It, and Subsidize Vegetables**  
<p>| Mark Bittman |
|---|---|
| <strong>Subject</strong> | Imposing an additional excise tax on sweetened and unhealthy foods is the best option for the government to help put a large barrier between Americans and junk foods that are the major cause of many health issues. |
| <strong>Occasion</strong> | Millions of Americans have become obese, and over one third the American populations is either diabetic or pre-diabetic, most commonly resulting from poor diet and unhealthy eating habits. |
| <strong>Audience</strong> | The Federal Government and the people interested in making a change in |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Persuade and inform the people of the bad habits that have been picked up over the last 30 years and trying to persuade them to revert back to healthier habits to be able to live a happy and healthy life.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Dedicated to informing the reader of the benefits of healthy foods compared to the consequences of unhealthy food choices. Acknowledges the arguments and makes sure to stand up for his beliefs through evidence from various studies at colleges and from experts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tone</td>
<td>Informative, informational, persuasive, argumentative, passionate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Good Food Bad Food Rough Draft

Childhood Obesity in America is a terrible problem, and there are consistent signs that it is getting worse. Poor nutritional choices in children's diets not only stunt their mental and physical growth, they also leaves a legacy of poor nutrition going into adulthood: obese children become obese parents, and tend to have obese children as well. The cost of childhood and adult obesity is staggering. Michelle Obama has been the driving force behind a new "healthy option" school lunch program, but this has met with some resistance, as noted in a CBS televised article titled "Michelle Obama-touted federal healthy lunch program leaves bad taste in some school districts' mouths", which reported one school child as saying the meal "tastes like vomit".

There is little argument that American school children need to change their diet. And there is no doubt that some of the impetus for that change has to come from the federal government. But it is not necessary for the entire program to be driven from a national perspective, and in fact, oversight of the implementation of such a program is probably more effective at a local level.

Instead of dictating the food choices nationally, the federal government should use a carrot and stick approach to encourage local healthy choice options. The government should establish a National Healthy Eating Office, with the power to assess the real food value of all foods. This office should have funding and power to do the following: designate certain foods as junk foods, and assess a staggered rate of additional tax on them; assess school lunch programs submitted to it by school districts across the nation for their nutritional value; provide funding for those school lunch programs (anywhere from zero to 100%) based on the nutritional value of the submitted program.
The Office will need to have considerable political clout to be able to perform these functions without interference. Jane Brody in the New York Times quotes Steven L. Gortmaker, a sociologist at the Harvard School of Public Health, "Almost all food policies recommended as priority actions, including front-of-pack traffic light labeling, have been heavily contested by the food industry." (Brody). "The fast-food industry spent more than $4 billion on marketing in 2009" (Bittman), so this multi-trillion dollar industry is unlikely to take any new regulatory proposals lying down, either.

This method of local initiative and federal support allows school districts to make local choices which can emphasize products grown locally: a sensible food choice for Montana might not be economically sensible for Florida. It also allows school districts to choose their speed of transition to more nutritional food, knowing that they will pay a tax penalty for the foods designated as junk food, and knowing that the more nutritional they make their program, the more funding they will receive for it. The current nationally run system is failing that test: "food distributed by the National School Lunch Program contains some of the same ingredients found in fast food, and the resulting meals routinely fail to meet basic nutritional standards" (Waters and Heron). Local oversight will make local school district officials and local parents and local schoolchildren responsible stakeholders in the program, and it will also enable them to involve local food producers.

People might well complain about the food supplied, because it is not as tasty as the junk food, but once they realize that they are arguing that they should pay a considerable sum extra for the non-nutritional choices, those arguments will quickly fade. It will be up to the local programs to find nutritional choices that don't "taste like vomit" while still attracting the federal funding for good nutrition.
The National Healthy Eating Office should be established to be a zero profit zero loss entity. It should set the taxes on junk food to be high enough to cover its own running costs and the costs of funding the subsidies of the school lunch programs. As school districts slowly but surely move toward healthier choices, the costs of subsidizing school lunch programs will increase, and the revenue raised from the junk food tax will decrease, but the shortfall will be more than equaled by the decrease in health costs made by reducing obesity across America. In addition, keeping the food supply programs local will encourage participation by school children themselves, parents, and other interested parties, encouraging open discussion about nutrition, which will help to educate children so they can make healthier choices as adults as well, and in due time educate their own children toward better nutrition.
Writing: Circle one in each category. Mark any major problems on the essay itself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spelling</th>
<th>(No spelling errors)</th>
<th>Few spelling errors</th>
<th>Many spelling errors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>(No grammatical errors)</td>
<td>Few grammatical errors</td>
<td>Many grammatical errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence Structure</td>
<td>(All sentences are complete)</td>
<td>Few incomplete sentences or run-ons</td>
<td>Many incomplete sentences or run-ons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Introduction:
   a. Does the introduction begin with an interesting “hook” that makes you want to continue reading?
     
