

Canadian and International Law 12
(CLN4U)

Independent Study Project (ISP): Legal Issues in Canadian Courts

Task:

- students will examine the legal process of the Canadian Court System by investigating selected court cases from the past
- each student will complete two in-depth and comprehensive legal reports that analyze the key aspects of each case
- students will select **one** case from **Group 1** and **one** case from **Group 2**
- each of the choices has their own specific due date and must be submitted on the specified date

Value: 30% of Final Mark (15% each)

Expectations:

- each student will complete two cases, one from Group 1 and one from Group 2
- for each case selected, students will summarize the key legal aspects
- each case will be written in report form and should be no longer than 1,200 words
- each paper will be an examination of the legal case and the necessary factors that influenced and shaped the judicial reasoning
- a crucial component will be the examination of the judicial decision of each case and the analysis and summary of each judgement
- there will also be a personal commentary component outlining whether each student agrees or disagrees with the decision and justification for their stance
- internet sources should be limited to official government websites, university websites, major newspapers, academic journals or magazines and legal websites
- although you will undoubtedly look at wikipedia and blogs these are not acceptable sources and will not be considered as part of your bibliography
- your bibliography must include a minimum of 5 sources, 3 of which are to be submitted in an annotated bibliography one week prior to your final submission

Cases:

Group 1:

R. v. Latimer 1994 (Euthanasia)	Due Date: February 19, 2013
R. v. Sharpe 2001 (Child Pornography)	Due Date: March 5, 2013
Truscott v. Her Majesty the Queen 2007 (Miscarriage of Justice)	Due Date: March 5, 2013

Group 2:

R. v. Morgentaler 1988 (Abortion)	Due Date: April 23, 2013
Donald Marshall 1983 (Wrongful Conviction)	Due Date: May 14, 2013
R. v. Zundel 1992 (Freedom of Expression - Hate Literature)	Due Date: May 14, 2013

Cases must be submitted on their specific due date

Submission Requirements:

- ***Annotated Bibliography of 3 sources to be submitted one week prior to final submission***

- an annotated bibliography provides a concise summary of each source and some assessment of its value or relevance to your topic

The paper will be comprised of the following headings:

- ***Particulars of the Case:***

- name of case and date of case
- the parties
- the charge or the regulations or statutes in dispute
- issue(s)
- decision held

- ***Defense Arguments / Closing Statement***

- ***Prosecution Arguments / Closing Statement***

- ***Judgement and Judicial Reasoning***

- ***Historical Significance***

- ***Personal Commentary on Final Decision***

- ***Bibliography***

Canadian and International Law 12 (CLN4U) Independent Study Project Rubric

Student: _____

Assessment Component	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Mark
	50 - 59%	60 - 69%	70 - 79%	80 - 100%	
Knowledge					/40
Facts, ideas and arguments included; all major components of the submission were addressed and information reflects a complete research process	Insufficient detail and demonstrates limited understanding of the important facts, ideas, and arguments in summary of the legal case. Many requisite components were omitted and lacked detail.	Has adequate detail and demonstrates some understanding of the important facts, ideas, and arguments involved in the legal case. One requisite component was omitted or much greater detail required.	Has specific details and demonstrates considerable understanding of the important facts, ideas, and arguments in summary of the legal case. All requisite components were included.	Is insightful and demonstrates a superior understanding of important facts, ideas, and arguments central to the legal case. All requisite components were included and all were discussed in great detail.	
Communication					/20
Report Format and Organization. Uses designated headings.	Sections are poorly organized and some are missing. A few formatting errors exist.	All required sections are included but one or two are poorly organized. One formatting error exists.	All required sections are included but one needs to be organized better. No formatting errors exist.	All required sections are included, and each is effectively organized. No formatting errors exist.	
Grammar, Mechanics, and Style	Numerous grammatical errors exist and impede meaning. Report has numerous punctuation, spelling, or capitalization errors. Sentences contain numerous errors and impede meaning. Style is not concise or professional.	Some grammatical errors exist but generally don't impede meaning. Report has some punctuation, spelling, or capitalization errors. Sentences contain some errors but don't impede meaning. Style is generally concise and professional, but some additional editing is warranted.	Few grammatical errors exist and don't impede meaning. Report has a few punctuation, spelling, or capitalization errors. Sentences contain few errors that don't impede meaning. Style is concise and professional. Both sentences and style are good.	No grammatical errors exist. Report has no punctuation, spelling, or capitalization errors. Sentences contain no errors and are diverse and sophisticated. Style is concise and professional. The report has clearly been edited and proofread numerous times.	
Thinking and Inquiry					/20
critical analysis of important factors specific to the historical significance of the case	Analysis is limited to surface aspects and exhibits a limited ability in identifying the historical significance of the case.	Analysis offers some insight/depth in identifying the historical significance of the case.	Analysis provides solid insight and considerable ability in identifying historical significance of the case.	Analysis provides thorough insight and a superior ability in identifying the historical significance of the case.	
Application					/20
Applies knowledge and understanding of the case to justify a personal stance. Personal commentary is well thought out utilizing the information at hand.	Limited expression of personal commentary and either unclear or not well developed and justified.	Some expression of personal commentary which is somewhat based on relevant and adequate data, but justification is not detailed.	Considerable expression of personal commentary; justification is evidence-based and detailed.	Superior expression of personal commentary; justification is excellent and thorough.	

Comments: _____

FINAL MARK: