## Assessment task 1: Case Note

This assignment requires students to write a **case note** in order to show their understanding of a case and to demonstrate their ability to present that understanding in a well-structured case note.

Students must write a case note on ***Royall v R***, found on pp. 275-291 of the *Waller & Williams* textbook. Students are **not** expected to look beyond the excerpt in the textbook.

The case note should follow IRAC format.

Before IRAC please include;

**1. Full citation**

**2. parties**

**3. date**

**4. court**

**5. Coram**

**6. Litigation history**

**7. brief material facts**

8. Issue

9.Rule

10.Application of law

11. Conclusion

12. Obiter/ratio

 Students will be assessed on their ability to read the case, understand the issues, reasoning and conclusion, and present that understanding in IRAC form.

**Referencing-** AGLC Third Edition

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Due date:** | 8th March 2017 PM |
| **Weighting:** | 15% |
| **Length and/or format**: | 750 words-NO MORE – excluding AGLC referencing  |
| **Purpose:** | This assignment is designed to test students’ ability to understand legal doctrine and to communicate that knowledge in a clear and professionally appropriate manner.  |
| **Learning outcomes assessed**: | ILO2 Describe and critically evaluate the offences created by the Criminal Law in Victoria and NSW |
| **Assessment criteria:** | See rubric in the appendix.  |

**Rubric – Assessment task 1: Case Note**

| **ILOs** | **Criteria** | **Standards** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Below Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Level 1 (e.g. F)** | **Level 2 (e.g. P)** | **Level 3 (e.g. C)** | **Level 4 (e.g. D)** | **Level 5 (e.g. HD)** |
| **ILO2** | **Outlines the relevant facts** | *Minimally* identifies or does not identify the relevant facts | *Somewhat* identifies the relevant facts but requires further development | *Generally* identifies the relevant facts. | *Almost completely* identifies the relevant facts. | *Completely and accurately* identifies the relevant facts. |
| **ILO2** | **Identifies and understands the legal issues** | *Minimally* identifies or does not at all identify the relevant issue(s) | *Somewhat* identifies the relevant issue(s) but requires further development | *Generally* identifies the relevant issue(s) | *Almost completely* identifies the relevant issue(s) | *Completely and accurately* identifies the relevant issue(s). |
| **ILO2** | **Identifies and understands the relevant legal rules and principles** | Shows little or no understanding of the legal rules and principles. | Shows some understanding of some of the legal rules and principles. | Generally understands the legal rules and principles. | Shows good understanding of the legal rules and principles. Is able to identify and discuss any relevant ambiguity or complexity in these rules. | Shows excellent understanding of the legal rules and principles. Is able to identify and discuss any relevant ambiguity or complexity in these rules. |
| **ILO2** | **Identifies and understand the application of the law to the facts.** | Does not show any understanding of the application of the law to the facts. | Shows some understanding of the application of the laws to the facts. | Shows adequate understanding of the application of the law to the facts. | Shows understanding of application of the law to the facts and is able to comprehend the complexity of the application. | Shows excellent understanding of application of the law to the facts and is able to comprehend and engage with the complexity of the application. |
| **ILO2** | **Use of IRAC** | Does not use IRAC | Some use of IRAC, but with mistakes or overlap in the use of categories. | Adequate use of IRAC (may be some minor overlap or errors in use) | Good use of IRAC, with clear differentiation of categories.  | Excellent use of IRAC, with clear differentiation of categories. |
| **ILO2**  | **Clear structure and writing** | Illogical or no discernible organisation of written work, which detracts significantly from clarity of overall document, writing is confusing, hard to follow, inappropriate choice of words | Sentence structure generally adequate but lacks variety, word choice limited but generally appropriate, sufficiently logical organisation and structure for clarity of overall document to be identified, some explanations and supporting statements/illustrative examples, although adequate for task, illogically organised within paragraph and, therefore, detract from overall clarity of ideas presented | Generally well-formed sentences throughout with varied structures, word choice generally appropriate and enhances coherence of ideas presented, mostly well considered and logical organisation and structure of written work, but with occasionally deficiencies, topic sentences clearly identifiable within paragraphs containing explanations, supporting statements/illustrative examples, not all paragraphs contain linking sentences but overall there is a smooth flow of ideas | Well-formed sentences throughout with varied structures, word choice appropriate and generally enhances coherence of ideas presented, suitable and coherent structure and organisation of written work, topic sentences clearly identifiable within well structured paragraphs containing clear explanations, supporting statements/illustrative examples and linking sentences, generally seamless flow of ideas | Well-considered and logical structure and organisation of written work, very well formed sentences throughout with varied structures, word choice is appropriate and significantly enhances coherence of ideas presented, topic sentences clearly identifiable within well-structured paragraphs containing clear explanations, supporting statements/illustrative examples and linking sentences, seamless flow of ideas |
| **ILO2** | **Academic writing conventions** | Poor observance of academic writing conventions; sentence fragments or run-on sentences may be apparent; frequent distracting errors in grammar, punctuation, spelling, capitalisation | Observance of academic writing conventions is adequate but inconsistent throughout; some evidence of proofreading, but errors apparent in grammar, punctuation, spelling, capitalisation, however, errors do not significantly detract from clarity of ideas presented; some inclusion of redundant or irrelevant information | Academic writing conventions generally observed; some evidence of proofreading, but errors apparent in grammar, punctuation, spelling, capitalisation, however, errors do not significantly detract from clarity of ideas presented; some inclusion of redundant or irrelevant information | Academic writing conventions observed throughout; full compliance with rules of grammar, punctuation, spelling, capitalisation; clear and concise expression used; carefully proofread | Academic writing conventions observed throughout; precise compliance with rules of grammar, punctuation, spelling, capitalisation; very clear and concise expression used; very carefully proofread |