

2.1 Mock Scenes

Mock crime scenes are important instructional activities because they give students the opportunity to practice what they learned in the classroom and in the workshops. It is important, however, to move students through the semester at a pace that mimics the workshop instruction. This means the complexity of mock scene investigation gradually increases. Content for scenes is available from many sources: real-life experience, newspaper articles, broadcast media, movies, and one's imagination.

Generally, each mock scene has the same format:

- An Incidence Report
- A list of evidence that students should find, collect and preserve
- A list of learning points that will expand as the semester moves forward.
- A Scene scenario that is not given to students until after the mock scene investigation is completed.
- Grades based on performance as evaluated by the instructor, assistant instructors, team leaders and team members.

2.1.1 Incident Report

For each scene investigation, students are given a first officer's report and an autopsy report, if necessary, and a team leader (maybe an assistant team leader) is assigned. Instructors have a copy of the scene scenario, the list of evidence and the learning points, those common to most scenes, e.g., searching, developing and searching for fingerprints, archiving including photography, sketching, video, etc. Scenes also have characteristics specifically related to the circumstances of the scene, e.g., bullet path determination, tire track casting, bloodstain pattern interpretation, etc, included in the learning point list.

Students work in teams, the size of which is determined by the size of the class. If the class has 16 students, there will be four teams of four. The number of simultaneous mock scenes active at any one time is dependent on the number of investigative teams. If there are four teams, there should be four mock scenes. The number of scenes also depends on the number of instructors.

2.1.2 Grading Mock Scenes

Each scene is worth 100 points, and students are graded on how well they perform specific tasks during the investigation of the mock scenes, see Table IM-1.1. Since each team member could be involved in one or more of the scene activities, but a grade is earned for only the activities performed. For example, if the student is assigned to search for, dust and lift fingerprints, the overall evaluation that student's performance for that scene will comprise the grade based on fingerprints done for that scene. On another scene, that same student might be the videographer or the photographer as well as be responsible for packaging evidence. At that scene the student

will be graded on each of those activities. Each activity is graded on a 100 point basis, which is averaged over all of the grades the student earns for that scene. For example, if a student earns a 65 for his photographs, 85 for packaging evidence, and 75 for the team leader's critique, he will have earned 75 points for that scene investigation. Students are not penalized for another student's poor performance or the bad management of the scene. Over the course of eight scenes, each student will have taken part in all aspects of the investigation.

Table IM-1.1 Grading Categories for Mock Scene Investigations

Scene Activity	Student 1	Student 2	Student 3	Student 4	Comments
Organization					
Management					
Sketches					
Searching					
Fingerprint development <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dusting 2. DFO 3. 1,2-Indanedione 4. Ninhydrin 5. Superglue fuming <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. H&H b. Vacuum c. Development 					
Fingerprint photography <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dusted prints 2. Enhanced prints 3. Fluorescent prints 					
Fingerprint lift <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tape lift 2. Gel lift 3. Silicone casting 					
2D impression lifts <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enhancement <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Chemical 2. Electrostatic 3. Gellifter 4. Photography 					
Impression Casting					
Bullet Recovery					
Shell casing recovery					
Bullet Path Determination <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Vertical component 2. Azimuth 3. Photography 					
GSR Presumptive testing					

Archiving 1. Establishing Photos 2. Midrange 3. Close-up					
Scene video					
Topic video					
Presumptive Blood ID					
Confirmatory blood 1. Immuno card					
Bloodstain Pattern Analysis 1. Archiving 2. Interpretation					
Total Number of Points					
Average No. Points/Grade					

The team leader's grade is determined by seven factors:

- ability to manage the investigation
- finding all of the evidence
- ensuring the proper tests/procedures are conducted
- the case file
- reconstruction report
- critique by other team members
- Instructor's evaluation

The report filed by the team leader, Textbox IM-1.1 is submitted in a 3-ring binder. It is, in essence, the work product of the team and is considered a case file. Photographs are submitted in electronic format because experience has shown that printing is time consuming, too expensive for students, and gives inconsistent results unless the printer is high quality.

