

Prof. Rachel Hope Cleves
rcleves@uvic.ca
Cle B202
Office hours: M 2:30-4:30

History 390B
Spring 2025
FIA 103
Class hours: MR 1-2:20

HSTR 390B: Modern History through Role Play



In this course we will take a deep dive into post-World War II American political history by playing two “Reacting to the Past” games. The first, “Chicago, 1968,” explores the backroom politics and riotous street fighting that took place during that year’s national Democratic Party convention. The second game, “Watergate, 1973-1974,” explores the constitutional crisis provoked by the investigation of the Watergate burglary. By taking on the roles of historic figures and recreating these debate-filled moments, drawing on extensive primary and secondary source readings, students will gain a deep familiarity with major themes in modern US political history.

Territorial Acknowledgement

We acknowledge and respect the ɫəkʷəŋən peoples on whose traditional territory the university stands and the Songhees, Esquimalt and WSÁNEĆ peoples whose historical relationships with the land continue to this day.

Reacting to the Past (RTTP) Games

Reacting to the Past is a teaching approach that promotes active learning by having students take on the roles of historical figures during turning points in world history. The games are not scripted and they have no fixed outcomes. The games might adhere to the past or diverge from it, depending on the play, although students must always try to remain true to their character's beliefs and context - also known as "the plausibility corridor." Success in the games depends on students persuading others to their points of view in speeches and private negotiations. RTTP games highlight the role that human decision-making plays in the past. For the most part, academic historians have abandoned the "great man" theory of history that overstates the significance of individuals as causal actors. However, historical explanations that rely entirely on structural forces to explain the past can make the mistake of overlooking the contingency – or chanciness – of history. RTTP games recognize the significance of both structural forces and historical actors in the shaping of the past.

Classroom Dynamics

During gameplay, the classroom runs entirely on student participation. The professor serves as "game master" and takes a backstage role making sure the games run smoothly. With the exception of introductory lecture days before each game, don't count on sitting back while the professor does the talking.

This class also has an associated Slack site. Slack is free messaging software that you can use to (responsibly) DM your classmates to conduct secret negotiations and other skullduggery. It's also a great way to make plans with your faction, share documents, and ridicule your opponents. I will also send you DMs via Slack to prompt you if necessary to take certain actions. The invitation to join our Slack channel can be found under the overview tab on Brightspace.

Attendance Policy

Attendance is required in this course. For RTTP classes to succeed, students need to be present to play their assigned roles. If key roles are absent, the entire game may be imperiled. If circumstances arise that prevent you from attending class, please alert me in advance (the earlier the better) so that I can adjust the game play and preserve the experience for other students. Unexcused absences will impact your participation grade.

Reading

For each game, you will read a gamebook that includes both a secondary source account of the historical context and a collection of primary sources. You will also have a detailed

role sheet to read for each game. Lastly, I will be posting suggested additional readings to Brightspace throughout the semester, for added context. You are responsible for readings the gamebook's historical context sections before each quiz. You should also work on reading through the primary sources, especially those connected to your historical role. Your participation and writing depend on familiarity with the primary sources. The Proctor and Parrish gamebooks are published and available through the UVic bookstore.

Nicholas Proctor, *Chicago 1968: Policy and Protest at the Democratic National Convention* (The University of North Carolina Press, 2022)

John M. Parrish, *Watergate, 1973-1974* (The University of North Carolina Press, 2023)

Grading

Quizzes:	30%
Participation:	30%
Writing:	40%

- 1) Quizzes: $2 \times 15\% = 30\%$

There will be two quizzes based on the assigned readings for each major game. The goal of these quizzes is to encourage you to do the reading and be familiar with the primary and secondary sources before the beginning of the games. The quizzes will be open book.

Jan 23: Chicago 1968 Quiz

March 6: Watergate 1973-74 Quiz

- 2) Class Participation = 30%

Chicago 1968	15%
Watergate 1973-4	15%

Class participation is worth 30% of your total grade, 15% each for Chicago 1968 and Watergate 1973-1974.

Students are expected to remain in character at all times during gameplay, including forums, debates, faction meetings, and social hours.

You must prepare all oral components outlined in your role sheets. Speeches should be delivered from notes or memory, not read aloud. Speeches should include quotations and examples from the assigned documents, and they should

engage specifically with questions and comments that have previously arisen in class.