     Yes

   b. Does the essay have a thesis, or an overall point? If so, write it below. If it needs work, explain:
     
     Yes the intro paragraph last sentence in the intro

2. Support and Analysis:
   a. To what extent does the author’s analysis convince you? Why?
     
     She does a great job in explaining what she is writing about.

   b. Where in the essay are you least convinced by the author’s point? What can be done to improve it?
     
     Everything looks great.

3. Structure:
   a. Can you identify the main topic of each paragraph? If not, in which paragraphs is it unclear?
     
     Yes it’s all very clear. (the essay)

   b. Does the writer use transitions (nevertheless, although, even though, however, what’s more, in addition, in other words, etc.) to make his/her organization of though clear to the reader?
     
     Yes.

4. Completeness:
   a. Where could the author have gone more in-depth or added more detail?
     
     Well it is all clear and it’s already great.

   b. Does the author admit and respond to other interpretations (objections / counterarguments)?
     
     Yes

   c. Does the author include the 3 required sentence patterns, and highlight and identify them?
     
     Yes

5. Clarity:
   a. Are any sentences confusing? Mark them with “confusing” on the paper itself.
     
     All the essay is very clear.

6. Overall:
   a. What single change would make the paper even stronger?
     
     Her paper is already great.

7. Resources:
   a. Does the author identify his/her sources using MLA style, both in-text and in a Works Cited?
     
     Yes she includes a work cited page. Good!
Writing: Circle one in each category. Mark any major problems on the essay itself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spelling</th>
<th>No spelling errors</th>
<th>Few spelling errors</th>
<th>Many spelling errors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>No grammatical errors</td>
<td>Few grammatical errors</td>
<td>Many grammatical errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence Structure</td>
<td>All sentences are complete</td>
<td>Few incomplete sentences or run-ons</td>
<td>Many incomplete sentences or run-ons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Introduction:
   a. Does the introduction begin with an interesting “hook” that makes you want to continue reading?
      YES IT DOES
   b. Does the essay have a thesis, or an overall point? If so, write it below. If it needs work, explain:
      YES

2. Support and Analysis:
   a. To what extent does the author’s analysis convince you? Why?
      ARGUMENTS ABOUT CHANGING DIETS
   b. Where in the essay are you least convinced by the author’s point? What can be done to improve it?
      NONE, ITS VERY CONVINCING

3. Structure:
   a. Can you identify the main topic of each paragraph? If not, in which paragraphs is it unclear?
      YES I CAN
   b. Does the writer use transitions (nevertheless, although, even though, however, what’s more, in addition, in other words, etc.) to make his/her organization of though clear to the reader?
      NEED MORE TRANSITION WORDS

4. Completeness:
   a. Where could the author have gone more in-depth or added more detail?
      NONE, GIVES VERY GOOD EXPLANATIONS IN HER PARAGRAPHS.
   b. Does the author admit and respond to other interpretations (objections / counterarguments)?
      YES, HOW SOME PEOPLE WOULDN'T LIKE THE CHANGE OF A HEALTHIER DIET
   c. Does the author include the 3 required sentence patterns, and highlight and identify them?
      I DO SEE SENTENCE PATTERNS BUT NEED TO BE HIGHLIGHTED AND IDENTIFIED

5. Clarity:
   a. Are any sentences confusing? Mark them with “confusing” on the paper itself.
      NONE ARE CONFUSING

6. Overall:
   a. What single change would make the paper even stronger?
      MAYBE GO EVEN MORE IN DEPTH BUT OVERALL ITS REALLY GOOD

7. Resources:
   a. Does the author identify his/her sources using MLA style, both in-text and in a Works Cited?
      YES THEY DO
Childhood obesity in America is a terrible problem, and there are signs that it is consistently getting worse. The poor nutritional choices in the children’s diets not only stunt their mental and physical growth, but also will result in children having poor nutritional habits that will continue into their adulthood: obese children become obese parents, and tend to have obese children as well. The cost of obesity among children and adults is staggering. Michelle Obama has been the driving force behind a new, "healthy option" school lunch program, but this has met with some resistance. A CBS televised article titled, "Michelle Obama-Touted Federal Healthy Lunch Program Leaves Bad Taste in Some School Districts' Mouths," reported one school child as saying the meal "tastes like vomit."

