

## JUS 261 Final Project Guidelines and Rubric

### Overview

The final project for this course is the creation of a scenario analysis.

Federal, state, and local judicial systems each have unique processes and require administration to effectively move cases through the systems. Players from each system interact in the administration of justice; therefore, it is important to understand how the systems work and engage with each other for efficient judicial administration. Understanding how judicial systems work is key for anyone looking to pursue a career within the courts.

In this assessment, you will examine and evaluate the roles and processes of the systems, regardless of your position within the systems. Through analyzing a scenario, you will determine proper venue, jurisdiction, and litigation process, as well as make administrative decisions. You will also assume multiple perspectives in order to determine efficient and effective ways to move a case through the judicial process.

The project is divided into **two 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 and Five**. The final product will be submitted in **Module Seven**.

In this assignment, you will demonstrate your mastery of the following course outcomes:

- Analyze venue and jurisdiction for their implications to different levels of government
- Illustrate the various roles played in the judicial system for informing the development of effective administration strategies
- Assess the function of calendars and dockets in the legal system for creating efficiency
- Evaluate the civil and criminal litigation processes at different levels of government for their ability to efficiently carry out justice

### Prompt

In this assessment, you will analyze and evaluate the following scenario from the perspectives of an attorney and a judge. You will address how this scenario would be handled by the judicial systems by creating a scenario analysis. Based on the scenario, examine how it would be tried within the judicial systems.

#### Scenario

Jed, Herman, and Jane live in Washington, D.C. Jed and Jane entered the local bank and took \$65,000. Jed and Herman both used shotguns during the robbery, though no one was hurt. Jane drove the getaway vehicle. Two hours later, as they headed toward the Canadian border, they were stopped by the police for speeding and taken into custody. The police determined that Jed and Jane matched the eyewitness descriptions of the robbers. Jane confessed their bank robbery scheme. Jed and Herman denied their involvement. The police only recovered \$25,000 in cash, but were unable to determine if the recovered money was taken from the bank. The police determined that Jed was a convicted felon at the time of the armed bank robbery. The local police and FBI were involved in the investigation.

The defense attorneys for each defendant (Jed, Herman, Jane) request a continuance for four months to sift through the evidence. The prosecution objects and argues that the delay would significantly clog the court's already heavy workload. In the alternative, the prosecution argues that if the court grants a continuance, then the prosecution should be allowed to prolong turning over the remaining discovery. The defense attorneys object and argue that this hinders their effective representation of their clients and would hinder a prompt resolution. The defense attorneys further argue that their clients deserve a well prepared and thorough defense. The judge currently has trials blocked over the next 10 months and wants to try the case now.

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

### I. Judicial Systems

- A. Describe the **hierarchical structure** for federal, state, and local court systems. What is the primary role of each level?
- B. Explain the primary differences between the federal and state **levels** of judicial systems. Describe the importance in having these different levels.
- C. Explain the **subject matter jurisdiction** for federal, state, and local courts. What impact does this have on the efficiency of court systems?
- D. Distinguish which court(s) would have **jurisdiction** in this scenario? Defend your response.
- E. **Determine** how **venue** is decided upon. What are the implications of venue?
- F. What would the **venue** be for this scenario? Defend why this venue is the most appropriate.
- G. Explain the applicable **sentencing guidelines** in the federal and state judicial systems for this scenario. Defend your response.
- H. Determine how sentencing guidelines impact the **functionality** of a court system. Defend your response.

### II. Judicial Administration

- A. Analyze how federal, state, and local courts **calendar and docket** cases. Are these processes effective in promoting efficiency? Defend your response.
- B. Describe how the **calendar** and continuance of this scenario would be handled differently in the state system versus the federal system. Defend your response.
- C. Identify the **key role** within federal and state judicial systems that most impacts process. How does this role aid in creating and maintaining an efficient and effective judicial process?
- D. **Describe the litigation process** that would be used for this scenario at the state and federal levels.
- E. Explain the **statute of limitations** on charging and trying cases. Determine how statute of limitations could impact efficiency in the litigation process of this case.
- F. Determine the **impact of venue** on process efficiency in this scenario. Defend your response.
- G. Explain how a four-month **continuance** affects the efficiency of any court under the circumstances presented in the scenario. Defend your response.
- H. How would you balance the prosecutor and defense attorneys' **concerns** regarding continuances in this scenario? Defend your response.
- I. Review the discovery laws in federal court. Determine if the prosecution's requested **discovery delay** violates the federal laws. Defend your response.
- J. Would you grant the **prosecution's request** (assuming that you granted the four-month continuance)? Defend your response.