Participation grades are not dependent on “winning” the game. Grading will take into account that certain roles in the games (“indeterminates”) demand more listening than speaking. I will do my best to shuffle roles so that students will not be assigned only “leadership” roles or “indeterminate” roles. If this happens by mistake, please alert me. If a player consistently behaves out of character or acts ahistorically, the game master may also kill the character. The game master will first warn the character by direct message. If the ahistorical behavior continues, the game master will “kill” the character and assign the student a new character.

A range: Attended all of the time. Participated frequently. Participation almost always addressed pertinent issues and demonstrated a clear understanding of the dynamics of the game. Participation frequently or always integrated readings into the arguments made by the character, demonstrated a clear sense of the student’s “character” and the way that character would have reacted to game events. In general, convincingly demonstrated thorough understanding of the game and the readings. Bonus points for really inhabiting your role (costumes, enthusiasm, etc.).

B range: Attended all or most of the time. Participated frequently. Participation usually addressed pertinent issues regarding the game. Readings not always integrated into the arguments made during the games, or didn’t always demonstrate complete understandings of the readings.

C range: Attended most or all of the time. Participated reasonably often, but participation indicated lack of complete understanding of the game and seldom cited readings OR participated occasionally, but in ways that demonstrated clear understanding of the course of the game and used the ideas of the readings successfully in addressing game issues.

D range: Attended irregularly or seldom participated. Participation indicated little understanding of the game or of the readings upon which the game was based.

F: Rarely attended, said little, openly ignored game or game requirements.

3) Writing Assignments: 40%

Reacting to the Past role sheets each come with their own unique set of suggested assignments that make it a challenge to set universal deadlines or rubrics. As a general guideline, you must submit your assignments for each game by that game’s wrap-up day. Most role sheets will direct you to submit speeches. Some roles instruct you to work as editors and submit newspapers, or present other alternative assignments. I expect you to hand in at least three written assignments, totaling a minimum of fifteen pages of double-

spaced 12-point font writing over the course of the semester. If your role sheets don't work with this general guideline, come and speak with me and we'll adjust accordingly. I will give you qualitative feedback on each assignment and then assign a total overall grade at the end. In my qualitative feedback I will give you a basic idea of how you're doing (excellent means A work, good means B work, doesn't meet all the requirements is C work). I have set up four assignment dropboxes in Brightspace where you can submit your work. Use dropboxes 1, 2, and 3 for your required three assignments. You may submit as many extra materials as you like to dropbox 4, which I will take into account as extra credit when arriving at your final grade for written assignments. Do not use AI chatbots or large language models to complete your assignments. All work submitted is required to be original and self-generated and engage with course materials. Work that does not meet these expectations will receive a failing grade. Use of editing tools like Grammarly is permitted, but all research, analysis, and composition must be your own work. For further clarification, see the university's Policy on Academic Integrity <https://www.uvic.ca/students/academics/academic-integrity/index.php>.

a. Speeches

DO NOT submit a fully written out speech. Instead, submit a detailed bullet point outline, which includes your specific arguments responding to the prompts in your role sheet, as well as quotations from the required primary sources that are cited with page numbers from the relevant gamebook. Do not include flowery flourishes or broad summaries. The bullet points should be heavy on details from the course materials that directly address the prompts in your role sheet. Assignments will be assessed based on their degree of completion of the prompts described in the role sheet. Cite all quotations and factual information following the History Department style guide <https://www.uvic.ca/humanities/history/current-students/undergraduate/style-guide/index.php> Assignments that are missing citations will not receive a passing grade.

b. All other writing prompts

For all other writing prompts, follow the instructions as laid out in your role sheet. Your assignment will be graded on your completion of the prompts described in your role sheet. Follow the same citation instructions listed above for speeches.

Course Guidelines and Policies

Communication with me: the best way to reach me is through email: rcleves@uvic.ca I prefer to be addressed as Prof. Cleves or Dr. Cleves.

Communication with you: I am 100% committed to respecting the gender identity, self-determination, and autonomy of all my students and I see it as my responsibility to create

a safe and respectful learning environment. If you'd like me to call you by a name that's different from what's printed in the class roster, let me know. And if you want to inform me which pronouns to use, please email me. My pronouns are she/her.

Student Hours: Please think of "office hours" as "student hours" – these are hours reserved for you if there's anything you want to talk about. I will be in my office, Clearihue B202, with the door open on Mondays from 2:30-4:30. You don't have to make an appointment first to come talk with me.

Students with Disabilities: If you need an accommodation for this class, please contact the Centre for Accessible Learning (CAL) uvic.ca/cal. My goal is to create a learning environment where everyone can thrive. I'll be happy to work with your needs.

