

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: *Palauan noun paradigms (abstract underlying representations and syllable structure)*

Grade: 93%

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:

- Very nice, through intro! You do a good job of both setting up the puzzle and summarizing your solution.
- Very good use of additional diagnostics! You've really done your homework (no pun intended)!
- I really like your strategy of offering up underlying forms as you work your way through the alternations. It makes the task of keeping track of everything easier for both you and your reader.
- Your discussion of the abstract/ambiguous vowels is very strong.
- Nice job identifying ordering relationships!

Suggestions:

- Not a huge deal, but there are quite a few typos.
- Your section on 3-part syllabification is great – I would just reorder it such that you discuss the presence of complex onsets/codas before you discuss the SSP since the SSP is only relevant if complex margins are permitted.
- There are a couple of spots where I have trouble following your line of reasoning – see inline comments for details.
- You do such an excellent job discussing the ambiguous vowels, but I would like to see a little bit of that discussion dedicated to the more basic level of abstractness in the data (that is, the fact that every underling form is abstract – what implications does that have for the learner, if any?).
- I was a little confused as to why you decided not to designate [ŋ] as stray in your [ŋ] deletion rule. This would have simplified your rule a bit.