

**THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG
FACULTY OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS**

**School of Business
BUSI1001/BUSI3801 – Business Law
(Academic Year 2016-2017, Semester 1, Subclasses ABC)**

GENERAL INFORMATION

Instructor: Beau Lefler

Email: blefler@hku.hk

Office: KK 1310

Phone: 3917-4218

Consultation times: By appointment

Teaching Assistant: TBD

Email:

Office:

Phone:

Consultation times: By appointment

Pre-requisites: n/a

Co-requisites: n/a

Mutually exclusive: n/a

Course Website: n/a

Other important details:

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course provides an introductory survey to the fundamentals and general principles of the law as it interacts with individuals and institutions in society. It seeks to equip students with a deeper understanding of the processes by which laws are made, including both formal and informal, and the influence that laws have on different stakeholders in a society. This course also works to teach students to understand and analyze current events through a legal lens.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

1. Gain an understanding of the basic structure of the Hong Kong legal system, including how laws are made and enforced.
2. Understand the broad scope of the law, and the diverse ways it interacts with individuals and institutions.
3. Develop the ability to analyze current events and social issues through a legal perspective, and then offer possible solutions.
4. Improve research, debate, problem solving, communication, and analytical skills through analysis of legal issues in both group and individual settings.

PROGRAMME LEARNING OUTCOMES

PLO1: Acquisition and internalization of knowledge of the programme discipline

PLO2: Application and integration of knowledge

PLO3: Inculcating professionalism and leadership

PLO4: Developing global outlook

PLO5: Mastering communication skills

COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES

Course Learning Outcomes		Aligned Programme Learning Outcomes	
CLO1: Appreciate the breadth of influence that law has on society, and understand how and why that influence is formed.		PLO 1, 2	
CLO2: Analyze the effects that law has on businesses and investigate how businesses respond to legal environments.		PLO 1, 2, 3	
CLO3: Analyze the relationship between law and society, and develop verbal and written presentation skills.		PLO 3, 4, 5	
COURSE TEACHING AND LEARNING ACTIVITIES			
Course Teaching and Learning Activities		Expected contact hour	Study Load (% of study)
T&L1. Lectures and in-class discussions:		30	25%
T&L3. Blog		30	25%
T&L4. Term Paper		20	17%
T&L5. Independent Study and Project Work		40	33%
Total		120	100%
Assessment Methods	Brief Description (Optional)	Weight	Aligned Course Learning Outcomes
A1. Blog	Students will contribute to a running blog based on analyses of the interaction of law and businesses through the lens of current events	40%	2, 3
A2. Visual Project	Students will work in groups to present a visual analysis and solution to a complicated legal issue.	30%	1, 3
A3. Written Project	Students will work in groups to present a detailed written analysis and solution to a complicated legal issue.	30%	1, 2, 3
A4. Class Attendance	Students are required to attend class.	10%	1, 2, 3
Total		100%	
STANDARDS FOR ASSESSMENT			
Course Grade Descriptors			
A+, A, A-	Demonstrate evidence of original thought, strong analytical and critical abilities as well as a thorough grasp of the topic from background reading and analysis; should demonstrate excellent organizational, rhetorical and presentational skills.		
B+, B, B-			

C+, C, C-	Demonstrate evidence of critical and analytical thinking but not necessarily original in their thinking; show adequate grasp of the topic from background reading and analysis; should demonstrate strong organizational, rhetorical and presentational skills.
D+, D	Demonstrate evidence of a reasonable grasp of their subject but most of their information is derivative, with rather little evidence of critical thinking; should demonstrate fair organizational, rhetorical and presentational skills.
F	Demonstrate evidence of being able to assemble the bare minimum of information, poorly digested and not very well organized in presentation. There is no evidence of critical thinking.
	Demonstrate evidence of poor knowledge and understanding of the subject, a lack of coherence and organization, and answers are largely irrelevant. Work fails to reach degree level.

Assessment Rubrics for Each Assessment

See Appendix 1 below.