Student Conduct: Please review the Trifaculty Code of Professional Behaviour for Students: <https://www.uvic.ca/services/advising/assets/docs/tri-fac-student-code-of-conduct.pdf>

Misconduct: The penalty for academic misconduct or plagiarism in this course will be an F for the assignment and possibly for the class. Please consult the History Department's Policy on Academic Integrity, attached at the end of the syllabus, to review the definition of plagiarism and academic misconduct

Course Schedule

The course schedule is subject to change, dependent on game play dynamics. I will always discuss potential shifts in the schedule with you and ask for your input.

DATE	TOPIC	READINGS
M Jan 6	Introductions Syllabus Review Slack sign up	Syllabus
R Jan 9	Mini-Game	
GAME 1: CHICAGO 1968		
M Jan 13	Lecture: Postwar Affluence and the Civil Rights Movement C1968 Role distribution	Proctor 1-64
R Jan 16	Lecture: Vietnam and the 60s	Proctor 1-64
M Jan 20	Discussion: Vietnam Primary Sources	Proctor 67 - 155
R Jan 23	Quiz Role Introductions Press Conference	

M Jan 27	Game Session: Parts 1-2	
R Jan 30	Game Session 3-4	
M Feb 3	Game Session 5 press conference	
R Feb 6	Game Session 6-7	
M Feb 10	Chicago wrap-up Chicago Post-Mortem	
R Feb 13	Chicago 1968 film: "Medium Cool" by Haskell Wexler (1969) Watergate role distribution	
SPRING BREAK HOLIDAY		
GAME 3: Watergate 1973-1974		
M Feb 24	Lecture: The Constitution and the Separation of Powers	Parrish 1-16
R Feb 27	Lecture: The Nixon Presidency and Watergate	Parrish 17-48
M Mar 3	Discussion: Watergate primary sources	Parrish 49-135
R Mar 6	Quiz Role Introductions	Parrish all
M Mar 10	Game Session 1: The Committee Hearings 1, July 1973	
R Mar 13	Game Session 2: The Committee Hearings 2, August 1973	
M Mar 17	Game Session 3: The Battle for the Tapes 1, October 1973	
R Mar 20	Game Session 4: The Battle for the Tapes 2 June 1974	
M Mar 24	Game Session 5: The Question of Impeachment 1, July 1974	
R Mar 27	Game Session 6, August 1974	
M Mar 31	Watergate Debriefing	
R Apr 3	Watergate Film: All the Presidents' Men	

Principles of Academic Integrity

Academic integrity requires commitment to the values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility. It is expected that students, faculty members and staff at the University of Victoria, as members of an intellectual community, will adhere to these ethical values in all activities related to learning, teaching, research and service. Any action that contravenes this standard, including misrepresentation, falsification or deception, undermines the intention and worth of scholarly work and violates the fundamental academic rights of members of our community. This policy is designed to ensure that the university's standards are upheld in a fair and transparent fashion. Students are responsible for the entire content and form of their work. Nothing in this policy is intended to prohibit students from developing their academic skills through the exchange of ideas and the utilization of resources available at the university to support learning (e.g., The Centre for Academic Communication). Students who are in doubt as to what constitutes a violation of academic integrity in a particular instance should consult their course instructor.

Academic Integrity Violations

Plagiarism

A student commits plagiarism when he or she:

- submits the work of another person in whole or in part as original work
- gives inadequate attribution to an author or creator whose work is incorporated into the student's work, including failing to indicate clearly (through accepted practices within the discipline, such as footnotes, internal references and the crediting of all verbatim passages through indentations of longer passages or the use of quotation marks) the inclusion of another individual's work
- paraphrases material from a source without sufficient acknowledgment as described above.

The university reserves the right to use plagiarism detection software programs to detect plagiarism in essays, term papers and other work.

Unauthorized Use of an Editor

An editor is an individual or service, other than the instructor or supervisory committee, who manipulates, revises, corrects or alters a student's written or non-written work.

The use of an editor, whether paid or unpaid, is prohibited unless the instructor grants explicit written authorization. The instructor should specify the extent of editing that is being authorized.

Review by fellow students and tutoring that do not include editing are normally permitted. In addition to consulting with their instructors, students are encouraged to seek review of and feedback on their work that prompts them to evaluate the work and make changes themselves.

Multiple Submission

Multiple submission is the resubmission of work by a student that has been used in identical or similar form to fulfill any academic requirement at UVic or another institution. Students who do so without prior permission from their instructor are subject to penalty.

