Example A (an evaluation argument):

Proposal for the Monitoring of Slaughterhouses

Every year, around 9 billion animals are killed in slaughterhouses around the world. Now compare that to the human population of 7 billion. Focusing on American slaughterhouses, there have been a number of documented experiences which entailed unskilled, illegal workers, as well as mal practice in the ways of slaughtering the animals, causing "live death" experiences leading to harm of the workers. Other cases have dealt with the toxicity and contamination of the meat itself. My proposal to the FDA is to overlook as well as enforce cameras and unexpected sanitation checks upon all American slaughterhouses. Food distributors such as restaurants and food markets have common sanitation checks and if they do not meet the standard sanitation laws they are shut down for the benefit of the common good. The criteria in which my team followed up on as we conducted field research was based on warehouse sanitation, overcrowding, and nutritional health of the animals.

On the field, my team of researchers and I noticed little sanitation at the eight plants we visited out of the 15 in our state. In a closed interview with an anonymous employee at the Cannon Forrest slaughterhouse, he/she disclosed to us that the manager becomes aware of an inspection a week before it occurs. Knowing this, he sends the workers into full force, cleaning and bleaching everything from floors to doors, creating a more appealing and sterile warehouse. While giving us a tour, the manager only showed us on the 2nd and 3rd floors, while not exposing us to the first floor. When asked if inspectors are allowed on the first floor, there was no response. In another anonymous interview with a 1st level worker he/she claimed that they were forced to wear masks and

rubber boots while working due to sewage covered floors that were only ever washed down by a hose. At least one worker from every plant gave us a swab sample of the bottom of their boot to use for research. Once taken to a lab at Wageningen University, 73.24% showed signs of MRSA. Following up on the study with research, it has come to our attention that nearly 60 percent of all swine in slaughterhouses carry the bacteria.

Our second point of criteria dealt with the overcrowding of slaughterhouses due to the harmful consequences it brings to animals. Overcrowding is a problem that not only affects animals but also humans. The similarities and symptoms of overcrowding showed signs of stress as well as changes in attitude. Observation of pigs concluded a change in attitude that led to aggressive behavior. Research from Pennington University also noted that there were over 86 noted cases of cannibalism. Crowded waiting areas are poorly sanitized and due to the close proximity have led to entire herd becoming ill or infected. Toxic emissions from large amounts of deposit are also contribute to the poor living conditions that cause infectious diseases to contaminate this source of meat.

Lastly, my team focused on the substances taken in by the animals. Often we hear the common phrase "You are what you eat". If we apply this saying to animals destined for the slaughterhouse, we wouldn't be too pleased with where this phrase would lead us. The most common feeding form for slaughterhouse-destined animals is to bulk them up as much as possible. This is done through corn-based feed which is unnatural compared to their common diet of grass and hay. Cattle and swine farmers use this technique to fatten up the animal or to enhance their milk supply. Corn feed may sound harmful to the common consumer yet it possesses several consequences that harm the animal's digestive system leading the producers to administer antibiotics to avoid symptoms such as

acidosis and bloating. In addition to the enhanced corn feed, the animals that need more assistance in gaining weight are administered steroids and hormones. If the use of steroids is discouraged by the competitive and moneymaking industry of baseball, I do not see how administering steroids to cattle in order to enhance there sale price is any different.

Despite the many benefits that may come along with this enactment, skeptics may dispute in claiming that mass production gives America the upper hand in the meat market as well as supplies many uneducated people with jobs. This assumption may be true, yet many of those holding jobs in such a dirty, low paid business are illegal immigrants. Regulation of all slaughterhouses would unveil this secretive and unlawful act and bring jobs to Americans as well as provide jobs for inspectors and surveillance workers. Others may argue that the industry is making money and the meat supply hasn't caused any epidemic diseases, so no change is truly necessary. Yet there have been several known cases in which people have died due to animals not receiving the correct amount of shock treatment, yet still being sent into production. At the Tilker Bay Slaughter house 12 pigs went into production alive, before they halted the belt, living through their deaths, they jumped around and ferociously beat at the equipment leading to the death of two employees and harm of 12 more. Other cases deal with rare bacteria in the meat that has led to the death of consumers. One strong example is the story of Kyle Peters, a two year old in Seattle who died from eating a burger contaminated with E-coli. Later it was found that the distributor was delivering meat with high amounts of these bacteria, infecting more than a dozen of its consumers before a temporary shut down for

inspection. Though this is only one case, continuation of such poor sanitation and animal care may lead to even more outbreaks.

