

COMMUNITY FOREST MANAGEMENT

Fall 2024

Friday, Periods 3-5 (9:35 – 12:35)

Course numbers: FOR 6628/LAS 6290

Format: face-to-face

Course credits: 3

Instructor: Dr. Karen A. Kainer

kkainer@ufl.edu

846-0833

210 Newins-Ziegler

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

Course readings:

Select articles and book chapters: See readings list.

Course description:

Natural resource management by communities has gained currency as a potentially viable strategy for conserving forest ecosystems, while supporting local livelihoods and cultural values. This 3-credit graduate course considers how governments, researchers, and practitioners (especially graduate students) collaborate with communities in these efforts. It analyzes the conceptual underpinnings, efficacy, and practice of this growing global trend of community-based natural resource management. The course is designed **for students from diverse disciplines** (forestry, anthropology, regional studies, fisheries, wildlife, biology, interdisciplinary studies, sociology, geography, plus....) **and different levels of expertise** to think critically, jointly, about the multi-scale, contextual factors that influence conservation and well-being outcomes. It is especially designed for graduate students who seek **concepts, tools, and strategies to integrate co-knowledge production** into their work. A variety of teaching methods will be employed with an **emphasis on experiential and cross-student learning**. This course fulfills the conceptual core requirement of UF's TCD certificate.

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.
- Thought through some options for working with partners (especially communities) in their graduate programs.

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
Final submission	25%	77 – 79% = C+
Peer review I (prelim statements & biblio)	10%	70 – 76% = C
Peer review II (research paper draft)	10%	60 – 69% = D
Knowledge exchange document	5%	< 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 = 7.7% of the course; two = 15.3%; and 3 = is almost a 1/4 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 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 23	Getting to know each other and the course	
Aug 28 - <i>This is Wednesday!</i>		<i>reflection paper</i>
Aug 30	Conservation, development, and the role of CFM	
Sep 6	Ecology behind CFM and resource harvesting	
Sep 13	TEK & other assets	<i>draft title & brief description</i>
Sep 20	Political ecology	
Sep 27	Forest rights and governance	<i>prelim statement & biblio</i>
SUPPORTING COLLABORATIVE MANAGEMENT		
Oct 4	Participatory research with communities <i>Case study: Fire in the Peruvian highlands</i>	<i>peer review I</i>
Oct 11	Gender and knowledge exchange <i>Case study: Mangrove restoration in Costa Rica</i>	
Oct 18	NO CLASS (Homecoming)	
Oct 25	TBD	
Nov 1	Collaborative (or co-) management <i>Case study: Communities and wildlife in Guyana</i>	
Nov 8	Research partnerships <i>Case studies: Brazilian sust use reserves & Mexican ejidos</i>	<i>draft research paper (no grade)</i>
Nov 15	Your graduate research and collaborative spaces	<i>peer review II</i>
Nov 22	Course wrap up and evaluation	<i>knowledge exchange document</i>
Nov 29	NO CLASS (Thanksgiving holiday)	
Dec 4		<i>final research paper</i>

***Electronically posted comments are due on Wednesday night before each class.**

Course e-Learning (Canvas)

We will be using UF's Canvas system (or e-Learning) to facilitate course communication, to access readings, and to submit assignments. 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 SFFGS (School of Forest, Fisheries, and Geomatic Sciences). 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 30 will be tagged "Aug 30: Conservation, development...CFM".

SETTING THE CONCEPTUAL STAGE

Aug 23 Getting to know each other and the course

No readings

Aug 30 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.

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.

Recommended

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

Kohler, F. and E.S. Brondizio. 2016. Considering the needs of indigenous and local populations in conservation programs. *Conservation Biology* 31(2):245-251. DOI: 10.1111/cobi.12843

Hajjar, R., Oldekop, J. A., Cronkleton, P., Newton, P., Russell, A. J. M., & Zhou, W. 2021. A global analysis of the social and environmental outcomes of community forests. *Nature Sustainability*, 4, 216–224. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41893-020-00633-y>

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/>

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.

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.

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

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.

Gavin, M.C., J. McCarter, F. Berkes, A. Mead, J.R. Stepp, D. Peterson and R. Tang. 2015. Defining biocultural approaches to conservation. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 30(3): 140-145.

Garnett et al. 2018. A spatial overview of the global importance of Indigenous lands for conservation. *Nature Sustainability* 1:369-374.

Sep 6 Ecology behind CFM

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.

Tickin, 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.

McCann, K.S. 2000. The diversity-stability debate. *Nature* 405:228-233.

Sep 13 **TEK & other assets**

Campbell, J., C. Jarrett, A. Wali, A. Rosenthal, D. Alvira, A. Lemos, M. Longoni, A. Winter and L. Lopez. 2023. Centering communities in conservation through asset-based Quality of Life planning. *Conservation and Society* 21(1):48-60.

**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/>

Please also peruse the following on the Legacy website:

- a) [Legado's radical approach](#)
- b) [The Power of Legacy](#)
- c) [Short video](#)

Recommended

Community assets & capitals

Molnár, Zs. And D. Babai. 2021. Inviting ecologist to delve deeper into traditional ecological knowledge. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 36 (8):679-690. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2021.04.006>

Sierra-Huelsz, J.A., P. Gerez Fernández, C. López Binnqüist, L. Guibrinet and E.A. Ellis. 2020. Traditional ecological knowledge in community forest management: Evolution and limitations in Mexican forest law, policy and practice. *Forests* 11(4), 403 <https://doi.org/10.3390/f11040403>

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>

Emery, M., & Flora, C. 2006. Spiraling-up: Mapping community transformation with community capitals framework. *Community Development*, 37(1):19-35.