## Milestones

Milestone One: Draft of Judicial Systems

In **Module Three**, you will submit a draft of the Judicial Systems section of your scenario analysis. Using your assigned reading and course materials, you will analyze the structure of the courts and the application of principles of jurisdiction and venue to the scenario provided. Your draft should be two to three pages in length. **This milestone is graded with the Milestone One Rubric.**

Milestone Two: Draft of Judicial Administration

In **Module Five**, you will submit a draft of the Judicial Administration section of your scenario analysis. Using your assigned reading and course materials, you will analyze the impact of judicial administration components— calendaring and docketing, and the roles of court staff and litigation participants. Your draft should be two to three pages in length. **This milestone is graded with the Milestone Two Rubric.**

Final Submission: Scenario Analysis

In **Module Seven**, you will submit your scenario analysis. It should be a complete, polished document containing **all** of the critical elements of the final product. It should reflect the incorporation of feedback gained throughout the course, as well as include the items that were omitted from your analyses in Milestone One and Milestone Two. **The final submission will be graded using the Final Project Rubric.**

## Final Project Rubric

**Guidelines for Submission:** Your scenario analysis must be four to six pages in length with double spacing, 12-point Times New Roman font, and APA formatting.

| Critical Elements                                    | Exemplary (100%)  | Proficient (85%)   | Needs Improvement (55%)   | Not Evident (0%)   | Value |
|--|---|--|---|--|-------|
| <b>Judicial Systems: Hierarchical Structure</b>      | Meets “Proficient” criteria and description is exceptionally clear and contextualized | Describes the hierarchical structure for federal, state, and local court systems, and establishes the primary role of each | Describes the hierarchical structure for federal, state, and local court systems, but does not establish the primary role of each                           | Does not describe the hierarchical structure for federal, state, and local court systems | 5.3   |
| <b>Judicial Systems: Level</b>                       | Meets “Proficient” criteria and explanation is exceptionally clear and contextualized | Explains the primary differences between federal and state judicial systems and describes the importance of having levels  | Explains the primary differences between federal and state judicial systems, but does not describe the importance of having levels                          | Does not explain the differences between levels of judicial systems                      | 5.3   |
| <b>Judicial Systems: Subject Matter Jurisdiction</b> | Meets “Proficient” criteria and supports claims with concrete examples                | Explains the subject matter jurisdiction for federal, state, and local courts, and states its impact on court efficiency   | Explains the subject matter jurisdiction for federal, state, and local courts, but does not address the impact of subject matter jurisdiction on efficiency | Does not explain subject matter jurisdiction for courts                                  | 5.3   |