Textbox IM-1.1 Template for Team Leader's Report

Template for Team Evaluation of Team Leader's Performance

Discuss the following using the Format Below

1. **Write a short synopsis – 2 sentences - of what the scene was about. Also, include a list of the 3 most important investigative questions.**
 - a. Were these questions discussed with the team before hand and
 - b. Did the investigation answer these questions?
2. ***In your opinion was scene handled efficiently?***
 - a. If so, briefly discuss why, giving specific examples.
 - b. If not, briefly discuss how you would have handled it differently
 - c. Give at least one specific example, depending on your opinion above.
3. ***Did the team leader split the work logically and effectively, so that each team member had specific responsibilities?***
 - a) If not, how would you have done it differently? Give at least one specific example.
 - b) If so, briefly discuss why. Give at least one specific example.
4. ***Did the team complete all the work that had to be done?***
 - a) If not, explain why using at least one specific example to illustrate your point.
 - b) What would you have done to make the scene processing better, more complete ad more efficient? Use specific examples.
5. ***Discuss the following with respect to the team leader and the assistant team leader.***
 - A. Did the team leader have a grasp of the situation?
 - Why? Give at least 2 examples. Explain the obstacles the team leader experienced:
 - The scene
 - With team members
 - With TA's
 - B. Did the team leader delegate responsibility effectively?
 - Why? Give at least 2 examples.
 - What feedback did the team give to the team leader?
 - What role did the assistant team leader play in delegating?
 - C. Did the team leader demonstrate leadership qualities?
 - Why? Give specific examples.
 - Was the team leader a dictator type? If so, explain using examples. If not, explain using examples.
 - Did the team leader ask for feedback from the team? Give examples
 - D. ***What role did the assistant team leader play?***
 - Was the assistant team leader a true co-leader or more of a follower?
 - How well did the assistant team leader and the team leader work together?
 - E. ***Did the assistant team leader demonstrate signs of leadership ability? Give at least one specific example.***
 - F. ***List 3 things that went wrong in the scene investigation? Why?***
 - G. ***Give one instance where team harmony fell apart. Was the team in sync during the investigation or were team members left more on their own with respect to deciding what to do and how to do it?***
 - H. ***During your team discussions to answer the questions above, was there significant disagreement among team members? Explain.***

The team's critique (evaluation) of the team leader is a composite opinion of the team leader's effectiveness as a leader and whether there was ample supervision that resulted in the investigation being completed successfully. Essentially it is the team's evaluation of the team leader's performance. The template is shown in Textbox IM-1.2. The detail of the team's response is held in confidence so that, if the criticism is harsh, the team leader is not made aware of it. The evaluation is used by the instructor to work with the student (team leader) as the semester moves forward. Additionally, the graduate student instructors separately evaluate the team leader's effectiveness as a leader. Both evaluations become part of the basis used to grade the team leader's performance.

Textbox IM-1.2 Template for Team Evaluation of Team Leader's Performance

Textbox 26.3 Scene Reconstruction Report Format

- I. Background information
 - a. Date
 - b. Names
 - c. Case numbers
- II. Items/Documents Examined
- III. Evidence Collected
- IV. Case Scenario
 - a. Purpose of the reconstruction
 - b. Investigative questions that needed to be answered
- V. Experiments Conducted: Tabular format
 - a. Purpose of the experiment
 - b. Experimental detail (how it was done)
 - c. Results of the experiment
 - d. If not successful explain why
- VI. Laboratory Results (tabular format)
 - a. Criminalistics reports
 - i. Hair reports
 - ii. Fiber reports
 - iii. Trace evidence reports
 - b. Ballistics/tool mark reports
 - c. Toxicology reports, if appropriate
 - d. Drug analysis reports, if appropriate
 - e. Fingerprint reports
 - i. Fingerprint examinations & results
 - ii. Explain why failures occurred, if applicable
- VII. Injury/Autopsy Report Summary
 - a. Interpret autopsy report in the context of the scene investigation
- VIII. On-scene work performed
 - a. Bloodstain pattern analysis
 - i. Location of pattern
 - ii. Interpretation of pattern
 - iii. Handedness, Impact, Gunshot, other?
 - b. Bullet path analysis
 - i. Angular component analysis
 - ii. Include table of calculation
 - iii. Interpret bullet path as it relates to the scene
 - c. Fingerprint enhancements: Include a table of prints
 - i. Fill out fingerprint survey logs
 - d. Footprint/tire track enhancements: Include a table of impression evidence located
 - i. Fill out Impression Evidence Logs
 - e. Other
- IX. Reconstruction Summary
 - a. Propose at least two scenarios for what happened. Discuss each with respect to how the physical and scientific evidence fits or disputes the scenarios
 - b. Propose a most reasonable from the two above.
 - i. Explain why the physical and scientific evidence most reasonably explain the conclusions, the investigative questions and why they eliminated alternative scenarios
 1. Include supporting diagrams
 2. Include supporting photos in the reconstruction document.
- X. Team members
 - a. Prepare a table that shows the team constitution/responsibilities and evaluation of their performance.

