

General Criteria	Exemplary	Accomplished	Adequate	Deficient
Presentation of the Puzzle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifies the/a real and interesting puzzle in the data Presents the puzzle clearly in the introduction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifies the/a real and interesting puzzle in the data, but doesn't present it sufficiently clearly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attempts to identify the/a puzzle, but doesn't necessarily get the whole picture, or fails to do so in a sufficiently clear manner 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not identify a puzzle Identifies a puzzle incorrectly Confusing presentation/discussion of the puzzle
Accuracy of Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No relevant facts are left unexplained Analysis is consistent with the available evidence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One or more aspects of the data may be left unexplained May not arrive at the best analysis or may not generalize as much as possible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fails to explain important facts in (or relevant to) the data set May arrive at an inferior and/or easily refuted analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fails to explain important facts in (or relevant to) the data set Major problems with the analysis
Presentation of Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All parts of analysis and explanations are clear, specific, and explicit Analysis is coherent and contains no inconsistencies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis and explanations are relatively clear but may be a bit vague on points Analysis may have some small problems or inconsistencies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis and/or explanation are unclear or difficult to follow It is not clear what the intended generalizations are Analysis is vague 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis is incomplete Explanation of the analysis is poor, or nonexistent Analysis is vague
Use of Evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All claims are supported by relevant data, or identified as reasonable assumptions Shows explicitly (with accurate reasoning) how the evidence leads to the conclusions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Claims are often but not always supported by data Shows how some (but not all) evidence leads to conclusions, with some accurate reasoning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Claims are not supported by data Fails to provide sufficient reasoning for how the evidence supports the conclusions Examples and evidence are not included 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Claims are not supported by data Examples are not included or are poorly integrated into the write-up Does not reason from evidence to conclusions Examples/evidence not included
Structure of Argumentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is structured in a logical manner where the main arguments and evidence are easily identifiable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a clear logical structure overall, but perhaps could be improved, or has parts that are not logically structured May include irrelevant discussion that does not advance the analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Difficult for the reader to follow the structure of argumentation Attempts a structured argument, but has significant deficiencies Includes irrelevant discussion that does not advance the analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not have a clear structure of argumentation Includes irrelevant discussion that does not advance the analysis
Addressing Relevant Theory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interacts with relevant theory precisely and accurately Jargon & terms used correctly Credits sources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> References some relevant theory, but perhaps not all, or with some imprecision Not all jargon/concepts used correctly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not invoke theory at all Significant imprecision with jargon/concepts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorrectly reports the theory Incorrectly applies theory
Audience Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data described sufficiently, in accessible ways Ideas, terms, proposals sequenced in accessible ways Carefully designed to be accessible to a reader 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data are occasionally presented with incomplete explanation/discussion Ideas, terms, and/or proposals occasionally introduced out of sequence At times somewhat inaccessible to a reader 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Frequent incomplete descriptions/discussions of data Ideas, terms, and/or proposals frequently introduced out of sequence The result is a paper that is difficult for a reader to follow. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pervasive incomplete descriptions/discussions of data Introduces ideas/data/analyses out of sequence in significant manners The result is a paper that is very difficult for a reader to follow
Relationship to the prompt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Follows directions to the letter Addresses all parts of the prompt Has clear intro and conclusion that follow guidelines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May fail to follow directions in some small ways May not address entire prompt Intro/conclusion missing components 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not follow significant parts of the directions Does not address important aspects of the prompt 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not follow significant parts of the directions or important aspects of the prompt Missing intro and/or conclusion
Clarity of Presentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is explicit/clear what the intended analysis is Wording is precise; no spelling errors or typos Examples are well integrated into the write-up of the analysis and formatted appropriately Good presentation and formatting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The intended analysis is not made clear at crucial points Some words may be used incorrectly and/or be spelled wrong Examples may not be well integrated into the write-up Has some small problems with presentation and/or formatting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Serious problems with presentation/formatting that may impede readability Spelling mistakes and/or sloppy wording, including misuse of terminology Examples are poorly integrated into the write-up 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Serious problems with presentation/formatting that impede readability Spelling mistakes and/or sloppy wording, including misuse of terminology

Name: Tadius Frank

Homework: *Japanese nasals (contrast, predictability, and features)*

Grade: 91% + 5% (Quiz 0) = 96%

Comments:

Please review the comments below as well as those on the hard copy of your paper; some comments are redundant (that is, they appear here *and* on the paper itself) for maximal clarity. Note that the strengths listed here are not a comprehensive list, but rather the things that stuck out most to me that I'd like to highlight.

Strengths:

- Fantastic formatting and presentation of examples. Thanks for following the formatting guidelines so carefully!
- You do a really nice job of not only integrating your examples into the prose but also discussing any data that you present clearly and thoroughly.
- You demonstrate a really clear understanding of key terminology and jargon at play in this assignment.
- You are very attuned to your audience and careful to explain terms and concepts that may be unfamiliar, such as the use of the [place] feature bundle.
- You do a really nice job in section 2.2 of explaining why the underlying forms are sometimes ambiguous.
- Excellent incorporation of theory as well as additional diagnostics.
- When discussing arguments you have made or will make in other parts of your paper, you consistently do a good job of telling the reader the exact section in which that argument can be found.
- You choose a good set of words for your derivations in (12) – very complete and illustrative of your analysis.
- Overall this is a very good paper that you clearly put a thought of work and thought into – nice job!

Suggestions:

- The first paragraph of your introduction does a great job of beginning to set up the puzzle. Next time, challenge yourself to go a step further and answer the following questions: what is interesting about these data? Why are they worth discussing/considering?
- Careful with your features! [glide] isn't actually a feature – you could/should use [consonantal] in its place.
- There are times when your wording is slightly convoluted and/or your sentence structure is overly complicated and it's difficult to follow your line of reasoning; please see hard copy of your paper for specific examples of this.
- I'm confused by your rule in (8) – you don't ever need a phonological rule to explain an “elsewhere” allophone. The assumption is that, if no other rules apply, then the underlying phoneme surfaces as itself (= the elsewhere allophone).
- A few comments about your rule in (9):
 - As mentioned above, [glide] isn't a real feature. I like what you're trying to do here (even though we haven't talked about Greek letter variables in class yet and I definitely didn't expect you to use them here), but you'd need more than one feature to accomplish this (specifically, [consonantal], [approximant], and [continuant]) because nasals and glides differ in all three of those manner features.
 - Using the [α place] notation here is okay – but in theory, using [place:] as Hayes does in chapter 4 of your textbook is better because it captures the idea that place features often move as a “bundle”. In this sense, you could think of the Greek letter notation as being ideal

for individual feature values (e.g. [α CORONAL]), and [place_i] encompassing a whole bundle of place features whose values are defined by Greek letter variables). Let me know if this is unclear and we can discuss “in person”!

- In your conclusion, be sure to begin with a restatement of the puzzle before proceeding with a summary of your analysis. Please also try to be more specific when discussing the types of additional data you would need to resolve any ambiguities in the data.