

COMMUNITY FOREST MANAGEMENT
Fall 2018

Wednesday, Periods 8-10 (3:00-6:00)

Course numbers: FOR 6628 (Section 5255), LAS 6290 (Section 1H92)

Course credits: 3

Instructor: Dr. Karen A. Kainer

kkainer@ufl.edu

846-0833

210 Newins-Ziegler

Office Hours: Best by appointment, but also...Monday: 10:00-12:00

Course readings:

Mulder, M.B. and P. Coppolillo. 2005. Conservation: Linking ecology, economics, and culture. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.

Plus...Select articles and book chapters: See readings list.

Course description:

Forest management by communities and local smallholders has gained currency as a potentially viable strategy for conserving forest ecosystems, while supporting local livelihoods and cultural values. This 3-credit graduate course examines how local people conserve their forests and under what conditions they garner significant social and economic benefits. The course analyzes the conceptual underpinnings, efficacy, and practice of this growing trend in global forest management, and considers how researchers and practitioners (including graduate students) have collaborated with communities in these efforts. It is designed for students from diverse disciplines and different levels of expertise to think critically, jointly, about the multi-scale, contextual factors that influence conservation and livelihood outcomes - applications that go beyond forests to other ecosystems. A variety of teaching methods will be employed with an emphasis on experiential and cross-student learning.

Learning objectives:

Upon completion of this course, students will have:

- Integrated new multidisciplinary knowledge with their personal and professional experiences to think critically about community-based forest management;
- Synthesized key ecological concepts for sound management of community resources;
- Articulated the relevance and complexity of the socio-political context on community-based resource management;
- Reviewed and discussed practical ways in which community-based management has been implemented;
- Reflected on their philosophies about biodiversity conservation, development, and cultural change.
- Written a research proposal or manuscript that integrates student interests with course learning.
- Conducted critical peer reviews of colleagues' works.

Grading:

Reflection paper	10%	94 – 100% = A
Readings comments	20%	90 – 93% = A-
Research paper		87 – 89% = B+
Preliminary statement and bibliography	10%	80 – 86% = B
Lightening presentation	5%	77 – 79% = C+
Final submission	25%	70 – 76% = C
Peer review I (prelim statements & biblio)	10%	60 – 69% = D
Peer review II (research paper draft)	10%	< 60% = E
Class participation*	<u>10%</u>	
Total	100%	

*Attendance is a prerequisite to in-class participation. **Every student is expected to attend every class.** Students bring a wealth of experience into the classroom, and each class period is a unique chance to learn from those experiences (cross-student learning). A second reason I insist on class attendance is because of the 3-hour class meetings. Missing one day = 6.7% of the course; two = 13.3%; and 3 = 1/5 of the course! In other words, quickly, one can miss a large portion of what could be learned.

In the past, I have always asked that students let me know immediately if they *have* to miss a class, and this courtesy has been extended almost without fail. Typically, one or two students from the entire course miss a session during the course of a semester (conference, sibling wedding, etc...). Indeed, more than one absence is not acceptable (except under extreme circumstances), and will be reflected in your participation grade. Unplanned absences (emergencies) just come up, and are dealt with differently.

Community Forest Management

Date	Topic	Assignments due*
SETTING THE THEORETICAL STAGE		
Aug 22	Introduction	
<i>Aug 27 - This is early early Monday morning!</i>		<i>reflection paper - 2:00 am</i>
Aug 29	Conservation, development, and the role of CFM	
Sep 5	Ecology behind CFM & harvesting from the forest	
Sep 12	TEK and other assets	<i>title & brief description (no grade)</i>
Sep 19	Political ecology	
Sep 26	Forest rights and forest governance	<i>prelim statement & biblio</i>
Oct 3	Variations of co-management	<i>peer review I</i>
Oct 10	Participatory approaches and methods	
MANAGEMENT CASE STUDIES		
Oct 17	Wildlife and communities	
Oct 24	Timber management (big and small)	
Oct 31	Change over time in Acre, Brazil	
Nov 7	The Mexico case Reforestation for conservation & community well-being	<i>draft research paper (no grade)</i>
SUPPORTING COLLABORATIVE MANAGEMENT		
Nov 14	Partnerships	<i>peer review II</i>
Nov 21	NO CLASS (Thanksgiving Holiday)	
Nov 28	Collaborations & research on the ground	<i>lightening presentations</i>
Dec 5	Course wrap up and evaluation	<i>final research paper</i>

***Electronically posted comments are due every session at 2:00 am on the Wednesday of each class.**

Reading Assignments

We will be using UF's Canvas system (or e-Learning) to facilitate course communication and to access readings that are not from the textbook or not free online to the general public. To login, open your Internet browser and navigate to <https://lss.at.ufl.edu>.

To get general help with e-Learning, you may access FAQs (https://lss.at.ufl.edu/help/Student_Faq) or call the Help Desk at 352-392-4357 anytime during [Help Desk](#) hours. Or email helpdesk@ufl.edu. If you use email, write from your gatorlink@ufl.edu email address, or include your UFID and/or gatorlink username (NOT your password!) in the body of the email. Provide complete information regarding the course and content to which you are referring. Someone will get back with you as soon as possible.