We call upon the FDA to enact such policies in order to fight the problem of contaminated meat at the head of production by installing monitoring systems and unexpected sanitation checks. This investment of 3.5 million dollars would be beneficial in that it would save the FDA the high costs of recalling and re-inspecting large amounts of contaminated beef and pork. Such an enactment would benefit the greater American society in providing over 10,000 jobs for the unemployed and provide safe and healthy meat. Lastly this would uphold the FDA's prestigious title of being the most sufficient and reliable food dietary monitoring industry, that according to your website gives great value to "Protecting and Promoting *Your* Health".

Example B (an excerpt from a proposal argument):

The Problem and Its Origin:

Rob Stewart's documentary *Sharkwater*, which has received 33 international awards since 2006, shows the detrimental impact that the shark-hunting industry has on shark species, many of which have already been driven to the edge of extinction. In fact, only 3% of the body weight of sharks is of high value, while the rest of the shark is usually thrown away because of its relatively low value. This small but valuable portion of sharks' body is their fins, which are in increasing demand worldwide for shark fin soup and traditional cures. Consequently, shark finning has increased significantly in size during the past decade and has become one of the major industries around the world.

Shark finning not only kills sharks just like other hunting practices do, but it also does it in an extremely cruel and inhumane way. Shark finning is the practice of removing and retaining shark fins. However, the rest of the living shark is thrown back into the ocean because fishers do not want their ships to be filled with fin-less sharks which they consider to be worthless. Although they are not killed directly as in normal shark-hunting practices, they are no longer able to move effectively due to the lack of fins. As a result, they either get eaten by other predators or simply die from suffocation or starvation, which can take days and is truly an agony for sharks.

Consequences of shark finning are both serious and irreversible. Firstly, it has significantly reduced the shark population and threatens sharks to extinction. According to a research conducted by Clarke et al. (2006) at the University of Hawaii and the National Research institute of Far Seas Fisheries, as many as 73 million sharks are hunted

each year for their fins, and this number is growing at a rate of 6% per annum. Since most sharks grow slowly, and that their reproduction rates are low, these numbers are actually more threatening than they appear to be. As a result, population of some shark species has been reduced by more than 80% during the past 50 years, and most shark species will become extinct within the next decade at the current rate (Marquez, 2006). Secondly, shark finning also adversely affects other living species in the ocean. Sharks, despite their frightening appearance, are in fact crucial for the entire oceanic ecosystem and other living species, especially coral reefs. Studies have shown that sharks, being at the top of the marine food web, help coral reef ecosystems to maintain a high biodiversity and densities for individual species. If sharks were to become extinct, the entire structure of the coral reef community would be altered. For example, without top predators like sharks, the population of herbivorous fish would decline, causing algae to overgrow, and to eventually suffocate reef. Once coral reefs become dead, other fish in the ocean will have fewer niches available for them. Last but not least, sharks also have high economic value. For example, sharks are essential for the tourism industry of islands and coastal areas. According to a study conducted by the Australian Institute of Marine Science and the University of Western Australia, "diver tourism contributes about 39 percent of the [Palau's] gross domestic product of $218 million, and 21 percent of divers chose their vacation there specifically to see the sharks, meaning that tourism to view sharks contributes about 8 percent of G.D.P" (Jolly, 2014). This study also showed that each reef shark inhabiting around the most popular dive sites in the area were worth $179,000 each.