Team Member	Responsibilities	Activities Performed During Investigation	Evaluation of Performance

3.1 Mock Scene - Example I – Good Friends

The following is an example of a scene given to students. Examples of other scene scenarios are within reach of an instructor's experience, imagination or current news. Certainly, there are multiple variations on this theme. The best scene scenarios are those taken from real-life cases fitted to the geography available in the course.

For each scene, students receive the incident report, 3.1.1, and the autopsy report, 3.1.2. They do not receive the list of evidence they are expected to find, 3.1.3, the learning points, 3.1.4, or the case scenario, 3.1.5, which they will receive after the case is completed and graded.

A successful suggestion is to have students who have taken the course (or faculty or graduate students) act out the crime BEFORE the class. A video of the acted-out crime can be shown to students after they have completed the mock scene. The videos need only to be produced once, which makes them a good source of crimes for subsequent semesters. As new ideas for scenes crop up, new videos can be added to the library of crimes. These also make for interesting discussions in-class or for quizzes concerning finding, collecting and packaging evidence as well as general discussion for scene management, techniques for fingerprinting, enhancing bloodstains, interpreting bloodstain patterns or finding and enhancing or lifting impression evidence, etc.

3.1.1 Incident Report

Officer – Oliver Shrek

Date: October 11, 2011

Occurrence Place: Spruce Cottage – Residence of Aspen Coors.

Mariah Carney, the resident in Pine Cottage, called the precinct at 8:32 p.m. to report a shooting at her neighbor's house. She looked out the window in time to see a man run from the porch of Spruce Cottage toward Thomas Hall. A couple of minutes later, a red Audi TT sped quickly down the brick pathway. She couldn't tell whether the same person was driving the car she had seen running from the cottage. She did not know how many shots were fired. She thought just one.

This officer responded to the scene and arrived at 3:41 a.m. On entering the scene, it appeared that there was a struggle, as magazines and old newspapers were on the floor. Blood drops were on the living room floor. A male, apparently the resident, was lying in blood in the fireplace room. A window was open on the first floor leading into the fireplace room. The backdoor and the basement doors were locked.

The scene was secured and the crime scene unit and the medical examiner were called.

3.1.1.2 Additional Information

The police stopped a red Audi TT that had run a red light on College Avenue. The driver's name was Jason "Bud" Weiser. The Audi TT was registered to Linda Rourke, a resident of Patton Township. Weiser stated that Rourke was his girlfriend. When asked where he was going, he stated that he was going home. When asked where he was coming from, he stated that he had been shopping. The police officer did not notice bags of groceries in the vehicle.

A conversation with Rourke indicated that she and Weiser were living together but that she did not know where he had gone that evening. She said that he and Aspen Coors had been spending a lot of time together lately. She never trusted Coors and was concerned that Weiser had been angry for spending so much time with him lately. She thought Coors had an arrest record for selling drugs, but she wasn't sure of that. She said Coors had the reputation of a wheeler-dealer. The police showed Ms. Carney photos of Weiser and Coors in order to see if she could identify them. She stated that Coors lived in Spruce House and that she thought he worked at Stocker Chevrolet during the day. She did not recognize Weiser and could not identify him as the man she saw running from Spruce Cottage.

An interview of the business manager of Stocker Chevrolet, Tom "Red" Cruise, said that Coors had been employed as the service manager for the past 2 years, and he'd had no problems with him. He was always at work on time and did not goof off. He indicated that Coors was fastidious. Apparently, Coors was an amateur carpenter and continually made very detailed drawings of his personal projects.

In a subsequent conversation with Weiser concerning someone seeing the Audi in the area where Coors was murdered, Weiser asked to call an attorney. Weiser's clothes were confiscated.

Respectfully submitted
Officer Oliver Shrek

3.1.2 Autopsy Report

Case Name: Aspen Coors, deceased

- *External Examination*

The external examination showed the presence of a bullet wound to the left front chest area. Contusions were seen on the left palmar and dorsal aspects of the right forearm and contusions on the right and left cheeks and jaw area. Bleeding in the mouth was also observed. Contusions were also seen in the left side of the abdomen.

- *Internal examination*

- Bullet wound.

The bullet entrance was in the front left chest with that was slightly upward toward the back. The bullet pierced the right ventricle of the heart. A .38 cal bullet was recovered and sent to the crime