We are fortunate to have additional technical support through SFRC (School of Forest Resources and Conservation). If you have technical needs specifically related to this course (i.e., link not functioning), please go the Discussion tab on the left hand panel in Canvas and under "Pinned Discussions", click on Technical Support.

Canvas is set up to access the readings required (and recommended) by date and topic. All articles listed below are required reading for the course, unless "**Recommended**" precedes the citation. To access the readings required (and recommended), go to the Discussion tab on the left panel of the main course site, readings for each class will be found by date and topic. For example, all required readings for August 29 will be tagged "Aug 29: Conservation, development...CFM".

SETTING THE THEORETICAL STAGE

Aug 22 Introduction

No readings

Aug 29 Conservation, development, and the role of CFM

Mulder, M.B. and P. Coppolillo. 2005. Chapter 4: Indigenous peoples as conservationists. Pages 81-103, In: Conservation: Linking ecology, economics, and culture. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.

Romero, C., S. Athayade, J.E. Collomb, M. DiGiano, M. Schmink, S. Schramski and L. Seales. 2012. Conservation and development in Latin America and Southern Africa: setting the stage. *Ecology and Society* 17(2): 17.

<http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol17/iss2/art17/>

Recommended:

Gilmour, D. 2016. Forty years of community-based forestry: a review of its extent and effectiveness. FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations) Forestry Paper 176. FAO, Rome.

Roe, D. 2008. The origins and evolution of the conservation-poverty debate: a review of key literature, events and processes. *Oryx* 42(4):491-503.

Charnley, S. and M.R. Poe. 2007. Community forestry in theory and practice: Where are we now? *Annual Review of Anthropology* 36:301-336.

Agrawal, A. and C.C. Gibson. 1999. Enchantment and disenchantment: The role of community in natural resource conservation. *World Development* 27(4):629-649.

Sep 5 Ecology behind CFM & harvesting from the forest

Mulder, M.B. and P. Coppolillo. 2005. Chapter 3: The natural science behind it all. Pages 53-80, In: *Conservation: Linking ecology, economics, and culture*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.

Ticktin, T. 2004. The ecological implications of harvesting non-timber forest products. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 41:11-21.

Recommended:

Ghazoul, J. and D. Shiel. 2011. Chapter 11: The ever-changing forest: disturbance and dynamics. Pages 229-246, In: *Tropical rain forest ecology, diversity, and conservation*. Oxford University Press, New York.

Montagnini F. and C.F. Jordan. 2005. Chapter 2: Characteristics of tropical forests. Pages 19-73, In, *Tropical Forest Ecology: The basis for conservation and management*. Springer, Berlin.

Sept 12 TEK and other assets

Wali, A., D. Alvira, P.S. Tallman, A. Ravikumar and M.O. Macedo. 2017. A new approach to conservation: using community empowerment for sustainable well-being. *Ecology and Society* 22(4):6. <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-09598-220406>

**Gómez-Baggethun, E., E. Corbera, and V. Reyes-García. 2013. Traditional ecological knowledge and global environmental change: research findings and policy implications. *Ecology and Society* 18(4): 72. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5751/ES-06288-180472>

**An interactive version (in which you can access most cited papers of this article that introduces TEK and its various aspects) is at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4471132/>

Sep 19 Political ecology

Mulder, M.B. and P. Coppolillo. 2005. Chapter 6: Rational fools and the commons. Pages 129-155, In: *Conservation: Linking ecology, economics, and culture*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.

Mulder, M.B. and P. Coppolillo. 2005. Chapter 7: The bigger picture. Pages 156-180, In: *Conservation: Linking ecology, economics, and culture*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.

Recommended:

Nygren, A. 2005. Community-based forest management within the context of institutional decentralization in Honduras. *World Development* 33(4):639-655.

Schmink, M. 1994. The socioeconomic matrix of deforestation. Pages 253-275, In: Arizpe, Lourdes, M. Priscilla Stone, and David C. Major (eds.). *Population and environment: Rethinking the debate*. Westview Press, Boulder.

Pokorny, B. and P. Pacheco. 2014. Money from and for forests: A critical reflection on the feasibility of market approaches for the conservation of Amazonian forests. *Journal of Rural Studies* 26:441-452.

Sep 26 Forest rights and forest governance

Larson, A.M., D. Barry and G.R. Dahal. 2010. New rights for forest-based communities? Understanding processes of forest tenure reform. *International Forestry Review* 12(1):78-96.

Dietz, T., Ostrom, E., and P.C. Stern. 2003. The struggle to govern the commons. *Science* 302(12): 1907-1912.

Recommended:

RRI (Rights and Resources Initiative). 2014. Chapters 1-4 and Annex 3 (Pages 9-35 and 60-65), In: *What future for reform? Progress and slowdown in forest tenure reform since 2002*. Rights and Resources Initiative, Washington DC.

