

Sample ACE (Draft) – Student A (Score: 81/100 = A-)

<p>Although facial recognition technology (FRT) is becoming more common in schools worldwide, this paper argues that it is not advisable for schools to adopt FRT on campus due to possible violation of students' privacy.</p> <p>FRT intrudes on students' privacy since the "informed consent" is not observed (Andrejevic & Selwyn, (2020). For instance, the facial recognition systems in operation in schools scan all students' faces in classrooms and corridors to function regardless of whether or not a student has opted out (Andrejevic & Selwyn, 2020). In other words, even if students can choose to opt out, the system cannot avoid scanning everyone, making "opt-in" or "opt-out" options impractical. As a result, this violates the principle of "informed consent" because students are not allowed to choose not to participate (Andrejevic & Selwyn, 2020).</p> <p>Some opponents claim that even if facial recognition systems scan all students by default, an "opt-out" mechanism still allows them to later remove their data or disable tracking, thereby preserving the principle of informed consent. However, while "opt-out" may allow data removal after scanning, the initial collection still violates privacy, as students have no rights to avoid being scanned in the first place. In fact, true consent requires the ability to refuse participation entirely, not just after the initial scanning.</p>	<p>Relevant background information</p> <p>Clear thesis statement</p> <p>Clear topic sentence with a clear <i>Claim</i></p> <p>In-text citation is accurate</p> <p><i>Grounds</i> are effective in supporting the claim</p> <p><i>Warrant</i> links the Claim and Grounds in a logical manner</p> <p>Clear topic sentence</p> <p><i>Counterargument</i> is supported by evidence and logically developed</p> <p>Effective <i>Response</i> refuting the Counterargument</p>
--	--

Component	Student A's Answer	Comments
1. Argument:	This paper argues that it is not advisable for schools to adopt FRT on campus due to possible violation of students' privacy.	Component is accurate
2. Claim*: (1 claim only)	FRT intrudes on students' privacy since the "informed consent" is not observed (Andrejevic & Selwyn, (2020).	Component is accurate In-text citation (author-prominent style) is accurate.
3. Grounds* (Data):	For instance, the facial recognition systems in operation in schools scan all students'	Component is accurate and relevant In-text citation (information-

Answer

	faces in classrooms and corridors to function regardless of whether or not a student has opted out (Andrejevic & Selwyn, 2020).	prominent style) is accurate Ground is effective in supporting the claim
4. Warrant* (Bridge):	In other words, even if students can choose to opt out, the system cannot avoid scanning everyone, making "opt-in" or "opt-out" options impractical. As a result, this violates the principle of "informed consent" because students are not allowed to choose not to participate (Andrejevic & Selwyn, 2020).	Component logically links the Grounds and the Claim In-text citation (information-prominent style) is accurate Sentences are clear and logically linked
5. Backing:	<i>Not Required</i>	
6. Qualifier:	<i>Not Required</i>	
7. Rebuttal - Counterargument:	Some opponents claim that even if facial recognition systems scan all students by default, an "opt-out" mechanism still allows them to later remove their data or disable tracking, thereby preserving the principle of informed consent.	Component is accurate Ground is relevant and effective in supporting the counterargument Sentences are clear and logically linked
7. Rebuttal - Response:	However, while "opt-out" may allow data removal after scanning, the initial collection still violates privacy, as students have no rights to avoid being scanned in the first place. In fact, true consent requires the ability to refuse participation entirely, not just after the initial scanning.	Component is accurate Response is relevant and effective in addressing the counterargument Ideas are concise and clear

Critical Thinking & Use of Grounds (30%) <i>Quality of Rebuttal (Counterargument + Response) and Grounds</i>					Argument Structure (30%) <i>Argumentation Model Template Adherence & Logical Interconnectedness of Components</i>					Academic Tone & Clarity (30%) <i>Tone, Flow, Precision</i>					Citations & References (10%) <i>APA Referencing Style</i>		
28	27	26	25	24	28	27	26	25	24	28	27	26	25	24	9	8.5	8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Response successfully addresses the counterargument Grounds are highly effective in supporting the claim 					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All model components are appropriately applied All model components are logically connected 					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formal tone with no informal language (e.g., contractions, colloquialisms, or conversational phrasing) Sentences are clear, logically structured, and free of ambiguity Smooth transitions between ideas with no awkward phrasing 					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Correct use of signal phrases and quotations No missing or misplaced citations All secondary citations, if any, are correctly cited Fully follows the APA referencing style 		