Despite these great values of shark species, its populations have been at a rapid rate declining due to the rapidly growing industry of shark finning. Shark fins are hunted

mainly for their economic and cultural values. The demand for shark fins comes primarily from the fact that they are the main ingredients of making the shark fin soup, which is a popular soup in the Chinese cuisine. Shark fin soup is also considered to be one of the luxury items in the Chinese cuisine, widely known among the Chinese as one of the eight-treasured food from the sea. Its history can be traced back to the Ming Dynasty, when the standards of living of the Chinese people were relatively low and only the emperor and high-level ministers had the privilege to enjoy this delicacy. With the changing of times and the improvement of people's living standards, shark fin soup became affordable for more and more Chinese people. The only thing that has not changed is the cultural meaning that was given to this item. Shark fin soup has been a symbol of wealth, power, and prestige in the Chinese culture. It is usually served at important occasions such as weddings, banquets, and business deals. During the past few decades, as China increased its process of reform and opening-up, the demand for shark fin soup has sky-rocketed, causing the global market for shark fin trading to expand explosively. According to an article published on *Orlando Sentinel* written by David Fleshler (2008), not only have more and more shark fin soups are being served in China, it has spread to a lot of Chinese restaurants in the United States:

> In Central Florida, at least four Chinese restaurants serve the soup. Tom Wong, a staff member at Chan's Chinese Cuisine on Colonial Drive, said his restaurant prepares the dish typically for birthdays and anniversaries. A course costing $85 to $98 feeds six to eight people. He said he didn't consider shark to be any different from beef or pork.

Moreover, the culinary use of shark fins has also spread into other parts of the world, in that Japanese cuisine and Western cuisine now also include dishes made of shark fins. All these factors have contributed to the global expansion of the shark finning industry.

The Solution and Past Attempts:

There have been international bans on shark finning. According to the Humane Society International/Europe (2013), "27 countries and the European Union had banned shark finning". However, the bans only apply to territorial waters of these nations, and there is not any regulation of shark finning on international waters. In addition, black market trading and illegal finning frequently occur despite bans on finning. For example, although shark finning is banned in the United States, according to an article published on *National Geographic* by Trivedi Bijal (2002), "a bowl of shark-fin soup can sell for $70 to $150. For trophy species like the whale and basking shark, a single fin can fetch $10,000 to $20,000" (para.5).

Although this might seem too simple or too idealistic, but in my opinion the only viable way to stop shark finning is to stop eating shark fin soup at restaurants or to stop purchasing shark products at grocery stores. As Jackie Chan said when he campaigned against shark finning, "there will be no killing if there is no trading." The major incentive behind the shark finning industry is the demand for shark fin soup. If the demand drops, trades of shark fins will subside, both legal and illegal ones.

The Viability and Opposing Views:

This solution is obviously very feasible and everybody should be able to comply, but the question lies in whether they are able to overcome their natural conservatism and become willing to do so. Let me summarize some of their ideas and discuss some reasons why they should do so.

1. **Shark fin soup is nutritious and good for the human body**

   Many people believe that shark fin soup is beneficial to the human body because

it contains a lot of nutrients. For example, when I was little I was told by my grandparents that shark fin is a very precious tonic that will enhance one's energy level and also prevent cancer.

However, there is no scientific evidence to back up these claims. In fact, according to the USDA National Database, shark fin soup contains almost no vitamin A, which is abundant in vegetable soup. In addition, not only is shark fin soup not nutritious, it can have certain negative effects on the human body. According to an article published on *China Daily*, "'

Shark fin may cause sterility because of mercury and other heavy metals contamination,' said Victor Wu, an officer at the United States-based WildAid, 'and the risk to men is much higher than women'" (2005, para.6).