Mulder, M.B. and P. Coppolillo. 2005. Chapter 9: Global issues, economics, and policy. Pages 210-237, In: *Conservation: Linking ecology, economics, and culture*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.

Overdeest, C. and J. Zeitlin. 2014. Constructing a transnational timber legality assurance regime: Architecture, accomplishments, challenges. *Forest Policy and Economics* 48:6-15.

Auld, G., L. H. Gulbrandsen, and C.L. McDermott. 2008. Certification schemes and the impacts on forests and forestry. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 33:187-187-211.

Wiersum, K.F., S. Humphries and S. van Bommel. 2013. Certification of community forestry enterprises: experiences with incorporating community forestry in a global system for governance. *Small-scale Forestry* 12:15-31.

Emerson, K., T. Nabatchi, and S. Balogh. 2011. An integrative framework for collaborative governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 22:1-29.

Schmink, M. 2004. Communities, forests, markets, and conservation. Pages 119-129, In: Zarin, D.J., J.R.R. Alavalapati, F.E. Putz, and M. Schmink (eds), *Working Forests in the Tropics: Conservation through Sustainable Use*. Columbia University Press, New York.

RRI (Rights and Resources Initiative). 2017. Power and potential: A comparative analysis of national laws and regulations concerning women's rights to community forests. Rights and Resources Initiative, Washington DC.

Wells, M. 1992. Biodiversity conservation, affluence and poverty: Mismatched costs and benefits and efforts to remedy them. *Ambio* 21:237-242.

Holling, C.S. and G.K. Meffe. 1996. Command and control and the pathology of natural resource management. *Conservation Biology* 10(2):328-335.

Oct 3 Variations of co-management

Cronkleton, P., J.M. Pulhin and S. Saigal. 2012. Co-management in community forestry: How partial devolution of management rights creates challenges for forest communities. *Conservation and Society* 10(2):91-102.

Persha, L. A. Agrawal, and A., Chhatre. 2011. Social and ecological synergy: Local rulemaking, forest livelihoods, and biodiversity conservation. *Science* 331:1606-1608.

Recommended

Porter-Bolland, L., E. A. Ellis, M.R. Guariguata, I. Ruiz-Mallén, S. Negrete-Yankelevich, & V. Reyes-García. 2012. Community managed forests and forest protected areas: An assessment of their conservation effectiveness across the tropics. *Forest Ecology and Management* 268:6-17.

2014 Video: CIFOR: Secrets of the Forest (24 minutes). Produced by the Peruvian Ministry of the Environment. In Spanish with English subtitles. View at:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6EjluD9jbxw>

Sears, R., P. Cronkleton, M. Perez-Ojeda del Arco, V. Robiglio, L. Putzel, and J. Cornelius. 2014. Timber production in smallholder agroforestry systems: Justifications for pro-poor forest policy in Peru. CGIAR, CIFOR, World Agroforestry Centre.

Cronkleton, P., D.B. Bray, and G. Medina. 2011. Community forest management and the emergence of multi-scale governance institutions: lessons for REDD+ development from Mexico, Brazil and Bolivia. *Forests* 2:451-473.

Ellis, E.A., K.A. Kainer, J.A. Sierra Huelsz and P. Negreros-Castillo. 2014. Community-based forest management in Quintana Roo, Mexico. Pages 131-151, In: Katila, P., G. Galloway, W. de Jong, P. Pacheco, and G. Mery (eds.). *Forests under pressure: local responses to global issues*. IUFRO (International Union of Forest Research Organizations) World Series Vol. 32, IUFRO, Vienna.

Santika, T., E. Jeijaard, S. Budiharta, E.A. Law, A. Kusworo, J.A. Hutabarat, T.P. Indrawan, M. Struebig, S. Raharjo, I. Huda, Sulhani, A.D. Ekaputri, S. Trison, M. Stigner, and K.A. Wilson. 2017. Community forest management in Indonesia: Avoided deforestation in the context of anthropogenic and climate complexities. *Global Environmental Change* 46:60-71.

Hajjar, R., R.A. Kozak, H. El-Lakany & J.L. Innes. 2013. Community forests for forest communities: Integrating community-defined goals and practices in the design of forestry initiatives. *Land Use Policy* 34:158-167.

RRI (Rights and Resources Initiative). 2012. What Rights? A Comparative Analysis of Developing Countries' National Legislation on Community and Indigenous Peoples' Forest Tenure Rights. Rights and Resources Initiative, Washington DC. The following website has links to the English, Spanish and French version of this document.

http://www.rightsandresources.org/publication_details.php?publicationID=4924

Oxfam, International Land Coalition, Rights and Resources Initiative. 2016. Common ground. Securing land rights and safeguarding the earth. Oxfam, Oxford, UK.

Agarwal, B. 2000. Conceptualizing environmental collective action: why gender matters. *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 24:283-310.

