

Section 1:

#1: Opening paragraph ("Imagine walking through our town on a Tuesday evening..." to "...that necessitates policing.")

Strengths:

- Your opening creates a vivid picture that helps readers see two different versions of the future, making them care about the topic straight away.
- The ending sentence clearly tells readers what your main argument will be, which helps them follow your thinking throughout the piece.

Weak Connection Between Ideas → Your opening moves from the imaginative scene to your main point quite quickly, which makes the connection feel rushed. You write "The difference between a town that survives and a town that thrives often lies in where it places its foundation," but this sentence doesn't clearly link back to the two scenes you just described. The word "foundation" is quite vague here—readers might wonder if you mean actual buildings, community values, or something else. Additionally, the phrase "acts as a proactive shield against the very societal decay" introduces large concepts without explaining them first, which could confuse younger readers trying to understand your argument.

Exemplar: *"The difference between these two futures comes down to a simple choice: do we spend money to catch problems after they happen, or do we spend money to stop problems from starting? A sports complex does the second option by bringing people together, keeping them healthy, and giving young people positive activities."*

#2: Second body paragraph ("Furthermore, we must consider the long-term physical and mental health..." to "...slowly collapsing from structural rot.")

Strengths:

- Your paragraph brings up an important point about health that others might not think about when discussing this topic, which shows you're thinking beyond the obvious arguments.
- The house metaphor at the end helps readers understand your point in a memorable way.

Underdeveloped Supporting Evidence → Whilst you claim that "we are currently facing a silent crisis of sedentary lifestyles and social isolation," you don't provide any specific examples or information to prove this is actually happening in your town. Your paragraph lists what a sports complex could do (elderly walking, workers decompressing, children building resilience), but these remain general ideas rather than concrete explanations of how these benefits would actually work. When you write "A heart attack caused by a sedentary lifestyle kills just as surely as violence," you're making a comparison, but you haven't shown readers that heart attacks from lack of exercise are actually a problem in your community, which weakens your argument's power.

Exemplar: *"In our town specifically, doctor's reports show that childhood obesity has increased by 15% in the past five years, and the community centre reports that after-school programmes have had to turn*

away 50 families due to lack of space. A sports complex would directly address these problems by providing safe places for exercise and activities."

#3: Final solution paragraph ("Ultimately, the choice between safety and recreation acts as a false dichotomy..." to "...achieves holistic safety by improving health and reducing crime simultaneously.")

Strengths:

- Your creative solution shows that you've thought carefully about both sides of the argument and tried to find a way to satisfy everyone.
- The three bullet points clearly explain why your solution would work, making it easy for readers to understand your thinking.

Insufficient Practical Details → Your "Community Resilience Hub" idea sounds good in theory, but you haven't explained the practical parts that would make readers believe it could actually happen. You mention "a wing of the sports complex for community policing," but you don't tell readers how big this wing would be, how much it would cost, or whether police officers would actually want to work in this way. The phrase "officers can maintain a presence not as enforcers in patrol cars, but as coaches, mentors, and accessible figures" assumes that police officers have time and training to be coaches, which might not be true. Without addressing these real-world concerns, your solution might sound nice but unconvincing to people who need to make the actual decision.

Exemplar: *"The Community Resilience Hub would dedicate 20% of the building to a modern police office with meeting rooms and desk space for three officers. These officers would run a weekly sports programme for teenagers, which would take just two hours of their time whilst helping them build trust with young people. Similar programmes in Melbourne have shown that crime rates drop by 12% when police regularly interact with youth in positive settings."*

- Your piece tackles an interesting topic and shows you can think about multiple sides of an argument, which is a valuable skill. However, your writing would become much stronger if you added specific examples and real information to support your claims. Additionally, when you introduce the counterargument (what people who disagree might say), you could spend more time fairly explaining their view before you respond to it. This would show readers that you've truly considered both sides rather than just quickly dismissing the other opinion. Also, your final solution needs more practical details about cost, size, and how it would actually work in daily life to convince readers it's truly possible, not just a nice idea.