Falsifying Materials Subject to Academic Evaluation

Falsifying materials subject to academic evaluation includes, but is not limited to:

- fraudulently manipulating laboratory processes, electronic data or research data in order to achieve desired results
- using work prepared in whole or in part by someone else (e.g. commercially prepared essays) and submitting it as one's own
- citing a source from which material was not obtained
- using a quoted reference from a non-original source while implying reference to the original source
- submitting false records, information or data, in writing or orally

Cheating on Work, Tests and Examinations

Cheating includes, but is not limited to:

- copying the answers or other work of another person
- sharing information or answers when doing take-home assignments, tests or examinations except where the instructor has authorized collaborative work
- having in an examination or test any materials or equipment other than those authorized by the examiners
- accessing unauthorized information when doing take-home assignments, tests or examinations
- impersonating a student on an examination or test, or being assigned the results of such impersonation
- accessing or attempting to access examinations or tests before it is permitted to do so

Students found communicating with one another in any way or having unauthorized books, papers, notes or electronic devices in their possession during a test or examination will be considered to be in violation of this policy.

Aiding Others to Cheat

It is a violation to help others or attempt to help others to engage in any of the conduct described above.

Procedures for Dealing with Violations of Academic Integrity

Procedures for determining the nature of alleged violations involve primarily the course instructor and the Chair. Procedures for determining an appropriate penalty also involve Deans, the Vice-President Academic and Provost and, in the most serious cases, the President.

Allegations

Alleged violations must be documented by the instructor, who must inform the Chair. The Chair shall then inform the student in writing of the nature of the allegation and give the student a reasonable opportunity to respond to the allegation. Normally, this shall involve a meeting between the instructors, the Chair, the student and, if the student requests in advance, another party chosen by the student to act as the student's adviser. If the student refuses to provide a response to the allegation or to participate in the process, the Chair may proceed to make a determination.

Determining the Nature of the Violation

The Chair shall make a determination as to whether compelling information exists to support the allegation.

Determining Appropriate Penalties

If there is compelling information to support the allegation, the Chair shall contact the Office of the Registrar to determine if the student's record contains any other confirmed academic integrity violations. If there is no record of prior violations, the Chair shall make a determination with respect to the appropriate penalty, in accordance with this policy.

Referral to the Dean

Where there have been one or more prior violations and the Chair has determined that compelling information exists to support the allegation, the Chair shall forward the case to the Dean (or the Dean's designate. In the Faculties of Humanities, Science and Social Sciences, the designate may be the Associate Dean Academic Advising). In situations where the student is registered in more than one faculty, the case will be forwarded to the Dean responsible for the course. The Chair may submit a recommendation to the Dean with respect to a proposed penalty.

Letters of Reprimand

Any penalty will be accompanied by a letter of reprimand which will be written by the authority (Chair, Dean, President) responsible for imposing the penalty. The letter of reprimand will be sent to the student and a copy shall be included in the record maintained by the Office of the Registrar.

Rights of Appeal

Students must be given the right to be heard at each stage, and have the right to appeal decisions in accordance with university policy, procedures and regulations. A student may:

- appeal a decision made by the Chair to the Dean of the faculty in which the student is registered within 21 business days of the date of the Chair's decision.
- appeal a decision made by the President under the provisions of section 61 of the University Act to the Senate Committee on Appeals in accordance with the Senate Committee on Appeals' Terms of

Principles of Academic Integrity

Reference and Procedural Guidelines. Deans who receive an appeal of the decision of a Chair should attempt to make a finding with respect to the appeal within 21 business days. In the case of a successful appeal, any penalty will be rescinded.

Penalties

Penalties for First Academic Integrity Violation

In situations where a determination is made that a student has committed a first academic integrity violation, the following penalties will normally be imposed. The penalties for violations relating to graduate dissertations, theses or final projects are different than those for other violations.

Plagiarism

Single or multiple instances of inadequate attribution of sources should result in a failing grade for the work. A largely or fully plagiarized piece of work should result in a grade of F for the course.

Unauthorized Use of an Editor

Unauthorized use of an editor should result in a failing grade for the work. In situations where unauthorized use of an editor to extensively edit work results in a student submitting work that could be considered that of another person, penalties for plagiarism may apply.

