**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](mailto:Revensonm@mahopac.k12.ny.us)  [or Revensonm@mahopac.org](about:blank) (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 Düsseldorf  34. John Wayne Gacy, the Killer Clown  35. John Wayne Glover, the Calling Card Killer  36. Andrew Kehoe  37. Philip Markoff ,The Craigslist Killer"  38. Lizzie Borden, Did she love her Axe?  39. Casey Anthony, Irresponsible parent or killer  40. Richard Trenton Chase, The Vampire of Sacramento  41. Albert Fish, the Gray Man, model for Hannibal Lector  42. Andrei Chikatilo ‘Butcher of Rostov”  43. John George Haigh “Acid Bath Murderer”  44. Wayne Williams  45. Dean Corll, The Candy Man  46. Moses Sithole, “ABC Murders”  47. Ottis Toole  48. Pedro Alonso Lopez, “Monster of the Andes”  49. Edward Theodore "Ed" Gein “ Origin of Hollywood monsters”  50. Nannie Doss “the Giggling Nanny”  51. Thug Behram  52. Harold Shipman  53. Elizabeth Báthory "Blood Countess"  54. Anders Behring Breivik, 2011 Norway attacks  55. Paul and Karla Bernardo, The Ken and Barbie klillers  56. Charles Starkweather  57. David Koresh  58. Seung-Hui Cho Virginia polytech shooter  59. Robert John Bardo, Rebecca Shafer case  60. Mark David Chapman  61. Charles Witman, Univeristy of Texas  62. Jim Jones  63. Lee Harvey Oswald  64. 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. or  Missing an image on every slide | | **0 pt**  Only a few informative slides.  or  Missing 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 | | | | | | | |