

## BUS 206 Final Project Guidelines and Rubric

### Overview

Business law impacts our everyday lives, both personally and professionally. Businesses enter contracts, manufacture goods, sell services and products, and engage in employment and labor practices—activities that must all adhere to certain laws and regulations. Recognizing and evaluating legal issues is a fundamental skill that will help you navigate commercial relationships and avoid potential problems in the business world.

The final assessment for this course will require you to analyze three case studies and produce a short report for each. You will apply your legal knowledge and your understanding of the types of business organizations. The project is divided into **three milestones**, which will be submitted at various points throughout the course to scaffold learning and ensure quality final submissions. These milestones will be submitted in **Modules Three, Five, and Six**. The final project will be submitted in **Module Seven**.

This assessment addresses the following course outcomes:

- Apply appropriate elements of the U.S. legal system and the U.S. Constitution to business scenarios for impacting decisions in authentic situations
- Apply concepts of ethics, morality, and civil and criminal law to business scenarios for informed corporate decision making
- Analyze the basic elements of a contract and a quasi-contract for their application to commercial and real estate scenarios
- Differentiate between the various types of business organizations for informing rights and responsibilities

### Prompt

Imagine yourself as a paralegal working in a law office that has been tasked with reviewing three current cases. You will review the case studies and compose a short report for each, applying your legal knowledge and understanding of the types of business organizations. In each of the three reports, you will focus on areas of law covered in this course. Case Study One focuses on the legal system, criminal law, and ethics. Case Study Two concentrates on contracts and landlord-tenant law. Case Study Three involves environmental law and business organizations.

### Case Study One

Chris, Matt, and Ian, who live in California, have decided to start a business selling an aftershave lotion called Funny Face over the internet. They contract with Novelty Now Inc., a company based in Florida, to manufacture and distribute the product. Chris frequently meets with a representative from Novelty Now to design the product and to plan marketing and distribution strategies. In fact, to increase the profit margin, Chris directs Novelty Now to substitute PYR (a low-cost chemical emulsifier) for the compound in Novelty Now's original formula. PYR is not FDA approved. Funny Face is marketed nationally on the radio and in

newspapers, as well as on the web and Facebook. Donald Margolin, a successful CEO and public speaker, buys one bottle of Funny Face over the internet. After he uses it once, his face turns a permanent shade of blue. Donald Margolin and his company, Donald Margolin Empire Inc., file suit in the state of New York against Novelty Now Inc. and Chris, Matt, and Ian, alleging negligence and seeking medical costs and compensation for the damage to his face and business reputation. It is discovered that PYR caused Margolin's skin discoloration. The website for Funny Face states that anyone buying their product cannot take Chris, Matt, and Ian to court. Novelty Now's contract with the three men states that all disputes must be brought in the state of Florida.

Specifically, the following **critical elements** must be addressed:

- A. Apply the **rules of jurisdiction** to the facts of this case and determine what jurisdiction(s) would be appropriate for Margolin's lawsuit against Funny Face and Novelty Now, respectively. Consider federal court, state court, and long arm principles in your analysis.
- B. Assume all parties agree to pursue **alternative dispute resolution** (ADR). Analyze the advantages and disadvantages of two types of ADR appropriate for this case. Be sure to define the characteristics of each in your answer.
- C. Applying what you have learned about ADR, which type would each party (Funny Face, Novelty Now, and Margolin) **prefer** and why?
- D. Apply concepts of criminal law and discuss whether or not corporations and/or corporate officers may be held liable for **criminal acts**.
- E. Identify, per the classification of crimes in the text, any **potential criminal acts** by Funny Face and/or Novelty Now.
- F. Assume the use of the emulsifier PYR, at the direction of Chris, is a criminal offense. Apply concepts of criminal law and discuss the **potential criminal liability** of Funny Face, Chris, Matt, Ian, and Novelty Now. Include support for your conclusion.
- G. Apply at least three guidelines of **ethical decision-making** to evaluate ethical issues within the case study.

