Report Requirements

* 8 ½ x 11, 1.5 space, 1” margins, Arial 12pt or equivalent.
* 4-6 pages of content (Not including table of contents, bibliography or appendices).
* Complete sentences/complete thoughts in bullet form or paragraphs.
* Must be YOUR work.
* Must follow APA Style Manual (<http://algonquincollege.libguides.com/citingandreferencing>)
* Must use at least **5 sources** other than the course material (lecture slides) and the**court case**(you must still cite the court case if using as a reference).
* References must be provided for all sources, both imbedded within the text of the paper (e.g. Smith, 1987) and within an APA formatted Bibliography.

Submission Requirements

* **Both electronic and hard copies of the assignment are due on October 16, 2019 at 5:30PM**
* Submit the electronic copy to the“Turnitin”Assignmenton Brightspace
* Submit the hard copy, pages numbered, stapled with cover page at the beginning of Class
* The hard copy must include a signed copy of the Student Attestation of Academic Integrity <http://www.algonquincollege.com/policies/files/2016/04/AA20-Appendix-1.pdf>
* Both hard copy and electronic version must be submitted before start of class. Late assignments will receive a grade of zero.

The Assignement

* Value is 15% of your overall grade
* Analyze the Supreme Court of CanadaCase- The Queen (Ont.) v. Ron Engineering, [1981] 1 SCR 111, 1981 CanLII 17 (SCC), <<http://canlii.ca/t/1lpk8>>- and it’s impact.
* **Your report must include the following**elements separately and sequentially

1. Background   
   Provide a description of what happened between Ron Engineering and the Government of Ontario that lead to the court case
2. Ron Engineering’s (The Plaintiff) Position  
   Provide a description of whyRon Engineeringbelieved they were entitled to their deposit
3. The Government of Ontario (The Defendant’s) Position  
   Provide a description of whyThe Government of Ontario believed they were entitled to keep the deposit
4. The Ruling  
   Provide a description of what the Supreme Court decided (who got to keep the deposit?).What their rationale fortheir decision and why was this so significant?
5. Personal Reflection – Mistakes in Procurement  
   Reflecting on the principles of public sector procurement, provide a brief reflection on how you think mistakes should be treated in the procurement process and what can be done to help prevent them?

**Notes:**

1. Please review the grading rubric.
2. Be careful, there are multiple levels of court involved in this case. While the history of the case is important to the analysis, focus on the case and arguments presented at the Supreme Court.

Organization of Your Assignment

* Cover Page
* Student Attestation of Academic Integrity<http://www.algonquincollege.com/policies/files/2016/04/AA20-Appendix-1.pdf>
* Table of Contents
* The Queen (Ont.) v. Ron Engineering
  1. Background
  2. Ron Engineering’s (The Plaintiff) Position
  3. The Government of Ontario Position
  4. The Ruling
  5. Personal Reflection – Mistakes in Procurement
  6. Bibliography

Grading Rubric

| ***Criteria*** | | | | | | **Points** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Points*** | ***0*** | ***4*** | **6** | **8** | **10** |  |
| ***Quality of Thinking*** | Content is not relevant to the task assigned | Student does not respond appropriately to the assignment | Student shows little original thought beyond the obvious.  Relies primarily on summary details. | Student responds appropriately to the assignment, shows original thought | Student excels in responding to assignment. shows originalthoughtand assessment of complexities that goes far beyond the obvious |  |
| ***Demonstration of Concept & Knowledge*** | Student does not have a grasp of the information; student cannot articulate basic concepts about the case.  There are significant factual errors in the content | Student is uncomfortable with the content and the assignment is disconnected from the facts of the case | Student demonstrates some misunderstanding of the case  There are minor factual errors in the content | Student demonstrates clear understanding of the case | Student demonstrates mastery of the case |  |
| ***Quality of Research &***  ***References*** | Work displays no references.  Connections between evidence and argument are absent/incorrect | Evidence is insufficient, misconstrued or misrepresented  Work does not have the appropriate number of required references. | Evidence is only occasionally relevant. Connections between arguments and evidence unclear.  Student does not integrate research correctly. | Student uses and integrates relevant research. | Student thoroughly integrates and connects research to argument.  Quality of references demonstrates a significant depth of research. |  |
| ***Points*** | ***0*** | ***2*** | **3** | **4** | **5** |  |
| ***Organization*** | Completely lacking in organization and coherence, no connection between ideas | Sequence of information is difficult to follow and argument is not coherent. | Reader has some difficulty following work because some arguments are not coherent. | Generallywell constructed flow of ideas | Information is logically presented, interesting and sequential. |  |
| ***Grammar & Spelling*** | Pervasive errors | Work has frequent errors. | Work has some errors that distract the reader | Work hasminor errors, but they don’t impede understanding | Work has little to no errors. |  |
| ***TOTAL (Out of 40)*** |  | | | | | |
| ***Normalized 15%*** |  | | | | | |