Agarwal, B. 2009. Gender and forest conservation: The impact of women's participation in community forest governance. *Ecological Economics* 68:2785-2799.

Westermann, O., J. Ashby, and J. Pretty. 2005. Gender and social capital: The importance of gender differences for the maturity and effectiveness of natural resource management groups. *World Development* 33 (11):1783-1799.

Giri, K. and I. Darnhofer. 2010. Nepali women using community forestry as a platform for social change. *Society & Natural Resources* 23:12, 1216-1229. DOI: [10.1080/08941921003620533](https://doi.org/10.1080/08941921003620533)

Oct 10 Participatory approaches and methods

Arnold, J. and W. Bartels. 2014. Chapter 12: Participatory methods for measuring and monitoring governance. Pages 238-262, In: Barnes, G. and B. Child (eds.), *Adaptive cross-scalar governance of natural resources*. Routledge, UK.

You are also required to either read:

Taylor, P.L., P. Cronkleton, and D. Barry. 2013. Learning in the field: Using community self studies to strengthen forest-based social movements. *Sustainable Development* 21:209-223.

or:

Fernandez-Gimenez, M.E., H.L. Ballard and V. E. Sturtevant. 2008. Adaptive management and social learning in collaborative and community-based monitoring: a study of five community-based forestry organizations in the western USA. *Ecology and Society* 13(2):4 [online] URL:

<http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol13/iss2/art4/>

Recommended

Firehock, K. 2003. Protocol and guidelines for ethical and effective research of community-based collaborative processes. Community Based Collaborative Research Consortium (CBCRC), University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA.

Reed, M.S., A. Graves, N. Dandy, H. Posthumus, K. Hubacek, J. Morris, C. Presll, C.H. Quinn, and L.C. Stringer. 2009. Who's in and why? A typology of stakeholder analysis methods for natural resource management. *Journal of Environmental Management* 90:1933-1949.

Yuliani, E.L., H. Adnan, C.J. Pierce Colfer and Y. Indriatmoko. 2015. Problem-solving versus appreciative inquiry approaches in community-based conservation. *Forests, Trees and Livelihoods* 24(2):97-111.

Case studies of research with communities:

Arnold, J.S. and M. Fernandez-Gimenez. 2007. Building social capital through participatory research: An analysis of collaboration on Tohono O'odham tribal rangelands in Arizona. *Society and Natural Resources* 20:481-495.

Parrado-Rosselli, A. 2007. A collaborative research process studying fruit availability and seed dispersal within an Indigenous community in the Middle Caqueta River region, Columbian Amazon. *Ecology and Society* 12: 39. [online] URL: <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol12/iss2/art39/>

Setty, R.S., K. Bawa, T. Ticktin, and C. M. Gowda. 2008. Evaluation of a participatory resource monitoring system for nontimber forest products: the case of amla (*Phyllanthus* spp.) fruit harvest by Soligas in South India. *Ecology and Society* 13(2): 19. [online] URL: <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol13/iss2/art19/>

MANAGEMENT CASE STUDIES

Oct 17 Wildlife & communities

Wilkie, D.S., E.L. Bennett, C.A. Peres & A.A. Cunningham. 2011. The empty forest revisited. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 1223:120-128.

Moller, H., F. Berkes, P.O. Lyver, and M. Kislioglu. 2004. Combining science and traditional ecological knowledge: Monitoring populations for co-management. *Ecology and Society* 9(3): 2. [online] URL: <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol9/iss3/art2/>

Recommended

Baur, E.H., R.B. McNab, L.E. Williams, Jr., V.H. Ramos, J. Radachowsky and M.R. Guariguata. 2012. Multiple forest use through commercial sport hunting: Lessons from a community-based model from the Petén, Guatemala. *Forest Ecology and Management* 268:112-120.

Milner-Gulland, E.J., E.L. Bennett and the SCB 2002 Annual Meeting Wild Meat Group. 2003. Wild meat: the bigger picture. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 18(7):351-357.

Oct 24 Timber management (big and small)

Putz, F.E., P.A. Zuidema, T. Synnott, M. Peña-Claros, M.A. Pinard, D. Sheil, J.K. Vanclay, P. Sist, S. Gourlet-Fleury, B. Griscom, J. Palmer and R. Zagt. 2012. Sustaining conservation values in selectively logged tropical forests: the attained and the attainable. *Conservation Letters* 5(4):296-303.

You are also required to either read:

Humphries, S., T. Holmes, D.F. Carvalho de Andrade, D. McGrath and J. Batista Dantas. 2018. Searching for win-win forest outcomes: Learning-by-doing, financial viability, and income growth for a community-based forest management cooperative in the Brazilian Amazon. *World Development*, in press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.06.005>

or

Ezzine de Blas, D., J.A. Sayer, G. Lescuyer, R. Nasi and A. Karsenty. 2009. External influences on and conditions for community logging management in Camaroon. *World Development* 37 (2): 445-456.