Multiple Submission without Prior Permission

If a substantial part of a piece of work submitted for one course is essentially the same as part or all of a piece of work submitted for another course, this should result in a failing grade for the assignment in one of the courses. If the same piece of work is submitted for two courses, this should result in a grade of F for one of the courses. The penalty normally will be imposed in the second (i.e., later) course in which the work was submitted.

Falsifying Materials

If a substantial part of a piece of work is based on false materials, this should result in a failing grade for the work. If an entire piece of work is based on false materials (e.g., submitting a commercially prepared essay as one's own work), this should result in a grade of F for the course.

Cheating on Exams

Any instance of impersonation of a student during an exam should result in a grade of F for the course for the student being impersonated, and disciplinary probation for the impersonator (if he or she is a student). Isolated instances of copying the work of another student during an exam should result in a grade of zero for the exam. Systematic copying of the work of another student (or any other person with access to the exam questions) should result in a grade of F for the course. Any instance of bringing unauthorized equipment or material into an exam should result in a grade of zero for the exam. Sharing information or answers for take-home assignments and tests when this is clearly prohibited in written instructions should result in a grade of zero for the assignment when such sharing covers a minor part of the work, and a grade of F for the course when such sharing covers a substantial part of the work.

Collaborative Work

In cases in which an instructor has provided clear written instructions prohibiting certain kinds of collaboration on group projects (e.g. students may share research but must write up the results individually), instances of prohibited collaboration on a substantial part of the work should result in a failing grade for the work, while instances of prohibited collaboration on the bulk of the work should result in a grade of F for the course. In situations where collaborative work is allowed, only the student or students who commit the violation are subject to penalty.

Violations Relating to Graduate Dissertations, Theses or Final Projects

Instances of substantial plagiarism, falsification of materials or unauthorized use of an editor that affect a minor part of the student's dissertation, thesis or final project should result in a student being placed on disciplinary probation with a notation on the student's transcript that is removed upon graduation, and being required to rewrite the affected section of the dissertation, thesis or final project.

While the determination of the nature of the offence will be made by the Chair, this penalty can only be imposed by the Dean. Instances of plagiarism, falsification of materials or unauthorized use of an editor that affect a major part of the student's dissertation, thesis or final project should result in the student being placed on disciplinary probation with a notation on the student's transcript that is removed upon graduation, and rejection of the dissertation, thesis or final project, and the student being required to rewrite the work in its entirety. While the determination of the nature of the offence will be made by the Chair, this penalty can only be imposed by the Dean. The penalties for violations relating to graduate dissertations, theses or final projects may apply where a violation occurs in submitted drafts, as well as in the final version of a dissertation, thesis or final project.

Particularly Unusual or Serious Violations

In the case of a first-time violation that is particularly unusual or serious (e.g. falsification of research results), the Chair may refer the case to the Dean, with a recommendation for a penalty more severe than those normally imposed for a first violation.

Penalties for Second or Subsequent Academic Integrity Violation Repeat Violations

Any instance of any of the violations described above committed by a student who has already committed one violation, especially if either of the violations merited a grade of F for the course, should result in the student being placed on disciplinary probation. Disciplinary probation will be recorded on the student's transcript. The decision to place a student on disciplinary probation with a notation on the student's transcript that is removed upon graduation can only be made by the Dean.

In situations where a student commits two or more major academic integrity violations, the student may be placed on disciplinary probation with a permanent notation on the student's transcript.

The decision to place a student on disciplinary probation with a permanent notation can only be made by the Vice-President Academic and Provost (or delegate), upon recommendation of the Dean. In making this decision, the Vice-President Academic and Provost will consider factors such as the nature of the major violations, and whether there has been an interval between violations such that learning could have taken place. If a student on disciplinary probation commits another violation, this should result in the student's permanent suspension. This decision can only be taken by the President, on the recommendation of the Dean.

In situations where a graduate student who has been placed on disciplinary probation after a first offence commits a second offence, the student should be subject to permanent suspension. This decision can only be taken by the President, on the recommendation of the Dean.

Non Course-Based Penalties

If a student has withdrawn from a course or the university, or is not registered in a course associated with a violation, this policy must still be followed. If a determination is made that compelling information exists to support the allegation against a student, a letter of reprimand and, if appropriate, a more serious penalty in this policy should be imposed, although no course-based penalty may be imposed.

HISTORY GRADES		
% Mark	Letter Grade	Point Average
90-100	A+	9
85-89	A	8
80-84	A-	7
77-79	B+	6
73-76	B	5
70-72	B-	4
65-69	C+	3
60-64	C	2
50-59	D	1
0-49	F	0