# Southern New Hampshire University

|  |   |  |  |  |     |
|--|---|--|--|--|-----|
| <b>Judicial Systems: Jurisdiction</b>                          | Meets “Proficient” criteria and response contains concrete evidence   | Distinguishes which court would have jurisdiction and defends response   | Distinguishes which court would have jurisdiction, but does not defend response  | Does not distinguish which court would have jurisdiction   | 5.3 |
| <b>Judicial Systems: Determine Venue</b>                       | Meets “Proficient” criteria and substantiates claims with specific instances  | Determines how venue is established, and describes the implications of venue   | Determines how venue is established, but does not describe the implications of venue   | Does not determine how venue is established  | 5.3 |
| <b>Judicial Systems: Venue</b>                                 | Meets “Proficient” criteria and substantiates claims with specific instances  | Identifies venue for scenario, and defends why venue is most appropriate   | Identifies venue for scenario, but does not defend why venue is most appropriate   | Does not identify venue for scenario   | 5.3 |
| <b>Judicial Systems: Sentencing Guidelines</b>                 | Meets “Proficient” criteria and draws connections to real-world processes   | Explains sentencing guidelines in the federal and state judicial systems, and describes their impact on functionality                                  | Explains sentencing guidelines in the federal and state judicial systems, but does not describe their impact on functionality  | Does not explain sentencing guidelines   | 5.3 |
| <b>Judicial Systems: Functionality</b>                         | Meets “Proficient” criteria and draws connections to real-world processes   | Determines how sentencing guidelines impact the functionality of a court system, and defends response  | Determines how sentencing guidelines impact the functionality of a court system, but does not defend response  | Does not determine how sentencing guidelines impact the functionality of a court system                      | 5.3 |
| <b>Judicial Administration: Calendar and Docket</b>            | Meets “Proficient” criteria and supports claims with specific examples from the calendar and docket processes             | Analyzes how federal, state, and local courts calendar and docket cases and establishes their impact on efficiency                                     | Analyzes how federal, state, and local courts calendar and docket cases but does not establish their impact on efficiency  | Does not analyze how courts calendar and docket cases  | 5.3 |
| <b>Judicial Administration: Calendaring</b>                    | Meets “Proficient” criteria and shows nuanced understanding of differences between the state and federal judicial systems | Describes how the calendaring and continuance of this case would be handled in the state and federal judicial systems and defends response             | Describes how the calendaring and continuance of this case would be handled in the state or federal judicial systems, but does not defend response or response is lacking detail or inaccurate | Does not describe how the calendaring of this case would be handled in the state or federal judicial systems | 5.3 |
| <b>Judicial Administration: Key Role</b>                       | Meets “Proficient” criteria and connects role with specific examples from processes                                       | Identifies key role within federal and state judicial systems, and establishes how each aids in maintaining an efficient and effective judicial system | Identifies key role within federal and state judicial systems, but does not establish how each aids in maintaining an efficient and effective judicial system                                  | Does not identify key role within federal and state judicial systems   | 5.3 |
| <b>Judicial Administration: Litigation Process Description</b> | Meets “Proficient” criteria and description is concise and contextualized   | Describes the litigation process at the state and federal level  | Describes the litigation process at the state or federal level, but not both   | Does not describe the litigation process   | 5.3 |

# Southern New Hampshire University

|  |   |   |  |   |             |
|--|---|---|--|---|-------------|
| <b>Judicial Administration: Statute of Limitations</b> | Meets “Proficient” criteria and is well qualified with examples   | Explains the statute of limitations on charging and trying cases, and determines their impact on efficiency           | Explains the statute of limitations on charging and trying cases, but does not address their impact on efficiency  | Does not explain the statute of limitations on charging and trying cases  | 5.3         |
| <b>Judicial Administration: Impact of Venue</b>        | Meets “Proficient” criteria and substantiates claims with specific instances  | Determines the impact of venue on process efficiency in this scenario and defends response                            | Determines the impact of venue on process efficiency in this scenario, but does not defend response  | Does not determine the impact of venue on process efficiency  | 5.3         |
| <b>Judicial Administration: Continuance</b>            | Meets “Proficient” criteria and qualifies connections with real-world examples  | Identifies the effects of a continuance on a court, explains the impact on a court’s efficiency, and defends response | Identifies the effects of a continuance on a court but does not explain the impact on a court’s efficiency or does not defend response                         | Does not identify the effects of a continuance on a court   | 5.3         |
| <b>Judicial Administration: Concerns</b>               | Meets “Proficient” criteria and solution is well supported and logical  | Determines how to balance attorney concerns, explains why chosen strategy would be effective, and defends response    | Determines how to balance attorney concerns but does not explain why chosen strategy would be effective or does not defend response                            | Does not determine how to balance concerns  | 5.3         |
| <b>Judicial Administration: Discovery Delay</b>        | Meets “Proficient” criteria and defense is well qualified with specific examples  | Determines if the prosecution’s requested discovery delay violates federal laws and defends response                  | Determines if the prosecution’s requested discovery delay violates federal laws but does not defend response   | Does not determine if the prosecution’s requested discovery delay violates federal laws   | 5.3         |
| <b>Judicial Administration: Prosecution Request</b>    | Meets “Proficient” criteria and determination is well supported and logical   | Determines if prosecution’s request should be granted and defends response  | Determines if prosecution’s request should be granted, but does not defend response  | Does not determine if prosecution’s request should be granted   | 5.3         |
| <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 | 4.6         |
| <b>Earned Total</b>                                    |   |   |  |   | <b>100%</b> |