**Cold War Chess Assignment**

**Rationale**: Students will research the key events, people, and ideologies involved in the Cold

War (1945-1991).

**Process**: Working as an individual or as a pair, students will complete the

following activities

1. Come to an understanding of the game of chess and what the “power” pieces are and how the game is played on a minimal level. This will also be covered in class.
2. Students will research the Cold War (Origins through the collapse of the USSR)nand in discussion with their partner, they will choose the 32 most important people, events, concepts and/or ideologies of the Cold War
3. Students **will create a chess board** of the Cold War that reflects their grasp of the significant developments of the struggle between pro-Communist and anti-Communist supporters during that era.

Hint: One way to make this work is to pick opposites….

Ex: Missiles in Turkey and missiles in Cuba may be opposite pieces and

arranged to reflect that idea.

Chess board may be a spreadsheet or be made by hand. Examples of completed boards will be shown in class. Physical boards and pieces will receive bonus points (if accurate and appropriate)

1. Students will **complete note-cards** that have their person, event, or ideology on one side and a thorough explanation of its **significance** **to the Cold War** on the other side.
2. Additionally: on the back of the note-card students must provide a **justification** of why their term on the front ranks as the chess piece that has been chosen.

Example: I choose President Truman as a Knight. I must explain why he deserves this ranking in addition to explaining his significance to the Cold War.

This part of the project will receive its own grade as well as the presentation of information.

**Cold War Chess Presentation Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Presentation Component** | **Poor**  (1) | **Acceptable** (2) | **Good** (3) | **Excellent** (4) |
|  **Style**: use effective verbal and nonverbal communication skills (e.g., voice volume, inflection, eye contact, etc.) |  poor style (long pauses, reading speech, "Umm..." and other mannerisms, poor eye contact, monotone, etc.) |  Either fluent delivery but reading, or awkward delivery but spontaneous |  generally good delivery and spontaneity but could improve |  Excellent style involving matching verbal and nonverbal style, good projection with inflection, spontaneous speaking |
|  **Coverage**: thorough and balanced in treatment of topic |  very incomplete, significant gaps, or biased treatment of topic |  either thorough but biased, or incomplete and balanced |  generally thorough and balanced but awkward, needs more evidence, or better sequencing |  thorough coverage of topic per assignment with balanced treatment of perspectives |
| **Justification**: explains reasoning and provides evidence  **(will count twice: 8 possible points)** |  little or no reasoning, explanation, or evidence provided |  reasoning and evidence presented but not well organized or poor sources |  good logical reasoning and evidence, but not integrated |  logical reasoning integrated with authoritative references on key points |
| **Graphics**: attractive & balanced layout, legible font |  no graphics (may be appropriate in some cases) |  graphics present but poor quality (illegible, inconsistent, , etc.) |  well done graphics but too much or too little, and not on key points |  well-designed and attractive graphics that simplify or summarize key ideas; original graphics |
|  |  |  |  |  |

 