2. **We should not take action since shark fin soup is part of the Chinese culture**

Although it is true that shark fin soup originated in China and still bears cultural meanings up to this day, it is irresponsible to neglect the fact that shark finning has become an international issue instead of a regional or local issue, in that more than 100 countries around the world are involved in shark fin trading. Beyond that, from the standpoint of a person who grew up in a typical Chinese middle-class family, I can reliably inform you that it is not part of the culture for common people to eat shark fin soup. It was only meant to be a delicacy for the emperor and aristocrats. However, during the past few decades, the wealth of the Chinese middle class increased significantly, and shark fin soup became affordable for more and more people in China. This phenomenon is completely irrelevant to traditional Chinese culture.

3. **We do not care because sharks are harmful to humans**

I have to admit that when most people hear about sharks, they usually first think of the scary scenes of sharks attacks they have seen on TV shows. However, based on statistics from the International Shark Attack File, much more people die from lightning strikes than from shark attacks each year. Beyond that, shark attacks are usually widely reported through various means of media even though they rarely occur and do not always result in casualties.

On the other hand, sharks have much more benefits to humans than we have ever noticed. For instance, a significant portion of our diet comes from the oceans. Sharks, being a top predator in the ocean, help regulate the ecosystem and maintain the biodiversity. If shark finning continues to grow and not be stopped, our future generations will be left with barren oceans.

Conclusion and the Prospect:

To sum up, even though shark finning seems very distant from our everyday life, its impacts on humans are certainly profound and immeasurable. In my opinion, the most effective and practical solution lies within ourselves. Therefore we need to take action right now by simply refusing to eat shark fin soup or to buy any shark product at grocery stores. If more and more people begin to act responsibly, we can undoubtedly make a change. Otherwise we are planting trees that will produce bitter fruits in the future, and people who will have to eat them will be our future generations.

Example C (another proposal argument):

You have probably seen, or at least have heard about, the famous horror movie *Jaws*, which is centered on a man-eating shark. In reality, people may be surprised that, according to the International Shark Attack File (2014), there are only about 60-80 confirmed shark attacks worldwide per year. However, between the years of 2010 and 2013, there have been seven fatal shark attacks along the western coast of Australia. In response to rising shark activity, the Western Australian government has recently implemented a controversial shark culling policy.

Problems with the Shark Culling Policy

Because the number of shark attacks, both fatal and nonfatal, has increased over the past few years, the Western Australian government introduced a shark culling policy in January 2014. In a media statement, Premier Colin Barnett (2013) announced the placement of seventy-two bait lines at eight popular beach locations from January 2014 to April 2014 "to protect beachgoers from dangerous sharks deemed to be a threat to humans." Barnett (2013) further explained that the bail lines are placed one kilometer, or 0.6 miles, off the shoreline, and contracted commercial fishing vessels would monitor and patrol these designated areas. Also, the shark must be over three meters, or almost ten feet, long in order for it to be "humanely destroyed" (Barnett, 2013), while those under the length requirement are released. Despite the length requirement, killing any shark that only *seems* dangerous, even though it has not actually physically attacked a human being, is the root of the contentious problem.

The potential consequences of the culling policy should be considered carefully. As apex predators in the water, sharks are crucial for a healthy marine ecosystem. Griffin, Miller, Freitas, and Hirshfield (2008) explain how sharks "not only affect population dynamics by consuming prey, but they can also control the spatial distribution of potential prey through intimidation … ultimately influencing community structure" (p. 1). Furthermore, sharks are "a necessary component to maintaining a complex ecosystem full of diversity" (Griffin et al., 2008, p. 1). While it appears that Griffin et al. wrote the article in partnership with Oceana, an international organization focused on ocean conservation, the main idea that sharks are important to oceanic ecosystems should not be completely ignored by the Western Australian government. In the same article, Griffin et al. (2008) center their argument on the fact that "humans kill more than 100 million sharks worldwide" (p. 1), in which the majority of them are killed for their fins. I mention shark finning, which is an entirely different problem concerning sharks, because it is important to note that the shark population is already rapidly declining. If the Western Australian government continues this culling policy, the potential for the endangerment, or even extinction, of certain shark species becomes greater.