Recommended

Humphries, S., T.P. Holmes, K. Kainer, C.G. Gonçalves Koury, E. Cruz and R. de Miranda Rocha. 2012. Are community-based forest enterprises in the tropics financially viable? Case studies from the Brazilian Amazon. *Ecological Economics* 77:62-73.

Rockwell, C., K.A. Kainer, N. Marcondes, and C. Baraloto. 2007. Ecological limitations of reduced impact logging at the smallholder scale. *Forest Ecology and Management* 238:365-374. ***Available in Portuguese**

Zarin, D.J., M.D. Schulze, E. Vidal, & M. Lentini. 2007. Beyond reaping the first harvest: management objectives for timber production in the Brazilian Amazon. *Conservation Biology* 21(4):916-925.

Clark, C.J., J.R. Poulsen, R. Malonga & P.W. Elkan, Jr. 2009. Logging concessions can extend the conservation estate for Central African tropical forests. *Conservation Biology* 23(5):1281-1293.

Oct 31 Change over time in Acre, Brazil

Cooper, N.A. and K.A. Kainer. 2018. To log or not to log: Local perceptions of timber management and implications for well-being within a sustainable use protected area. *Ecology and Society* 23(2):4. <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-09995-230204>

Vadjuenec, J.M., M. Schmink, and C.V.A. Gomes. 2011. Rubber tapper citizens: emerging places, policies, and shifting rural-urban identities in Acre, Brazil. *Journal of Cultural Geography* 28(1):73-98.

Watling, J., J. Iriarte, F.E. Mayle, D. Schaan, L.C.R. Pessenda, N.J. Loader, F.A. Street-Perrott, R.E. Dickau, A. Damasceno and A. Ranzi. 2017. Impact of pre-Columbian “geoglyph” builders on Amazonian forests. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (PNAS)* 114(8):1868-1873.

Recommended

Kainer, K.A., L.H.O. Wadt and C.L. Staudhammer. *In press*. The evolving role of *Bertholletia excelsa* in Amazonia: contributing to local livelihoods and forest conservation. *Desenvolvimento e Meio Ambiente*.

Rockwell, C.A. and K.A. Kainer. 2015. Local and scientific perspectives on the bamboo-dominated forest in Acre, Brazil: A complementary knowledge base for multiple-use forest management. *International Forestry Review* 17(S1):51-64.

Kainer, K.A., M. Schmink, A.C.P. Leite, and M.J. da Fadell Silva. 2003. Experiments in forest-based development in Western Amazonia. *Society and Natural Resources* 16:869-886. [DOI: 10.1080/716100619](https://doi.org/10.1080/716100619)

Nov 7 The Mexico case
Reforestation for conservation & community well-being

Villavicencio Valdez, G. V., E. N. Hansen and J. Bliss. 2012. Factors impacting marketplace success of community forest enterprises: The case of TIP Muebles, Oaxaca, Mexico. *Small-scale Forestry* 11:339-363.

Valladares-Padua, C., S.M. Padua and L. Cullen, Jr. 2002. Within and surrounding the Morro do Diabo State Park: biological value, conflicts, mitigation and sustainable development alternatives. *Environmental Science & Policy* 5:69-78.

Recommended

Antinori, C. and D.B. Bray. 2005. Community forest enterprises as entrepreneurial firms: economic and institutional perspectives from Mexico. *World Development* 33(9):1529-1543.

Bray, D.B. 2010. Capitalism meets common property. *Americas Quarterly* (Winter):30-35.

Cullen, L., Jr., K. Alger, and D.M. Rambaldi. 2005. Land reform and biodiversity conservation in Brazil in the 1990s: Conflict and articulation of mutual interests. *Conservation Biology* 19(3):747-755.

Uezu, A., D.D. Beyer, and J.P. Metzger. 2008. Can agroforest woodlots work as stepping stones for birds in the Atlantic forest region? *Biodiversity Conservation* 17:1907-1922.

SUPPORTING COLLABORATIVE MANAGEMENT

Nov 14 Partnerships and communities

Menzies, N.K. 2007. Negotiating partnerships, Pages 152-170 (Chapter 9) In: *Our forest, your ecosystem, their timber*, Columbia University Press, New York.

Mishra, C., J.C. Young, M. Fiechter, B. Rutherford and S.M. Redpath. 2017. Building partnerships with communities for biodiversity conservation: lessons from Asian mountains. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 54:1583-1591.

Duchelle, A.E, K. Biedenweg, C. Lucas, A. Virapongse, J. Radachowsky, D. J. Wojcik, M. Londres, W.L. Bartels, D. Alvira and K.A. Kainer. 2009. Graduate students and knowledge exchange with local stakeholders: Possibilities and preparation. *Biotropica* 41:578-585.

Recommended:

Berkes, F. 2007. Community-based conservation in a globalized world. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 104(39):15188-15193.

Klooster, D.J. 2002. Toward adaptive community forest management: Integrating local forest knowledge with scientific forestry. *Economic Geography* 78(1):43-70.