### Case Study Two

Sam Stevens lives in an apartment building where he has been working on his new invention, a machine that plays the sound of a barking dog to scare off potential intruders. A national chain store that sells safety products wants to sell Sam's product exclusively. Although Sam and the chain store never signed a contract, Sam verbally told a store manager several months ago that he would ship 1,000 units.

Sam comes home from work one day and finds two letters in his mailbox. One is an eviction notice from his landlord, Quinn, telling him he has to be out of the apartment in 30 days because his barking device has been bothering the other tenants. It also states that Sam was not allowed to conduct a business from his apartment. Sam is angry because he specifically told Quinn that he was working on a new invention, and Quinn had wished him luck. The second letter is from the chain store, demanding that Sam deliver the promised 1,000 units immediately.

Specifically, the following **critical elements** must be addressed:

- A. Analyze the elements of this case to determine whether a **valid contract** exists between Sam and the chain store. Support your response by identifying the elements of a valid contract in your analysis.

- B. Assume there is not a valid contract between Sam and the chain store. Analyze the elements of a **quasi-contract** and a promissory estoppel to determine whether the chain store would prevail on a claim of either. Why or why not? Include support for your analysis.
- C. Identify the **rights and obligations** of both the landlord and tenant under a standard residential lease agreement.
- D. Based upon those rights and obligations, does Sam's landlord have **grounds to evict**? Why or why not?
- E. Further, what **defenses** might Sam raise to an eviction action? Support your response.

### Case Study Three

Jeb and Josh are lifelong friends. Jeb is a wealthy wind-power tycoon, and Josh is an active outdoor enthusiast. They have decided to open a sporting goods store, Arcadia Sports, using Jeb's considerable financial resources and Josh's extensive knowledge of all things outdoors. In addition to selling sporting goods, the store will provide whitewater rafting, rock-climbing, and camping excursions. Jeb will not participate in the day-to-day operations of the store or in the excursions. Both Jeb and Josh have agreed to split the profits down the middle. On the first whitewater rafting excursion, a customer named Jane falls off the raft and suffers a severe concussion and permanent damage to her spine. Meanwhile, Jeb's wind farms are shut down by government regulators, and he goes bankrupt, leaving extensive personal creditors looking to collect.

Specifically, the following **critical elements** must be addressed:

- A. Identify the main types of **business entities** and discuss the advantages and disadvantages of each.
- B. Recommend a **specific business entity** for Arcadia Sports and include your reasoning.
- C. Based on the characteristics of each type of business entity, determine the type under which Jeb and Josh would be personally liable to Jane for **damages**.
- D. Based on each type of business entity, analyze the ability of Jeb's personal creditors to **seize the assets** and/or profits of Arcadia Sports.

## Milestones

Milestone One: Case Study One

In **Module Three**, you will submit the first milestone. For this milestone, you will review Case Study One and compose a short report, applying your legal knowledge and understanding of the types of business organizations. Case Study One focuses on the legal system, criminal law, and ethics. **This milestone will be graded with the Milestone One Rubric.**

Milestone Two: Case Study Two

In **Module Five**, you will submit the second milestone. For this milestone, you will review Case Study Two and compose a short report, applying your legal knowledge and understanding of the types of business organizations. Case Study Two concentrates on contracts and landlord-tenant law. **This milestone will be graded with the Milestone Two Rubric.**

Milestone Three: Case Study Three Discussion

In **Module Six**, you will submit the third milestone. This milestone is a discussion regarding business entities and their advantages and disadvantages. Your active participation in this discussion topic is essential to improving your understanding of the advantages and disadvantages of the various business entities. Actively engaging with your peers will help you complete the remaining critical elements in the third case study for your final submission. **This milestone will be graded with the Milestone Three Rubric.**

Final Project Submission: Case Study Analyses

In **Module Seven**, you will submit your final project. It should be a complete, polished artifact containing **all** of the critical elements of the final product. It should reflect the incorporation of feedback gained throughout the course. **This submission will be graded with the Final Project Rubric.**

## Final Project Rubric

**Guidelines for Submission:** Each of the three reports should be three to six pages in length. The documents should use double spacing, 12-point Times New Roman font, and one-inch margins. Citations must be given in APA format.