Another problem with the policy is that sharks are not the only creatures that can get caught in the bait lines. Other marine animals, like dolphins, whales and turtles, are also at risk of getting stuck and potentially dying, if they are not released in time. Humans may also still be at risk, but for different reasons. Jane J. Lee (2014) quotes Chris Lowe, a marine biology professor at California State University, Long Beach, who argues that people may believe "all is well" and that mentality could lead to risky behavior, such as "going further offshore" and "going to more remote places." Lee may

not be entirely credible since her opinion piece is found on *National Geographic's* Ocean Views, a blog focused on bringing awareness to marine issues. However, Lowe has analyzed data from shark culls performed in Hawaii during the 1950s. In general, Wetherbee, Lowe, and Crow (1994) concluded that the shark control programs did not have "any measurable effects on the rate of shark attacks in Hawaiian waters" (p. 95). Their research reveals that a similar plan of action failed to bring the expected result.

Solutions for the Problem

I propose that instead of catching and killing sharks, the government should focus solely on catching, tracking, and releasing the sharks. According to the previously mentioned media statement from Barnett (2013), almost $15 million of government funds have been spent since 2011 for shark monitoring, aerial surveillance and tagging programs, while an additional $5 million is spent for research initiatives. While the government already has tagging and tracking programs in place, I would suggest improving and expanding them. In fact, a great white shark was tagged about a week ago near Albany, an area that is not covered by the shark culling policy. As stated in a press release from ABC News (Australian Broadcasting Corporation) (2014), the seventeen-foot-long great white shark became the "largest to be fitted with an internal acoustic tag off the Australian coast." Because the tag will last for the next ten years, not only can scientists and researchers study its behavior and movement patterns, but also can keep track of the shark to warn beach goers if it comes too close to the shore (ABC press release, 2014). If lifeguards on duty were given a device that monitored the tagged sharks, they could give advance warning and get everyone out of the water safely.

Secondly, I propose that the government should fund an education program or campaign, in which people can learn about the dangers of swimming in the ocean environment. In a study conducted by Crossley, Collins, Sutton, and Huveneers (2014), researchers from various Australian aquatic science centers and programs, almost eight-hundred Australian beach users took their survey about the public's stance on shark attacks and mitigation measures (p. 154). Crossley et al. found that, while the beach goers were "relatively aware" of the mitigation measures, they "overestimated" the efficacy of the mitigation measures and the risk of shark attacks (p. 154). Despite a fear of shark attacks, the survey participants do not choose beach sites according to mitigation practices but instead select beaches in favor for their landscape and popularity (Crossley et al., 2014, p. 159). The results from the survey emphasize the necessity for improving public education about the risks of shark attacks.

So then what are some ways the government can increase public knowledge about shark attacks? To start with, it is important for swimmers to know the basic "rules" for staying safe in the water. Christopher Neff (2012), a third-year doctoral student at the University of Sydney whose research topic is concentrated on the politics of shark attacks, presents fifteen variables that one should consider before venturing out into the ocean. The variables focus on four major categories: weather conditions (avoid swimming after storms or during cloudy weather), environment conditions (consider the time of the day, temperature of the water, and clarity of the water), human behavior (avoid going far from the shore, swimming alone, and staying in the water for too long), and shark behavior (avoid wearing bright-colored wetsuits or shiny, metallic jewelry that will attract sharks) (Neff, 2012).

If the government can emphasize these precautionary factors through an education program, people would be more aware of their surroundings, which could prevent shark attacks. The government could also develop a training program in which people could learn what to do if they encounter a shark. But perhaps the most important thing the government could do is change the perspective of the beach. Instead of looking at the beach as a carefree giant swimming pool, people should treat it with caution as if camping in the wilderness.

Lastly, the government always has the option of temporarily or permanently shutting down beaches that are known for their high amounts of human-shark interactions. However, tourism is a quite significant industry in Australia. Closing off certain beaches would make the surrounding businesses, like hotels and restaurants, lose a lot of money and/or shut down. This course of action would probably be used as a last resort.