Ros-Tonen, M.A.F., T. van Andel, C. Morsello, K. Otsuki, S. Rosendo, and I. Scholz. 2008. Forest-related partnerships in Brazilian Amazonia: There is more to sustainable forest management than reduced impact logging. *Forest Ecology and Management* 256:1482-1497.

Menton, M.C.S., F. D. Merry, A. Lawrence and N. Brown. 2009. Company-community logging contracts in Amazonian settlements: Impacts on livelihoods and NTFP harvests. *Ecology and Society* 14(1):39. [online] URL: <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol14/iss1/art39/>

Nov 21 **NO CLASS** – Thanksgiving holiday

Nov 28 **Collaborations and research on the ground**

Toomey, A.H. 2016. What happens at the gap between knowledge and practice? Spaces of encounter and misencounter between environmental scientists and local people. *Ecology and Society* 21(2):28. [online] URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5751/ES-08409-210228>

Ochocka, J., E. Moorlag and R. Janzen. 2010. A framework for community entry: PAR values and engagement strategies in community research. *International Journal of Community Research and Engagement* 3:1-19.

Kainer, K.A., M.L. DiGiano, A.E. Duchelle, L.H.O. Wadt, E. Bruna, and J. Dain. 2009. Partnering for greater success: Local stakeholders and research in tropical biology and conservation. *Biotropica* 41:555-562.

Recommended:

Alexiades, M.N., C.M. Peters, S.A. Laird, C. López Binnqüist, and P. Negreros-Castillo. 2013. The missing skill set in community management of tropical forests. *Conservation Biology* 27(3):635-637.

Kainer, K.A., M. Schmink, H. Covert, J.R. Stepp, E.M. Bruna, J.L. Dain, S. Espinosa and S. Humphries. 2006. A graduate education framework for tropical conservation and development. *Conservation Biology* 20(1):3-13.

Manolis, J.C., K.M. Chan, M.E. Finkelstein, S. Stephens, C.R. Nelson, J.B. Grant, and M.P. Dombeck. 2009. Leadership: a new frontier in conservation science. *Conservation Biology* 23:879-886.

Dec 5 **Course wrap-up and evaluation**

1998 Video: Good Wood (44 minutes). Produced by David Springbett and Heather MacAndrew. Directed by David Springbett. View at: <http://vimeo.com/17580366>

Re-read your reflection paper on Conservation and human well-being.

Recommended:

Roe, D., D. Thomas, J. Smith, M. Walpole, and J. Elliott. 2011. Biodiversity and poverty: Ten frequently asked questions – ten policy implications. Gatekeeper 150. IIED (International Institute for Environment and Development), London.

2013 Video. Asociación de comunidades forestales de Petén (ACOFOP) (8 minutes). Produced by Alianza Mesoamericana de los pueblos y bosques. View at: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KRkXTxRWChM>

Radachowsky, J, V.H. Ramos, R. McNab, E.H. Baur, and N. Kazadov. 2012. Forest concessions in the Maya Biosphere Reserve, Guatemala: A decade later. *Forest Ecology and Management* 268:18-28.

Baynes, J. J. Herbohn, C. Smith, R. Fisher and D. Bray. 2015. Key factors which influence the success of community forestry in developing countries. *Global Environmental Change* 35:226-238.

Course Resources! (other readings)

Schwartz, M.A. 2008. The importance of stupidity in scientific research. *Journal of Cell Science* 121:1771.

Sunderlin, W., J. Hatcher, and M. Little. 2008. From exclusion to ownership? Challenges and opportunities in advancing forest tenure reform. Rights and Resources Initiative, Washington, DC.

White, A. and A. Martin. 2002. Who owns the world's forests? Forest tenure and public forests in transition. Forest Trends, Washington, DC.

Moon, K. and D. Blackman. 2014. A guide to understanding social science research for natural scientists. *Conservation Biology* 28(5):1167-1177.

Nair, P.K.R. 2005. How (not) to write research papers in agroforestry. *Agroforestry Systems* 64:v-xvi.

British Ecological Society. 2013. A guide to peer review in ecology and evolution. British Ecological Society, London. Available at: <http://www.britishecologicalsociety.org/wp-content/uploads/Publication/Peer-Review-Booklet.pdf>

Olsson, L., A. Jerneck, H. Thoren, J. Persson, and D. O'Byrne. 2015. Why resilience is unappealing to social science: Theoretical and empirical investigations of the scientific use of resilience. *Science Advances* 1:e1400217.

Anderson, C.B., A. Monjeau and J.R. Rau. 2015. Knowledge Dialogue to attain global scientific excellence and broader social relevance. *BioScience* 65(7):709-717.

ASSIGNMENT: Readings comments

Each week (each module), you will prepare for class by accessing some of the best thinking on the topic at hand. I have carefully selected key readings that are required, and additional readings (noted as "Recommended") that might be helpful to you as you prepare proposals and manuscripts or...are just curious to hear more perspectives. The rationale behind this assignment is to provide us with insights of

individual perspectives prior to class, better incorporate what others have to say on the topic at hand, and begin class dialogue.