COURSE CONTENT AND TENTATIVE TEACHING SCHEDULE (1-2 weeks per topic)

LECTURING TOPICS	PRE-CLASS READING (Unless otherwise stated, please click the links below)
Course Overview – Into to Law	
Legal Environment in Hong Kong	Hong Kong Legal System ¹ Immigration Policies ² Anti-Discrimination ³
Business Organizations	Doing Business in HK and China ⁴
Business Organizations - International	Architectures of corruption ⁵
Ethics	Training students to be ethical ⁶ Ethics, Heuristics and Biases (pdf on Moodle)
Contracts	Consumer-related problems ⁷
Agency & Employment	Employment Disputes ⁸
Crimes	Crime and Police ⁹

¹ <<http://www.hkcl.org/en/topics/hkLegalSystem/all.shtml>>

² <<http://www.hkcl.org/en/topics/immigration/all.shtml>>

³ <<http://www.hkcl.org/en/topics/antiDiscrimination/all.shtml>>

⁴ <<http://www.hkcl.org/en/topics/businessAndCommerce/all.shtml>>

⁵ <http://www.taxjustice.net/cms/upload/pdf/0701_Mirror_Mirror_corruption.pdf>

⁶ <http://www.slate.com/articles/business/the_dismal_science/2012/09/business_school_and_ethics_can_we_train_mbas_to_do_the_right_thing_.html>

⁷ <http://www.hkcl.org/en/topics/consumer_complaints/all.shtml>

⁸ <<http://www.hkcl.org/en/topics/employmentDisputes/all.shtml>>

⁹ <<http://www.hkcl.org/en/topics/policeAndCrime/all.shtml>>

Torts	Personal Injuries¹⁰ Defamation¹¹
REQUIRED/RECOMMENDED READINGS & ONLINE MATERIALS (e.g. journals, textbooks, website addresses etc.)	
<p>Essential:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course reading material includes the links above and other readings provided through Moodle. You are expected to read all of the pre-class readings before the class discusses the related topic. • You will be given additional reading related to the course projects. <p>Recommended (Optional):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Textbook: Srivastava, D. K. (2014). <i>Business law in Hong Kong</i>. Hong Kong: Sweet & Maxwell/Thomson Reuters. 	
MEANS/PROCESSES FOR STUDENT FEEDBACK ON COURSE	
Online response via Moodle site	
COURSE POLICY (e.g. plagiarism, academic honesty, attendance, etc.)	
<p>Academic Honesty and Integrity</p> <p>You are expected to do your own work whenever you are supposed to. Incident(s) of academic dishonesty will NOT be tolerated. Cheating or plagiarism of any kind will result in an automatic Fgrade for the course plus strict enforcement of all Faculty and/or University regulations regarding such behavior.</p> <p>The University Regulations on academic dishonesty will be strictly enforced! Please check the University Statement on plagiarism on the web: http://www.hku.hk/plagiarism/.</p> <p>Academic dishonesty is a behavior in which a deliberately fraudulent misrepresentation is employed in an attempt to gain undeserved intellectual credit, either for oneself or for another. It includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the following types of cases:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Plagiarism - The representation of someone else's ideas as if they are your own. Where the arguments, data, designs, etc., of someone else are being used in a paper, report, oral presentation, or similar academic project, this fact must be made explicitly clear by citing the appropriate references. The references must fully indicate the extent to which any parts of the project are not one's own work. Paraphrasing of someone else's ideas is still using someone else's ideas, and must be acknowledged. Unauthorized Collaboration on Out-of-Class Projects - The representation of work as solely one's own when in fact it is the result of a joint effort. Cheating on In-Class Exams - The covert gathering of information from other students, the use of unauthorized notes, unauthorized aids, etc. Unauthorized Advance Access to Assessment Materials - The representation of materials prepared at leisure, as a result of unauthorized advance access (however obtained), as if it were prepared under the rigors of the exam setting. This misrepresentation is dishonest in itself even if there are not compounding factors, such as unauthorized uses of books or notes. 	
ADDITIONAL COURSE INFORMATION (e.g. e-learning platforms & materials, penalty for late assignments, etc.)	
This course will utilize the MOODLE framework.	