Feasibility of the Proposed Solutions

The expansion and improvement of shark tagging and tracking programs would be beneficial for reducing the amount of shark attacks. In fact, the same technique was successfully used off the coast of Recife, Brazil. Afonso and Hazin (2014), researchers from Universidade Federal Rural de Pernambuco and Unviersidade do Algarve respectively, analyzed data from the study, which focused on post-release behavior and movement (p. 55). They found out that, after the tiger sharks were caught, tagged and released, they would tend to move away from their place of capture into deeper waters, and "an eventual mandatory release of live animals could be effective to improve the conservation of the species" (Afonso & Hazin, 2014, p. 55). If the Western Australian

government followed suit, shark culling would not have to be necessary. It would be relatively easy to expand these programs because the government already has the technology and equipment needed for acoustic tagging. The fact that the government has already started to tag sharks is good, but it can be much better.

However, the cost of increasing and upgrading the tagging programs could be a problem at first. Since the government already spends $15 million on tagging and monitoring the current amount of sharks, expanding the usage of tags would be quite expensive, thus at least doubling in costs potentially. Barnett's press release (2014) revealed that the estimated cost of the shark culling measures would be approximately $1 million. I would suggest that the government uses the $1 million costs for the culling policy towards its shark attack prevention programs for the public. If the combination of the catch-and-release method and the education programs turn out to be successful, then the beach visitors would feel safer in the water with the knowledge that they would receive a notification if a tagged shark is nearby the shore. The public may also feel more comfortable while swimming if they took the precautionary measures and knew what to do if they happen to encounter a shark. As a result, the general fear of shark attacks may decrease among the public, while attendance at the beach could increase. With an increase of visitors at the beaches, the tourism industry would thrive over time, thus compensating a little for the expensive costs of the tagging and surveillance equipment and research.

Tying Everything Together

In conclusion, the Western Australian government implemented the shark culling policy in order to control the rising amount of shark attacks. However, the policy not only

affects the sharks, but also other marine life, the marine ecosystem, and even human beings. My solution to the problem is to change from the current catch-and-kill method to a catch-and-release method, which includes tagging and tracking the sharks, and to educate the public on taking appropriate precautionary measures before stepping into the ocean. Although both parts to my solution may be costly to put into action at first, the outcome will likely benefit both sharks and humans.

Types of Evidence
Personal Experience **Example:** Only a portion of the population experiences chronic migraines, though many individuals know the pain of a headache every now and then. For people with chronic migraines, the combination of prescription medicine and a healthy lifestyle can provide relief for some individuals. For example, my aunt recently began taking a daily preventative medicine and eliminated process foods from her diet. Instead of having migraines for the majority of the month, she now only has a few that are less severe. It's a big improvement in her quality of life.
Observation or Field Research **Example:** Few people carry on long conversations today without checking their phone at least once during the conversation. At my favorite coffee shop this May, I watched thirty individuals sit down for a cup of coffee with friends on Saturday morning. Out of those thirty conversations, only four went from start to finish without anyone checking their cell phones for a call or text.
Interviews, Surveys, or Questionnaires **Example:** Bike lanes should also be added to the busiest city streets because are important for all travelers and commuters. In a recent city survey of one hundred residents, 80% of individuals supported the addition of bike lanes to the most busy streets in town, regardless of the type of transportation they use personally (e.g., car, bus, or bike). A number of citizens also commented on why it was so important to add the bike lines. [Report interview examples]
Library or Internet Research **Example:** Many people grew up hearing that we should get eight hours of sleep a night. However, the Wall Street Journal recently reported several sleep studies support the idea that seven hours of sleep is the optimal amount of rest time.