While you are **required to do the readings for each of the 14 class periods**, you are free to choose whichever 13 of 14 classes you wish for posting comments that flow from those readings. I do not want a summary or abstract of each of the readings or a formalized, well-thought out rebuttal of the authors' arguments. Rather, I expect you to share with the class some of your thoughts that were stimulated by the readings. What did the readings mean to you? Do you buy the author's thesis? Why? Did the readings stimulate you to reflect on a past experience? How? I have purposefully chosen a more informal group discussion format so that students feel freer to express their basic, gut reactions to the readings. Each student should post his or her comments by 2:00 am the Wednesday of class. That's 2:00 in the morning before each session!

Comments will be posted in the Discussion section of Canvas. Click on the course Community Forest Management. Go to "Discussion" listed in the left hand column, and then click on the topic for the week. For example, by Wednesday at 2:00 am, you are required to post your comments in the following forum "Aug 29: Conservation, development, and the role of CFM". Others in the class will then be able to read your comments and add theirs. The length of comments is not fixed, but should range from two to four paragraphs. The sum of these comments is worth 20% of your grade.

ASSIGNMENT: Reflection Paper on conservation and human well-being

The reflection paper will be read by me only. Please prepare a 2- to 3-page (single-spaced) paper that reflects your thoughts on the questions below. It is **due Monday, August 27 at 2:00 am** to give me time to read the essays prior to Wednesday's class; please send me an electronic copy via Canvas. You may read the assigned readings for that Wednesday's class (or anything else for that matter) before developing your essay, but this assignment is not a synopsis of the conservation-development debate, but rather, a personal reflection. As such, citations are allowed, but not necessary nor expected. It is worth 10% of your grade.

- (1) As you think about the relationship between biodiversity conservation and human well-being, which one do you think should be prioritized? Do you see this as a dichotomy with significant tradeoffs? Or as issues that can be reconciled?
- (2) Do you personally prioritize one over the other in your work (e.g., chosen profession or jobs held) or personal life (e.g., how you choose to use your purchasing power, donate your time or money)? Please provide examples.
- (3) How do you think you developed this philosophical bent? What in your past, for example, might have steered you more toward one direction or the other?

ASSIGNMENTS: Research paper & Peer reviews

Each student will write a research proposal or analytical paper related to the themes of the course, to be developed over the semester. The intent is to offer an opportunity for students to develop a paper that

can be helpful to their careers or is a necessary part of their graduate program. If you are in the proposal-writing phase, then this paper may be your research proposal, or some portion of it.

WARNING: Do not simply present a proposal you have no intention of carrying out. In my experience, this leads to a poorly researched, shallow product.

If you have already carried out your graduate fieldwork, then you may consider preparing an article or chapter for your thesis/dissertation. Alternatively, you could select a hypothesis(es), premise(s) or question(s) related to CFM and analyze pertinent supporting *and* refuting evidence/data. Or, you could analyze the state of CFM in your home country or expected country of research. In all cases, you are expected to use course concepts and literature. You should focus on peer-reviewed literature, but certainly some gray literature may also be important to include. Students are encouraged to discuss their ideas with me to get approval for their plan. USE SPELL CHECK AND GRAMMAR CHECK FOR ALL VERSIONS!

The research paper will be developed in steps. A *preliminary title* and 3- to 4-sentence content description will be turned in via Canvas on **September 12**. This preliminary title is NOT graded. The purpose is twofold: (1) to encourage students to begin more focused thinking on the content of their paper, and (2) to provide information to me for forming research paper peer groups. Use Word for this and all submissions.

Preliminary statement

By **September 26**, all students will submit a *preliminary statement (1- to 2- single-spaced pages) and an accompanying bibliography*. This statement should convey main ideas you intend to pursue in your proposal/paper, including data you intend to collect and/or analyses you foresee carrying out. The bibliography should demonstrate that you have identified sufficient material to write on this topic (even though you may not have read all sources yet). ***At the beginning of your statement, please record the following:*** Title of document, advisor and department, if pursuing an M.S. or Ph.D., if paper is a proposal or analytical paper, and 8-10 keywords. This statement/bibliography is worth 10% of your final grade, and will be submitted via Canvas in Word. I will provide feedback to each student.

Peer review I

In addition, each student will be grouped with 2 to 4 other students who will also receive an electronic copy of your statement (please send to them via email). Due **October 3**, each student within the group will also provide a written peer review (*Peer review I*) of each student's preliminary statement and bibliography within their group. In other words, you will be reviewing the preliminary statements of 2 to 4 students, and they in turn, will be reviewing yours. Please email a copy of the corresponding peer review to each student you reviewed. Also, upload copies (best if can join into one file) of your reviews into Canvas where I can also view them. These reviews are worth 10% of your total grade.

