**Using Forensics: Historical Cases Solved and Unsolved**

**Objectives:** Investigate various cases and show how forensic Science was/is being used.

1. Provide background on the individuals involved
2. Describe the forensic research that took place.
	1. What areas of forensic were utilized?
	2. What equipment was needed or used?
	3. What evidence did it yield? Psychological profile?
	4. What was/were the conclusion(s)?
3. Identify any possible controversy(s) behind the individual/events behind the case. (screw-ups)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Presentation Due date TBA.**  | E-mail to Revensonm@mahopac.k12.ny.us  or Revensonm@mahopac.org (google) or bring in flash drive for me to copy |
| See attached rubric.  |  |

**Include:** Cover page, Background on the individual + their crime(s), evidence obtained, technologies used and how evidence was analyzed (this should be scientific), final ruling, Bibliography

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recent Individual cases:**  | 33. Peter Kürten, The Vampire of Düsseldorf34. John Wayne Gacy, the Killer Clown35. John Wayne Glover, the Calling Card Killer36. Andrew Kehoe37. Philip Markoff ,The Craigslist Killer"38. Lizzie Borden, Did she love her Axe?39. Casey Anthony, Irresponsible parent or killer40. Richard Trenton Chase, The Vampire of Sacramento41. Albert Fish, the Gray Man, model for Hannibal Lector42. Andrei Chikatilo ‘Butcher of Rostov”43. John George Haigh “Acid Bath Murderer”44. Wayne Williams45. Dean Corll, The Candy Man46. Moses Sithole, “ABC Murders”47. Ottis Toole48. Pedro Alonso Lopez, “Monster of the Andes”49. Edward Theodore "Ed" Gein “ Origin of Hollywood monsters”50. Nannie Doss “the Giggling Nanny” 51. Thug Behram52. Harold Shipman 53. Elizabeth Báthory "Blood Countess"54. Anders Behring Breivik, 2011 Norway attacks55. Paul and Karla Bernardo, The Ken and Barbie klillers56. Charles Starkweather57. David Koresh58. Seung-Hui Cho Virginia polytech shooter 59. Robert John Bardo, Rebecca Shafer case60. Mark David Chapman61. Charles Witman, Univeristy of Texas62. Jim Jones63. Lee Harvey Oswald64. Amanda Knox  |
| 1. David Berkowitz, Son of Sam,
2. Ted Kaczynski, The Unabomber
3. Alexander Pichushkin, The Chessboard killer
4. Claus & Sunny von Bulow
5. Richard Crafts, Conn. Wood chipper Murder
6. Dr. Jeffrey McDonald, *Satanic Army Physician*
7. Jean Harris, Dean of Discipline
8. Anne Kevin Neal
9. Jeffery Dahmer
10. Dennis Rader “BTK Strangler ”
11. The Snaggletooth Killer
12. NY Zodiac Killer
13. California Zodiac Killer
14. Gary Leon Ridgway “Green River Killer”
15. Richard Ramirez “The Night Stalker”
16. Chandra Ann Levy The Disappearance
17. Anders Behring Breivik
18. Sam Sheppard, The Fugitive?
19. Scott Peterson
20. Kevin Neal
21. Ted Bundy
22. Charles Manson
23. William G. Bonin, the Freeway Killer
24. Bobby Joe Long
25. Edmund Kemper,
26. Timothy McVeigh and Terry Nicholis
27. Joel Rifkin
28. Albert De Salvo, Boston Strangler
29. Butch DeFeo, Amityville horror?
30. Eric Harris and Dylan Klobold, Columbine
 |