Critical Elements	Exemplary (100%)	Proficient (85%)	Needs Improvement (55%)	Not Evident (0%)	Value
<b>Case Study One: Rules of Jurisdiction</b>	Meets “Proficient” criteria and cites scholarly research to support claims	Correctly applies the rules of jurisdiction to the facts of this case and determines what jurisdiction(s) would be appropriate for Margolin’s lawsuit against Funny Face and Novelty Now	Applies the rules of jurisdiction and determines what jurisdiction(s) would be appropriate for Margolin’s lawsuit against Funny Face and Novelty Now, but determination of jurisdiction is incorrect for this case	Does not apply the rules of jurisdiction or determine what jurisdiction(s) would be appropriate for Margolin’s lawsuit	6

<b>Case Study One: Alternative Dispute Resolution</b>	Meets “Proficient” criteria and offers insight, based on scholarly research, as to why the chosen types of ADR would be appropriate choices in this situation	Analyzes the advantages and disadvantages of two types of ADR and defines the characteristics of each	Analyzes the advantages and disadvantages of two types of ADR, but analysis is cursory or does not define the characteristics of each	Does not analyze the advantages and disadvantages of two types of ADR	6
<b>Case Study One: ADR Preference</b>	Meets “Proficient” criteria and offers concrete examples to substantiate and comprehensively describe why the chosen types of ADR would be preferred by the respective parties	Applies knowledge of ADR and discusses which types of ADR each party (Funny Face, Novelty Now, and Margolin) might prefer and logically defends choices	Applies knowledge of ADR and discusses which types of ADR each party might prefer, but discussion is cursory and/or does not discuss reasons for preferences, or defense is illogical	Does not apply knowledge of ADR or discuss which types of ADR each party might prefer	6
<b>Case Study One: Criminal Acts</b>	Meets “Proficient” criteria and cites specific, applicable rules of law	Applies concepts of criminal law and discusses whether or not corporations and/or corporate officers may be held liable for criminal acts	Applies concepts of criminal law and discusses whether or not corporations and/or corporate officers may be held liable for criminal acts, but discussion is cursory or lacks detail	Does not apply concepts of criminal law or discuss whether or not corporations and/or corporate officers may be held liable for criminal acts	6
<b>Case Study One: Potential Criminal Acts</b>	Meets “Proficient” criteria, and ideas are well supported with annotations from the text	Correctly identifies, per the classification of crimes in the text, any potential criminal acts by Funny Face and/or Novelty Now	Identifies any potential criminal acts by Funny Face and/or Novelty Now, but criminal acts identified are incorrect for this case	Does not identify any potential criminal acts by Funny Face and/or Novelty Now	6
<b>Case Study One: Potential Criminal Liability</b>	Meets “Proficient” criteria and cites scholarly research to support analysis	Applies concepts of criminal law and discusses the potential criminal liability of Funny Face, Chris, Matt, Ian, and Novelty Now and includes support for the conclusion	Applies concepts of criminal law and discusses the potential criminal liability of Funny Face, Chris, Matt, Ian, and Novelty Now but does not include support for the conclusion, or support is weak	Does not apply concepts of criminal law or discuss the potential criminal liability of Funny Face, Chris, Matt, Ian, and Novelty Now	6