I expect that reviews will include changes directly on the preliminary statement (using the Track Changes feature, for example). I also expect helpful suggestions/comments, likely through a separate series of paragraphs or using the Comments feature under "Review". These comments should include reiterating what you understand as the main aim of the paper, gaps in logic and flow, and perhaps additional bibliographic suggestions.

Please read through the following attached guidelines for some review suggestions before you begin, especially Best Practices (p 14-20) and Ethics in Peer Review (p 23-25):

British Ecological Society. 2013. A guide to peer review in ecology and evolution. British Ecological Society, London. Available at: http://www.britishecologicalsociety.org/wp-content/uploads/Publ_Peer-Review-Booklet.pdf

Draft

Students will now prepare a complete draft of the proposal or paper; these *drafts are required, but not graded*. Please upload one copy via Canvas by **November 7**, and I will provide written feedback. Similarly, please submit one copy for feedback to one of your original peer group members, as assigned by Dr. Kainer. *This is your final opportunity to get critical feedback to improve your paper!*

Peer review II

Please conduct *Peer review II* for one peer in your group. Upload a copy of your review by **November 14** via Canvas for my review. Also, please return a copy of your review directly to the peer whose paper you reviewed. This review is worth 10% of your total grade.

I expect that reviews will include changes directly on the preliminary statement (using Track Changes, for example), coupled with helpful suggestions/comments, likely through a separate series of paragraphs or using the Comments feature of Track Changes. These might include reiterating what you understand as the main aim of the paper, gaps in logic and flow, additional bibliographic suggestions, etc...

It might be helpful to revisit the following attached guidelines before you begin - just as a reminder: British Ecological Society. 2013. A guide to peer review in ecology and evolution. British Ecological Society, London. Available at: http://www.britishecologicalsociety.org/wp-content/uploads/Publ_Peer-Review-Booklet.pdf

This final peer review is worth 10% of your grade and is due on **November 14**.

Lightening presentation

On **November 28**, you will give a 3-minute (3 minutes! No more!!!) lightening presentation on your research paper. You will clearly need to focus on key points and practice, practice because slides are only visible for a short period of time and any text used must be short and to the point. The idea is to provide an opportunity for everyone to have an idea of what everyone else is working on. It also provides an opportunity for feedback from the entire group. Please upload your PowerPoint slides (if you intend to use PowerPoint – not a requirement, but visuals of some sort are VERY helpful) to Canvas by 8:00 am on November 28. These oral presentations are worth 5% of your grade.

Please read the following “Giving Lightening Talks”
<http://www.perl.com/pub/2004/07/30/lightningtalk.html>

Final paper

Finally, students will turn an electronic copy of their *final paper* by **December 5** (last day of class). The length of the paper should be between 8-10 single-spaced pages, excluding tables, figures and

bibliography. The final version is worth 25% of your grade, and will be evaluated using the following criteria:

Criteria	A successful final paper will:	Score
Research question/problem	Clearly identify and discuss a significant research question or questions	5
Conceptual & theoretical clarity	Present and apply a clear conceptual framework – integrate relevant literature	5
Methods & analysis	Articulate a coherent proposal for research design and methods to address the problem OR methods & analysis already conducted and articulated	5
Writing and organization	Use correct punctuation and grammar, and structure paper in a logical flow of ideas and sections	5
Relevance	Connect the analysis and conclusions to issues relevant to community-based resource management as discussed in the course	5

I will not provide feedback on this final version, except for a numeric grade.

UF Helping Resources

- [UF Writing Studio](#) The Writing Studio is a free service for current UF students. Students have the opportunity to work one-on-one with a consultant (up to 30 minutes, twice a week) on issues specific to their own particular writing needs and development. They assist students to become better proofreaders and editors of their own work.
- [Counseling and Wellness Center](#) Students experiencing crises or personal problems that interfere with general wellbeing are encouraged to utilize the university's counseling resources. Confidential counseling services are available at no cost for enrolled students. Resources are also available for students seeking to clarify career and academic goals and to deal with academic challenges.

UF Policies

- **Students with Disabilities Act:** The Dean of Students Office coordinates needed accommodations of students with disabilities. This includes the registration of disabilities, academic accommodations within the classroom, accessing special adaptive computer equipment, providing interpretation services, and mediating faculty-student disability related issues. *Dean of Students Office, 202 Peabody Hall, 392-7066.*
- **Software Use:** All faculty, staff, and students of the University are required and expected to obey the laws and legal agreements governing software use. Failure to do so can lead to monetary damages and/or criminal penalties for the individual violator.
- **Academic Misconduct:** Academic honesty and integrity are fundamental values of the University community. Work submitted for credit by UF students should not include any form of plagiarism, cheating or unauthorized aid. Unless an assignment is explicitly identified as collaborative, all work should be completed independently. Students should understand and follow the [Student Honor Code](#) that they signed upon enrollment at the University of Florida: *“I understand the University of Florida expects its students to be honest in all their academic work. I agree to adhere to this commitment to academic honesty and understand that my failure to comply with this commitment may result in disciplinary action up to and including expulsion from the University.”*