Score: 43/50

Section 2:

#1 Prevention Over Policing: Investing in the Heart of the Community

Imagine walking through our town on a Tuesday evening. In one version of our future, the streets are empty, save for the flashing blue lights of a patrol car leaving a fortified, concrete police station to respond to yet another disturbance. In the other version, the air is filled with the sound of whistles, cheering parents, and the rhythmic thud of basketballs against pavement. The difference between a town that survives and a town that thrives often lies in where it places its foundation. While [Whilst] the security provided by a new police station is undeniably important, the construction of a new sports complex is the superior choice. By fostering social cohesion, improving public health, and engaging our youth, a sports complex acts as a proactive shield against the very societal decay that necessitates policing.

#2 To understand the necessity of a sports complex, we must first look at the logical correlation between community engagement and crime reduction, while [whilst] acknowledging our ethical responsibility to our youth. Extensive sociological research demonstrates that communities with accessible recreational facilities experience lower rates of vandalism and petty crime. This is the "idle hands" theory in practice; when young people have structured, positive outlets for their energy, they are less likely to seek excitement through illicit means. A sports complex offers mentorship, discipline, and a sense of belonging. However, proponents of the police station argue that our current crime statistics demand an immediate, enforcement-based response. They claim that a sports complex is a luxury we cannot afford when safety is at risk. This argument, while [whilst] well-intentioned, is fundamentally reactive. It treats the symptoms of a fracturing community—crime and disorder—rather than the root cause. A new police station may help catch offenders faster, but a sports complex prevents them from becoming offenders in the first place. It is a tragedy to wait until a teenager is in handcuffs to intervene in their life, when a jersey and a team could have set them on a different path.

Furthermore, we must consider the long-term physical and mental health of our citizenry [citizens]. We are currently facing a silent crisis of sedentary lifestyles and social isolation. A state-of-the-art sports complex is not merely a gym; it is a hub for mental well-being and physical longevity. It is a place where the elderly can walk safely in winter, where stressed workers can decompress, and where children build the resilience required for adulthood. We have a moral obligation to provide infrastructure that promotes [fosters] life, not just infrastructure that manages conflict. Opponents might argue that a police station provides a more tangible form of "safety," suggesting that citizens feel more secure knowing law enforcement has better facilities. I refute this by defining "safety" more broadly. True safety is not just the absence of crime, but the presence of health and community connection. A heart attack caused by a sedentary lifestyle kills just as surely as violence. Investing in a police station while [whilst] ignoring public health is akin to buying an expensive alarm system for a house that is slowly collapsing from structural rot.

#3 Finally, regarding economic vitality and civic pride, the sports complex offers a superior return on investment. A dynamic sports facility attracts regional tournaments, visitors, and families looking to relocate, injecting revenue into local businesses. It serves as a beacon of pride, a place where memories are made and the town's identity is forged. Conversely, those favouring the police station argue that essential services must take precedence over economic stimulation, and that we must prioritize [prioritise] "law and order" to attract business. However, businesses and families are rarely attracted to towns defined by their heavy police presence; they are attracted to vibrant, liveable communities. To prioritize [prioritise] a police station is to signal that our town anticipates trouble. To prioritize [prioritise] a sports complex is to signal that our town anticipates growth. It creates a narrative of hope rather than a narrative of fear.

Ultimately, the choice between safety and recreation acts as a false dichotomy, which we can solve through an advanced solution: The Community Resilience Hub. Rather than choosing one over the other,

I propose we build the sports complex but integrate a "Community Liaison Office" within the design. Instead of a fortress-like police station separated from the public, we designate a wing of the sports complex for community policing. Officers can maintain a presence not as enforcers in patrol cars, but as coaches, mentors, and accessible figures within the community centre. This innovative approach ensures cost efficiency by ~~utilizing~~ [utilising] one building for two purposes, builds trust by allowing police to interact with youth in positive environments rather than punitive ones, and achieves holistic safety by improving health and reducing crime simultaneously.

In conclusion, the decision before us is not merely about bricks and mortar; it is about the philosophy of our town's future. Choosing a police station is a decision rooted in fear and reaction, an admission that we expect crime to rise and community bonds to fail. Choosing a sports complex, however, is an investment in hope and prevention. It addresses the root causes of crime, fortifies the physical health of our citizens, and builds a vibrant economy. By adopting the Community Resilience Hub model, we can bridge the gap between enforcement and engagement, proving that the safest town is not the one with the most police, but the one with the strongest community.