¹⁰ <<http://www.hkcliv.org/en/topics/personalInjuries/all.shtml>>

¹¹ <<http://www.hkcliv.org/en/topics/defamation/all.shtml>>

Appendix 1: Grading Rubrics

BUSI 1001/3801 BUSINESS LAW – BLOG POST GRADING RUBRIC (30% of the Course Total)

<p>Structure (Max. 3 marks)</p>	<p>3 Marks The blog post was well structured with: - (i) distinct introduction, body paragraphs and conclusion; and (ii) there was appropriate use of title and/or subheadings.</p>	<p>2 Marks The blog post was fairly structured with: - (i) indistinguishable introduction, body paragraphs and conclusion; and/or (ii) there was inappropriate use of title and/or subheadings.</p>	<p>1 Mark The blog post was poorly structured by being unable to satisfy any criteria for 3 marks or 2 marks mentioned on the left.</p>	<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Fail (0%) - No Submission/ Plagiarism found</p>	
<p>Argument/ Analysis (Max. 9 marks)</p>	<p>7 - 9 Marks In addition to the criteria for 5-6 marks on the right; the author was able to outline briefly:- (i) how the solution(s) can be implemented; and/or (ii) how the current/foreseeable obstacles to implement the solution(s) can be overcome.</p>	<p>5 - 6 Marks The blog post provided legal solution(s) of the author, and:- (i) there were examples/authorities to back up his/her propositions; and (ii) such examples and authorities were applied appropriately.</p>	<p>3 - 4 Marks The blog post provided the author's legal solution(s), but:- (i) there was no example/ authority to back up his/her propositions; or (ii) inappropriate example/authority was applied to back up his/her propositions.</p>		<p>1 - 2 Marks The blog post provided:- (i) only a factual description of the event in concern with no personal analysis/ argument/ suggestion of the author; or (ii) the author's personal financial/political insight instead of providing the personal legal solution(s); or (iii) your classmate(s) had already written a post/posts with strikingly similar proposals based on the same article(s)/case(s).</p>
<p>Research Effort (Max. 9 marks)</p>	<p>7 - 9 Marks Comprehensive research effort was demonstrated by:- (i) citing additional references from any appropriate academic publications (textbooks and/or journals); and (ii) satisfying all criteria for 5-6 marks mentioned on the right.</p>	<p>5 - 6 Marks Satisfactory research effort was demonstrated by: - (i) citing additional references from local/international publications of the judiciary/legislature/government agencies/ statutory bodies and/or NGOs; and (ii) satisfying all criteria for 3- 4 marks mentioned on the right.</p>	<p>3 - 4 Marks Fair research effort was demonstrated by:- (i) citing references solely from local/international media (e.g. newspapers and magazines); and (ii) applying the appropriate citation method.</p>		<p>1 - 2 Marks Minimal research effort was demonstrated by:- (i) citing references solely from sources with limited authenticity (e.g. Wikipedia, internet forum); or (ii) applying the inappropriate citation method (e.g. by quoting the URL alone without any descriptions of the reference source).</p>

Appendix 1: Grading Rubrics (Cont'd)

BUSI 1001/3801 BUSINESS LAW – BLOG POST GRADING RUBRIC (30% of the Course Total) (Cont'd)				
Timeliness of the Topic (Max. 3 marks)	3 Marks The topic of the blog post was related to:- (i) an event within the recent 6 months; or (ii) an event more than six months ago, but with recent further developments /debates on it.	2 Marks The topic of the blog post was related to an event happened six months to a year ago, with no further developments/debates on it thereafter.	1 Mark The topic of the blog post was related to an event happened a year ago or earlier, with no further developments/debates on it thereafter.	Fail (0%) - No Submission/ Plagiarism found
Relevance of the Topic (Max. 3 marks)	3 Marks The topic of the blog post was highly relevant to the lecture topics; and the author was able to link the blog post with the topic(s).	2 Marks The topic of the blog post was relevant to the lecture topics; but the author was unable to link the blog post with the topic(s).	1 Mark The topic of the blog post had little or no relevance to any of the lecture topics.	
Sentence Mechanics (Max. 3 marks)	3 Marks The blog post was carefully proofread with appropriate use of terminology and without typographical errors.	2 Marks The blog post was carefully proofread, but there were some grammatical errors/ inappropriate use of terminology/ typographical errors.	1 Mark The blog post had a large number of grammatical errors/ typographical errors/ or with frequent inappropriate use of terminology.	
Late Submission	Up to 10% deduction on the total blog post score per day late.			
Word Limit	Up to 10% deduction on the total blog post score for every 100 words above 1000 words.			

