Morphology: Paper, 1st draft | Please remember to include and sign the Honor Pledge on the first or last page!

	Excellent (A)	Competent (B-C)	Needs work (D-F)
General structure *(more weight)*	• Intro with main point, preview of findings • Conclusion that summarizes project, relates to broad themes • Findings clearly presented • Discussion supported w/ orgnzd evdnce • Analysis/interp explicitly justified • Discussion focused on main point	• Intro, but point/findings not stated • Conclusion not related to paper • Findings not fully clear • Evdnce sparse or not well orgnzd • Some justification; needs more • Needs more focus on main point	• No intro • No conclusion • Findings very unclear • No supporting evidence • No justification or arguments • No discernable main point
Linguistic analysis *(more weight)*	• Class concepts used where approp. • Relevant ling theory/model(s) presented clearly, accurately	• Some class concepts used • Relevant ling t/m presented, but not clearly/accurately explained	• Insufficient use of cls concepts • Ling t/m cited but not explained, or no ling t/m used
for type (a)	• Morphological type; evidence discussed • Basic categories; evidence discussed • Inflection; evidence discussed • Derivation; evidence discussed • Compounding; evidence discussed • Theoretical discussion at least 25% • Theoretical discussion shows insight	• Addressed partly/no evidence • Addressed partly/no evidence • Addressed partly/no evidence • Addressed partly/no evidence • Addressed partly/no evidence • Theoretical discussion, but needs more • Some insights missed	• Not addressed • Not addressed • Not addressed • Not addressed • Not addressed • Little or no theoretical disc • Many insights missed
for type (b)-(d)	• Linguistic background well explained • Relevant phenomena well explained • Other criteria for the paper type are met	• Presented, but hard to follow • Presented, but hard to follow • Other criteria are mostly met	• Not well explained • Not well explained • Other criteria not generally met
Data	• Lg data presented systematically • Exx have morph-by-morph glosses	• Data, but presentation not clear • Examples glossed, but not m-b-m	• No data presented • No glosses given
(if new lg data collected)	• Methodology section clear, complete • Incl full materials, e.g., survey, [partial] transcript... (in appendix?) • Data (or summary?) presented systematically in course of paper • Helpful graphics for numerical data	• Methodology partly described • Data summaries included, but not complete [if app.] materials • Data presented in paper, but not well organized • Data graphics, but not helpful	• Methodology not described • Collected data not included • Discussion in paper refers only to appendix; crucial data not presented in body of paper • Graphics relevant but not used
Mechanics	• Citations in discussion; ling format • Bibliography complete, consistent • At least 10 pages before bibliog. (a data appendix counts as 2 pp at most) • Neat, legible, few or no typos	• Needs more cit., or wrong format • Bib inconsistent, or refs missing • At least 8 pages, or 10 pages but obviously padded • Mostly neat/legible; some typos	• Few or no citations • Few or no refs in bibliography • Shorter than 8 pages • Many errors; hard to read

- See also the "Paper-writing tips for linguistics" web page, linked from the "Final project information" page
- Wikipedia is fine for you to use for background information, but please do not cite it as a source (find another reference for any information you want to include in your paper)