Testimony **Example:** Some residents say too many mediocre restaurants have opened recently, but restaurant critic Doug Smith begs to differ about the pizza restaurant on 1st Avenue. "They're doing things the right way – with quality ingredients and attentive service. There's nothing mediocre about the restaurant," Doug concluded in his recent review for the newspaper.
Statistical Data **Example:** The United States Census reports that as of 2013, the country's population hovers around 316 million. This statistic has increased by almost 8 million since the previous Census population count in 2010.
Hypothetical Examples, Cases, and Scenarios **Example:** There are a few possibilities for what the future of our roads could look like if bike lanes are not added. Roadways could continue to crowd as cyclists and drivers negotiate how to share the road. Near collisions at busy intersections, especially during rush hour, would continue at greater rates as the population of the city increases. Most importantly, if no bike lanes are added, it will not be a question of whether someone will lose their life while cycling and sharing the road with vehicles, it will simply be a question of when.

*** Organizational Plan for Argument (completed)

Exordium Narratio Propositio Partitio	introduction (one to several paragraphs)	Attention grabber - use data from a statistic that will increase the readers awareness of the issue. Explain Publix's produce operation and compare it to Whole Foods (contrast. writer's thesis (claim) Publix should reengineer its produce operations.
Confirmatio	Presentation of writer's position	Main body of essay Why should Publix label their GM vegetables? consumers have the right to know what's in their foods, especially with products for which health concerns have been an issue. Mandatory labeling will allow consumers to identify and stay away from products that may be harmful. (resemblance) 21 countries and the European Union have established mandatory labeling. Make sure each reason is tied to a value or belief held by the audience
Confutatio	summary of opposing views	(1) Genetically modified vegetables should not be labeled because consumers who want to buy non-genetically modified vegetables have the option to purchase organic vegetables. (2) Labels on genetically modified foods imply a warning about health effects, where no difference has been recognized.

		(3) Labeling would impose a cost on consumers
Confutatio	Response to opposing views	Refutes or concedes
Peroratio	conclusion	sums up the argument use a hypothetical example, case and scenario to leave a long lasting impression.

If the Farm Fresh Factory does not complete certain criteria then they will lose the support of the Whole Foods Alliance.

The problem with Farm Fresh Factory is that they have no longer meeting the requirements sent in place their governing organization the Whole Foods Alliance. The criteria set in place are not being meet, and if changes are not implemented then the Farm Fresh Factory will lose the parternership with the WFA.

There is a solution though, if the company is able to fix 2/3 of the missing criteria in the course of 90 days then the partnership will hesitantly remain. To become a full-fledged member again the Farm Fresh Factory must complete the missing criteria and be in full cooperation by the half year mark. If the proper conditions are not met by this time the company will be dropped by the WFA. Although if the time limit is too short they could also be reconsidered for the next year.

Criteria: Sanitary conditions, Smart business management, certification for all organic growing conditions, ability to produce quality products, reliable ship dates, high productivity/efficiency, low-cost/safe packaging methods ,ability to maintain conditions at all farm locations, zero contaminatiob and employee conditions.

Field research/Survey: Survery the 15 different locations owned by the FFF and each location was evaluated based on the above criteria. Of the 15 locations 7 were found missing more than 2 major criteria points, 4 were missing 1-2 and the rest received pleasing results.

Interviews: A sample of 2 employees were chosen at random from each location to be interviewed, and a cautionary amount of workers and complaints with how the company was run or their working conditions.

Testimony: An ex-employee who was suing the company for unsafe working conditions had his case looked into. He said that the FFF is liable for the debilitating back problems he had.

Statistics: Use data about crop production (decrease), amounts of missing criteria, profit, number of late/missed ship dates,etc.

Hypothetical/resemblance: Compare to a previous partner company of the WFA and show the consequences they received from not meeting the criteria.

Opposers may believe the criteria is too strict or harsh, but the WFA has a niche group of costumers and can only afford to partner with companies would are more than willing to fill the necessary requirements.

Recommended improvements include: To update organic certification (a few locations no longer meet certification requirements, and the 2 new locations have yet to be certified), improve shipments (both quality of product delivered and methods, create more organized management and facilitate better conditions for employees.