Answer

Sample ACE (Draft) – Student B (Score: 66/100 =B-)

<p>Facial recognition technology has been adopted by many schools all over the world. However, some parents do not support the FRT in schools due to the privacy issue.</p> <p>Parents think FRT harms their kids a lot. The results of a research study indicate that the average score of parents' dangerous beliefs in the virtual world (DBVW) is 3.865, which is higher than the average level (3.000), indicating that the parents were worried about the disclosure of students' personal privacy, and generally had a cautious attitude towards new technologies (Perry & Sibley, 2010). FRT violates students' privacy.</p> <p>It is argued that FRT does not harm their kids because it monitors them 24/7, ensuring their safety in school. Although kids are monitored all the time, it can't guarantee their safety.</p>	<p>Relevant background information</p> <p>Identifiable thesis statement</p> <p>Unclear Topic sentence</p> <p>Unclear <i>Claim</i></p> <p><i>Grounds</i> are relevant</p> <p>Ineffective <i>Warrant</i></p> <p>Incorrect and absence of in-text citations</p> <p>Clear topic sentence</p> <p>Unsupported <i>Counterargument</i></p> <p>Unsupported <i>Response</i></p>
---	--

Component	Student B's Answer	Comments
1. Argument:	However, some parents do not support the FRT in schools due the privacy issue.	Argument is not directly addressing the topic
2. Claim*: (1 claim only)	Parents think FRT harms their kids a lot.	Claim is vague Informal tone: "think" and "kids" No in-text citation
3. Grounds* (Data):	The results indicate that the average score of parents' DBVW is 3.865, which is higher than the average level (3.000),	Grounds are relevant Direct copying from the text Inaccurate secondary citation
4. Warrant* (Bridge):	(indicating that the) parents were worried about the disclosure of students' personal privacy, and generally had a cautious attitude towards new technologies (Perry & Sibley, 2010). FRT violates students' privacy.	In fact, the Warrant can be "Parents are doubt about FRT as it may potentially leak personal data of their children, leading to privacy issue" to support the Claim "Parents are worried about their children's privacy"
5. Backing:	<i>Not Required</i>	
6. Qualifier:	<i>Not Required</i>	

Answer

7. Rebuttal - Counterargument:	FRT does not harm their kids because it monitors them 24/7, ensuring their safety in school.	Component is identifiable Grounds are limited
7. Rebuttal - Response:	Although kids are monitored all the time, it can't guarantee their safety.	Component is identifiable. The Response is related to the counterargument Grounds are absent

Critical Thinking & Use of Grounds (30%) <i>Quality of Rebuttal (Counterargument + Response) and Grounds</i>	Argument Structure (30%) <i>Argumentation Model Template Adherence & Logical Interconnectedness of Components</i>	Academic Tone & Clarity (30%) <i>Tone, Flow, Precision</i>	Citations & References (10%) <i>APA Referencing Style</i>
<div>19 18 17 16 15</div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Response attempts to address the counterargument Grounds are sometimes effective in supporting the claim 	<div>23 22 21 20</div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1-2 components are inappropriately applied 1-2 components are not fully connected (e.g., weak warrant in Toulmin) 	<div>23 22 21 20</div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Predominantly formal but may include some lapses (e.g., a contraction, slightly informal word choice) Sentences are generally logically structured Some transitions may be abrupt or mechanical 	<div>6.0 5.5 5.0</div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No citations for direct quotations Citations are missing in most cited sources Secondary citations, if any, are missing or incorrectly cited Frequent errors in APA referencing style (e.g., missing years, incorrect author order)