**Historical Cases PowerPoint Presentation Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Written Content**  | **Proficient** | **lacking** | **Minimal** |
| **Spelling & Punctuation** | **1Pt**No Mistakes | **½ pt**One minor mistake, but clarity achieved | **0 Pt**Multiple mistakes |
| **Required Elements** | **2 pts**\* Minimum of 7 informative slides, *Title and “the end” slide do not count*\* Included 1 image per slide pertaining to your topic | **1 Pts**Fewer than 7 informative slides. orMissing an image on every slide | **0 pt**Only a few informative slides. orMissing images |
| **5 Questions** | **2 pts YES** | **0 Pts No** |  |
| **Design** | **1Pt**Varied graphics clearly complement slide’s message. Graphics and sounds are appropriate to the career. Graphics are very creative, Background vs. text is clear | **½ pt**Graphics complement slide’s message. Graphics and sounds appropriate, Background vs. text is minor issue | **0 Pt**Graphics are minimally used to communicate slide’s message.Background vs. text is a problem  |
| **Communication** | **2Pt**Mostly communicates other than through screen reading. Maintains eye contact, Audio nice a clear | **1pt**Minor communication flaws, | **0 Pt**Communicates very little screen reading. Reading, no eye contact. |
|  | **Content** | **Proficient****understanding** | **lacking****understanding** | **Minimal understanding** |
| Background behind the person(s)  | 7 ----- 6 | 5 - 4 | 3 2 1 0  |
| Areas of forensics utilized? | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Types of Evidence found? | 1 | ½ | 0 |
|  Identify which was Circumstantial evidence. | 1 | ½ | 0 |
| Identify which was direct evidence  | 1 | ½ | 0 |
| What equipment/techniques were used to analyze the above evidence? Psychological profile? | 2 | 1.5 1 | 0 |
| How was it used in the case? | 2 | 1.5 1 | 0 |
| What was/were the conclusion(s)?  | 2 | 1.5 1 | 0 |
| **Total Points**  |  |
| Not prepared -20%/day |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Written Content  | Proficient, 1Pt | Lacking, clarity achieved ½ pt | Minimal, 0 Pt |
| **Spelling & Punctuation** | No Mistakes | minor mistake(s) | Multiple mistakes |
| **Appearance** | Well designed  | A bit untidy | Multiple mistakes |
| **Cover page** | Well done | Provided | Not provided |
| **Bibliography**  | Well done | Provided  | Not provided |
|  | **Content** | **Proficient****understanding** | **lacking****understanding** | **Minimal understanding** |
| Background behind the person(s)  | 7 ----- 6 | 5 - 4 | 3 2 1 0  |
| Areas of forensics utilized? | 2 | 1.5 1 | 0 |
| Types of Evidence found? | 1 | ½ | 0 |
|  Identify which was Circumstantial evidence. | 1 | ½ | 0 |
| Identify which was direct evidence  | 1 | ½ | 0 |
| What equipment/techniques were used to analyze the above evidence? Psychological profile? | 2 | 1.5 1 | 0 |
| How was it used in the case? | 2 | 1.5 1 | 0 |
| What was/were the conclusion(s)?  | 2 | 1.5 1  | 0 |
| **Total Points**  | /22 points |
| Not prepared -20%/day |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Written Content  | Proficient, 1Pt | Lacking, clarity achieved ½ pt | Minimal, 0 Pt |
| **Spelling & Punctuation** | No Mistakes | minor mistake(s) | Multiple mistakes |
| **Appearance** | Well designed  | A bit untidy | Multiple mistakes |
| **Cover page** | Well done | Provided | Not provided |
| **Bibliography**  | Well done | Provided  | Not provided |
|  | **Content** | **Proficient****understanding** | **lacking****understanding** | **Minimal understanding** |
| Background behind the person(s)  | 7 ----- 6 | 5 - 4 | 3 2 1 0  |
| Areas of forensics utilized? | 2 | 1.5 1 | 0 |
| Types of Evidence found? | 1 | ½ | 0 |
|  Identify which was Circumstantial evidence. | 1 | ½ | 0 |
| Identify which was direct evidence  | 1 | ½ | 0 |
| What equipment/techniques were used to analyze the above evidence? Psychological profile? | 2 | 1.5 1 | 0 |
| How was it used in the case? | 2 | 1.5 1 | 0 |
| What was/were the conclusion(s)?  | 2 | 1.5 1 | 0 |
| **Total Points**  | /22 points |
| Not prepared -20%/day |