There is little argument that American school children need to change their diets. And there is no doubt that some of the impetus for that change has to come from the federal government; however, it is not necessary for the entire program to be driven from a national perspective. Oversight of the implementation of such a program is probably more effective at a local level.

Instead of dictating the food choices nationally, the federal government should use a carrot and stick approach to encourage local healthy choice options. The government should establish a National Healthy Eating Office, with the power to assess the real food value of all foods. This office should have funding and power to do the following: designate certain foods as junk foods
and assess a staggered rate of additional tax on them; assess school lunch programs submitted to
it by school districts across the nation for their nutritional values; provide additional amounts of
funding for those school lunch programs based upon the nutritional value of the submitted
program.

The Office will need to have considerable political clout to be able to perform these
functions without interference. Jane Brody in the New York Times quotes Steven L. Gortmaker,
a sociologist at the Harvard School of Public Health, "Almost all food policies recommended as
priority actions, including front-of-pack traffic light labeling, have been heavily contested by the
food industry," (Brody). "The fast-food industry spent more than $4 billion on marketing in
2009," (Bittman), so this multi-trillion dollar industry is unlikely to take any new regulatory
proposals lying down, either.

This method of local initiative and federal support allows school districts to make local
choices which can emphasize products grown locally; a sensible food choice for Montana might
not be economically sensible for Florida. It also allows school districts to choose their speed of
transition to more nutritional foods knowing that they will pay a tax penalty for the foods
designated as junk food, and knowing that the more nutritional they make their program, the
more funding they will receive for it. The current nationally run system is failing that test; "food
distributed by the National School Lunch Program contains some of the same ingredients found
in fast food, and the resulting meals routinely fail to meet basic nutritional standards," (Waters
and Heron). Local oversight will make local school district officials and local parents and local
schoolchildren responsible stakeholders in the program, and it will also enable them to involve
local food producers more.
People will complain about the food supplied because it is not as tasty as the junk food to most people, but once they realize that they are arguing that they should pay a considerable sum extra for the non-nutritional choices, those arguments will quickly fade. It will be up to the local programs to find nutritional choices that don't "taste like vomit" while still attracting the federal funding for good nutrition. With some creativity and kitchens with staff who are able to transform foods, nutritious foods can taste just as good, if not better than the junk foods that most schools currently make available to the students.

The National Healthy Eating Office should be established to be a zero profit, zero loss entity. It should set the taxes on junk food to be high enough to cover its own running costs and the costs of funding the subsidies of the school lunch programs. As school districts slowly but surely move toward healthier choices, the costs of subsidizing school lunch programs will increase, and the revenue raised from the junk food tax will decrease, but the shortfall will be more than equaled by the decrease in health costs made by reducing the high rates of obesity all across America. Additionally, keeping the food supply programs local will encourage participation of the community members and businesses by encouraging more open discussions about nutrition, and in turn, will help to educate children so they can make healthier choices as adults as well. In due time, they will be able to educate their own children of better nutritional choices and others in their community.
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Module 3/4 Learning Reflection

This module focused on (subject matter; main issue)...
the importance of having healthy food choices, especially in school.

The sentence patterns we focused on in this module were...
sentence pattern #1, #12, #16, and #20.

These sentence patterns involve...
semicolon usage and conjunctions and commas.

One of the reading strategies I found most useful in this module was (activities for MT 2 – which were useful and why)...
charting the text because it helped in writing the rhetorical precis and doing the SOAPSTone's.

What I'm most proud of in my argumentative essay is...
my ability to provide good reasons why food choice is important.

What I learned from studying this topic was (new knowledge, understandings about world)...
the foods served at schools are not very healthy— they contain the same products as many fast foods.

In the future (in school, or everyday life) I might use this new knowledge I’ve gained in this module by (informing others? Studying something in college? Making different choices or behavior towards other by...) using it when I become a chef. Keeping the food healthy is important.

English LF Feedback: