

Advanced Life Support District | Annotation

	Employs a Public Voice	Advocates Civic Engagement	Argues a Position Based on Reasoning & Evidence	Employs a Structure
<p>Title: Advanced Life Support district needed to help ensure top quality services</p> <p>Form: Letter to the Editor</p> <p>Media: Print</p> <p>URL:</p>	<p>Score: 4</p> <p>The writing: Effectively employs a powerful opening vignette illustrating that paramedics save lives, and laying the groundwork for “<i>why we should provide funding for ALS (Advanced Life Support) services in our area.</i>”</p> <p>Reflects an inclusive tone, frequently using “we” that marks the writer as a member of the Stillwater County Community. While the opening vignette uses vivid language (“<i>They just saved your life.</i>”), the rest of the letter uses a matter of fact tone.</p> <p>Effectively establishes the writer’s credibility through demonstrating detailed knowledge about how ambulance services are currently funded and through showing an understanding that community members would potentially be concerned with increased taxes.</p> <p>NOTE: The writer directly engaged in civic dialogue with community members through interviews with paramedics and a survey of community members.</p>	<p>Score: 4</p> <p>The writing: Effectively raises awareness about the precarious funding for Columbus’s current Advanced Life Support services (“<i>...cost for transports and trips to the hospital only covers the diesel and supplies used</i>” and “<i>funding to pay for the life-saving level of care it is currently providing by national grant money</i>”) and emphasizes the importance of the service through the repetition of the idea of “<i>life-saving</i>”.</p> <p>Advocates for allowing taxpayers to vote on the creation of an ALS district, effectively demonstrating that this is reasonable (Columbus offers the only ALS service for the county, other funding sources won’t cover the full costs in the future) and feasible (71% of residents surveyed expressed willingness to support a reasonable tax increase).</p>	<p>Score: 4</p> <p>The writing: Uses effective and logical reasoning, demonstrating the necessity of an ALS district, the long-term funding challenges, and an opportunity for voters to decide. The writing demonstrates a clear value for the public to provide life-saving services and for voting on tax increases.</p> <p>Offers thoughtful interpretation and synthesis of evidence about how ALS is currently funded and provided, interviews with paramedics, and a community survey. While the argument could have been further strengthened by adding a bit more background information about how the survey was conducted (e.g., numbers of respondents, sampling strategy, question wording), this type of detail is often hyperlinked in professional opinion editorials, so this does not lower the score for this piece.</p> <p>Analyzes and counters concerns (“<i>Some people ... may ask why we need to pay for ambulance services when the ambulance already charges...</i>”) by offering a clear explanation for how ALS funding works.</p>	<p>Score: 4</p> <p>The writing: Effectively uses the organization to develop the argument: lifesaving nature of ALS, how funding for ALS works, identifying strong community support, and concluding with a proposal for the community to vote.</p> <p>Includes a strong and purposeful opening vignette and echoes the emphasis on saving lives in the concluding paragraph (“<i>And who knows? It might even save your life some day.</i>”)</p> <p>Satisfactorily links ideas, maintaining a focus on why taxpayers should support an ALS district. While the links among paragraphs do not serve to fully create cohesion, this is not enough to lower the overall structure score.</p>