Appendix 1: Grading Rubrics (Cont'd)

BUSI 1001/3801 BUSINESS LAW – BLOG COMMENT GRADING RUBRIC (10% of the Course Total)		
1	0.5	0
<p>Comment was made with constructive and relevant feedback and/or analysis; and either:</p> <p>(1) Something new was added to the discussion (through an additional link or some additional and valuable insight); or</p> <p>(2) extended comments on a given thread or on multiple threads were made.</p>	<p>Comment was made with constructive and relevant feedback and / or analysis;</p> <p>However, the comment did not require any additional research or work.</p>	<p>No comment was made on time; or</p> <p>Repeated/offensive/rude comments were made; or</p> <p>Comments were off topic; or</p> <p>Comments were not insightful, argumentative.</p>
<p>Remarks: Students can make multiple comments on various posts published in a week. In such cases, students will be able get a maximum of 2 marks for that particular week if: -</p> <p>(i) They made one comment satisfying the criteria of 1 point; or</p> <p>(ii) They made two separate comments on two different posts, and each of them satisfied the criteria of 0.5 points.</p> <p>If students are dissatisfied with the comment's score given by the blog post writer, please send your course TA an email with your grounds stated in the email. The course TA and/or the Instructor will make a final decision on the score.</p>		

Appendix 1: Grading Rubrics (Cont'd)

BUSI 1001/3801 BUSINESS LAW – VISUAL PROJECT GRADING RUBRIC

SCORE	CONTENT	PRESENTATION
27-30 “A” range	Well explained, concise and clear analysis of the problem. Topic is made relevant to students. The solution is strong, implementable and if common, shows new way to implement.	The video is engaging, and helps the viewer to easily move through the logic of the content. The narrative is compelling.
24-26 “B” range	Analysis is understandable, but not clear and concise. Topic is not clearly made relevant to the Hong Kong people. The solution is common, or implausible.	Video is understandable, but there are distractions in the audio or video content, and it is not easy to follow the logic of the content. The narrative is interesting, but not compelling.
18-23 “C” range	Analysis is confusing or weak. The topic is dry and irrelevant to Hong Kong people. The solution is old and repackaged without change.	The video or audio is not very good quality. The logic is not very clear, and the narrative is not very interesting.
15-17 “D” range	Lame analysis. Topic is made boring. Solution is cut and paste.	The video or audio is poor. The logic is not clear. The narrative is boring.
< 15 Fail	Students did not understand the problem or did not present a solution.	Boring and difficult to watch.

Appendix 1: Grading Rubrics (Cont'd)

BUSI 1001/3801 BUSINESS LAW – WRITTEN PROJECT GRADING RUBRIC

SCORE	WRITING	CONTENT	
		PROBLEM	SOLUTION
26-30 “A” range	Logical, structure that leads the reader onward. Good use of evidence and sources, showing depth of research. Sentences are well designed. Almost no errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling.	Specifically meaningful to the Hong Kong people, with ramifications in their own life.	Ideas are strong, specific, implementable, and not rewriting of common themes.
22-25 “B” range	Structure is understandable, but not compelling. Evidences and sources are mostly online news articles. Sentences are basic. Errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling are on every page.	Only made tangentially related to Hong Kong people and their everyday lives.	Some ideas are new, but mostly offshoots of ideas others have had in the past.
14-21 “C” range	Structure is slightly confusing. Evidence is all “first page of a search engine”. Sentences are unwieldy or sound like Google translation. Errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling are in most paragraphs.	One sided analysis that would not convince the Hong Kong people that they should care.	Ideas are readily available online and simply repurposed for this paper.
10-13 “D” range	Structure is hard to follow. Very little source material. Sentences are hard to follow. A lot of grammar, punctuation and spelling errors.	Seems like a cut and paste from internet articles.	Ideas are old and common.
<10 Fail	Confusing, poorly written, cobbled together, and hard to read.	Student did not understand the project.	Student did not understand the project.