<b>Case Study One: Ethical Decision-Making</b>	Meets “Proficient” criteria and offers insight into the relationship between ethics and law	Accurately applies at least three guidelines of ethical decision-making to evaluate ethical issues within the context of the case study	Applies at least three guidelines of ethical decision-making to evaluate ethical issues within the context of the case study, but application of guidelines has gaps in accuracy or logic	Does not apply at least three guidelines of ethical decision-making to evaluate ethical issues within the context of the case study	6
<b>Case Study Two: Valid Contract</b>	Meets “Proficient” criteria, and analysis is well qualified with concrete examples and is well supported and plausible	Analyzes the elements of the case to determine whether a valid contract exists between Sam and the chain store and supports response by identifying the elements of a valid contract	Analyzes the elements of the case to determine whether a valid contract exists between Sam and the chain store, but analysis is incorrect or does not support response by identifying the elements of a valid contract	Does not analyze the elements of the case to determine whether a valid contract exists between Sam and the chain store	6
<b>Case Study Two: Quasi-Contract</b>	Meets “Proficient” criteria and cites scholarly research to substantiate claims	Analyzes the elements of a quasi-contract and a promissory estoppel to determine whether the chain store would prevail on a claim of either, logically explains why or why not, and includes support for analysis	Analyzes the elements of a quasi-contract and a promissory estoppel to determine whether the chain store would prevail on a claim of either and explains why or why not, but the explanation is cursory and/or illogical or does not include support for analysis	Does not analyze the elements of a quasi-contract and a promissory estoppel to determine whether the chain store would prevail on a claim of either	6
<b>Case Study Two: Rights and Obligations</b>	Meets “Proficient” criteria and is accurate in effectively discussing nuanced rights and obligations in the relationship between the landlord and tenant	Correctly determines the rights and obligations of both the landlord and tenant under a standard residential lease agreement	Determines the rights and obligations of the landlord or the tenant under a standard residential lease agreement (but not both) or is incorrect in which rights and obligations apply	Does not determine the rights and obligations of both the landlord and tenant under a standard residential lease agreement	6
<b>Case Study Two: Grounds to Evict</b>	Meets “Proficient” criteria and provides a thorough, step-by-step analysis with specific supporting evidence applied to each element of the relevant legal test	Correctly determines whether Sam’s landlord has grounds to evict based upon the previously stated rights and obligations	Determines whether Sam’s landlord has grounds to evict but does not base determination on the previously stated rights and obligations or is incorrect in determination	Does not determine whether Sam’s landlord has grounds to evict	6

<b>Case Study Two: Defenses</b>	Meets “Proficient” criteria and cites scholarly research to substantiate determination	Accurately determines what defenses Sam might raise to an eviction action and effectively supports the response	Determines what defenses Sam might raise to an eviction action but is not accurate in determination or support is ineffective	Does not determine what defenses Sam might raise to an eviction action	6
<b>Case Study Three: Business Entities</b>	Meets “Proficient” criteria and offers insight into the nuances of each in relation to one another	Correctly identifies the main types of business entities and discusses the advantages and disadvantages of each	Identifies the main types of business entities, but identification is not correct, or does not discuss the advantages and disadvantages of each, or discusses the advantages or disadvantages of each (but not both)	Does not identify the main types of business entities	6
<b>Case Study Three: Specific Business Entity</b>	Meets “Proficient” criteria and includes specific, well-supported reasoning for business entity choice	Recommends a specific business entity for Arcadia Sports and includes a logical reasoning	Recommends a specific business entity for Arcadia Sports, but reasoning is illogical or missing	Does not recommend a specific business entity for Arcadia Sports	6
<b>Case Study Three: Damages</b>	Meets “Proficient” criteria and offers nuanced insight as to why they are liable under that specific business entity	Accurately determines the type of business entity under which Jeb and Josh would be personally liable to Jane for damages	Determines the type of business entity under which Jeb and Josh would be personally liable to Jane for damages, but is not accurate in determination	Does not determine the type of business entity under which Jeb and Josh would be personally liable to Jane for damages	6
<b>Case Study Three: Seize the Assets</b>	Meets “Proficient” criteria and cites scholarly research to support analysis	Correctly analyzes the ability of Jeb’s personal creditors to seize the assets and/or profits of Arcadia Sports	Analyzes the ability of Jeb’s personal creditors to seize the assets and/or profits of Arcadia Sports, but analysis is incorrect or lacks detail	Does not analyze the ability of Jeb’s personal creditors to seize the assets and/or profits of Arcadia Sports	6
<b>Articulation of Response</b>	Submission is free of errors related to citations, grammar, spelling, syntax, and organization and is presented in a professional and easy to read format	Submission has no major errors related to citations, grammar, spelling, syntax, or organization	Submission has major errors related to citations, grammar, spelling, syntax, or organization that negatively impact readability and articulation of main ideas	Submission has critical errors related to citations, grammar, spelling, syntax, or organization that prevent understanding of ideas	4
<b>Total</b>					<b>100%</b>