Hannah Van Horn

If the Farm Fresh Factory does not complete certain criteria then they will lose the support of the Whole Foods Alliance.

The problem with Farm Fresh Factory is that they have no longer meeting the requirements sent in place their governing organization the Whole Foods Alliance. The criteria set in place are not being meet, and if changes are not implemented then the Farm Fresh Factory will lose the parternership with the WFA.

There is a solution though, if the company is able to fix 2/3 of the missing criteria in the course of 90 days then the partnership will hesitantly remain. To become a full-fledged member again the Farm Fresh Factory must complete the missing criteria and be in full cooperation by the half year mark. If the proper conditions are not met by this time the company will be dropped by the WFA. Although if the time limit is too short they could also be reconsidered for the next year.

Criteria: Sanitary conditions, Smart business management, certification for all organic growing conditions, ability to produce quality products, reliable ship dates, high productivity/efficiency, low-cost/safe packaging methods ,ability to maintain conditions at all farm locations, zero contaminatiob and employee conditions.

Field research/Survey: Survery the 15 different locations owned by the FFF and each location was evaluated based on the above criteria. Of the 15 locations 7 were found missing more than 2 major criteria points, 4 were missing 1-2 and the rest received pleasing results.

Interviews: A sample of 2 employees were chosen at random from each location to be interviewed, and a cautionary amount of workers and complaints with how the company was run or their working conditions.

Testimony: An ex-employee who was suing the company for unsafe working conditions had his case looked into. He said that the FFF is liable for the debilitating back problems he had.

Statistics: Use data about crop production (decrease), amounts of missing criteria, profit, number of late/missed ship dates,etc.

Hypothetical/resemblance: Compare to a previous partner company of the WFA and show the consequences they received from not meeting the criteria.

Opposers may believe the criteria is too strict or harsh, but the WFA has a niche group of costumers and can only afford to partner with companies would are more than willing to fill the necessary requirements.

Recommended improvements include: To update organic certification (a few locations no longer meet certification requirements, and the 2 new locations have yet to be certified), improve shipments (both quality of product delivered and methods, create more organized management and facilitate better conditions for employees.

Introduction

-Exordium: (hook, choose 3)

a. Statistic of profit loss

b. number of customer complaints for the year

c. injuries on the job

-Narratio: (assignment) The assignment was to evaluate the Farm Fresh Factory on specific criteria

-Propositio: (proposal) If the parameters of the WLA are met in an allotted time the partnership shall not be breeched.

-Partitio: (preview) Here are overall traits that were reviewed (business plan/minor grievances) but what needs to be focused on are these points (Serious stuff!: sanitation, employee safety, product quality)

-Confirmatio: (Criteria)

a. Category 1: Sanitary Conditions, ability to produce quality products, employee safety, contamination

b. Category 2: high productivity/efficiency, certification for all organic growing conditions

c. Category3: enjoyable employee conditions, low-cost packaging, reliable ship dates, smart business management

-Confutatio: (summary) If they Category 1 infractions are not fixed within 6 months then the FFF with no longer be a partner of the WFA. To maintain connections with the WFA then the FFF is required to have all problems in the criteria implemented. If these tasks are not completed then the FFF will be dropped by the WFA and will not be reconsidered until the next year.

-Peroratio: (call for action) The poor conditions of the FFF must be fixed. Companies that do not meet the standards of the WFA are unacceptable to the organization and the customer. The customers deserve a quality product and through this evaluation is can be seem that the FFF is lacking this ability.

evaluated based on the above criteria. Of the 15 locations 7 were found missing more than 2 major criteria points, 4 were missing 1-2 and the rest received pleasing results.

Interviews: A sample of 2 employees were chosen at random from each location to be interviewed, and a cautionary amount of workers and complaints with how the company was run or their working conditions.

Testimony: An ex-employee who was suing the company for unsafe working conditions had his case