Well-being

Biedenweg, K., & Gross-Camp, N. D. 2018. A brave new world: integrating well-being and conservation. *Ecology and Society*, 23(2):32. <https://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol23/iss2/art32/>
This paper introduces a series of thoughtful papers centered on the concept of well-being.

McGregor, A., S. Coulthard and L. Camfield. 2015. Measuring what matters: The role of well-being methods in development policy and practice. Project Note 04. Overseas Development Institute (ODI), London.

Klúvanková, T., S. Brnkaľáková, M. Špaček, B. Slee, M. Nijnik, D. Valero, D. Miller, R. Bryce, M. Kozová, N. Polman, T. Szabo, and V. Gežík. 2018. Understanding social innovation for the well-being of forest-dependent communities: A preliminary theoretical framework. *Forest Policy and Economics* 97:163-174. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2018.09.016>

Gough, I., & McGregor, J. A. (Eds.). (2007). Wellbeing in developing countries: from theory to research. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Sep 20 Political ecology

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.

Vandergeest, P. and N.L. Peluso. 2015. Political Forest. In: R. L. Bryant (Ed.), The International Handbook of Political Ecology (pp. 162–175). Edward Elgar Publishing.

Oxfam. 2021. Quick guide to power analysis. Oxfam, UK.

Recommended:

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.

Explicit research application of political ecology

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

Power

Boonstra, W.J., 2016. Conceptualizing power to study social-ecological interactions. Ecol. Soc. 21. <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-07966-210121>

Raik, D.B., A.L. Wilson and D.J. Decker. 2008. Power in Natural Resource Management: An application of theory. Society and Natural Resources 21:729-739. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920801905195>

Gaventa, J., 2006. Finding the Spaces for Changes: A Power Analysis. Inst. Dev. Stud. Bull. 37, 23–33. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1759-5436.2006.tb00320.x>

Sep 27 Forest rights and forest governance

Larson, A.M. et al. 2021. Hot topics in governance for forests and trees: Towards a (just) transformative research agenda. Forest Economics and Policy 131:012567. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2021.102567>

Salomon AK et al. 2023 Disrupting and diversifying the values, voices and governance principles that shape biodiversity science and management. Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B 378: 20220196. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2022.0196>

Recommended:

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

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

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.

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.

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.

Gynch, S. S. Lawry, R. McLain, I. Monterroso, & A. Adhikary. 2020. Is community tenure facilitating investment in the commons for inclusive and sustainable development? *Forest Policy and Economics*, 111, 102088.

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.

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.

SUPPORTING COLLABORATIVE MANAGEMENT

Oct 4 Participatory research with communities

Case study: Living with fire in the Peruvian highlands

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.

Luna-Celino, V. and K.A. Kainer. Submitted. Living with fire: agricultural burns by Quechua farmers in the Peruvian Andes. *Human Ecology*.

Daeli, W., R. Carmenta, M.C. Monroe and A. Adams. 2021. Where policy and culture collide: Perceptions and responses of swidden farmers to the burn ban in West Kalimantan, Indonesia. *Human Ecology* 49:159-170.

Recommended

Participatory approaches and methods

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

Reed, M.G. J.P. Robson, M. Campos River, F. Chapela, I. Davidson-Hunt, P. Friedrichsen, E. Haine, A.B. Dreaver Johnston, G. Lichtenstein, L.S. Lynes, M. Oloko, M. Sánchez Luja, S. Shackleton, M. Soriano, F. Sosa Pérez and L. Vasseur. 2023. Guiding principles for transdisciplinary sustainability research and practice. *People and Nature* 00:1-16.

Mishra, C., J. C. Young, M. Fiechter, B. Rutherford & S. M. Redpath. 2017. Building partnerships with communities for biodiversity conservation: lessons from Asian mountains. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 54, 1583–1591. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12918>

Krystalli, R., E. Hoffecker, K. Leith & K. Wilson. 2021. Taking the research experience seriously: A framework for reflexive applied research in development. *Global Studies Quarterly* (2021) 1, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1093/isagsq/ksab022>

Arnold, J. S., & M.E. Fernandez-Gimenez. 2010. Engaging communities through participatory research. In *Forest Community Connections* (pp. 78-100). Routledge. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781936331451-6/engaging-communities-participatory-research-jennifer-arnold-maria-fernandez-gimenez?context=ubx>

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.

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/>

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.

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.

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. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08941920701337887>

Cronkleton, P., M.A. Albornoz, G. Barnes, K. Evans and W. de Jong. 2010. Social geomatics: Participatory forest mapping to mediate resource conflict in the Bolivian Amazon. *Human Ecology* 38:65-76. DOI 10.1007/s10745-009-9296-4

Brunet, N. M., Hickey, G. M., & Humphries, M. M. (2014). Understanding community-researcher partnerships in the natural sciences: A case study from the Arctic. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 36, 247–261. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2014.09.001>

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/>

Athayde, S.F. de., G.M. da Silva, J. Kaiabi, H.R. de Souza, K. Ono, and E.M. Bruna. 2006. Participatory research and management of arumã (*Ischnosiphon gracilis* [Rudge] Köern., Marantaceae) by the Kaiabi people in the Brazilian Amazon. *Journal of Ethnobiology* 26(1):36-59.

Oct 11 Gender and knowledge exchange

Case study: Mangrove restoration in Costa Rica

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. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-7429.2009.00563.x>

Please read one of the following **gender papers**:

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

Colfer, C. J. P., B. Sijapati Basnett, and M. Ihalainen. 2018. Making Sense of 'intersectionality': A Manual for Lovers of People and Forests: Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), Bogor, Indonesia.

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

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)

Schmink, M. and M. Arteaga Gómez-Garcia. 2015. Under the canopy: Gender and forests in Amazonia. CIFOR Occasional Paper 121. CIFOR (Center for International Forestry Research).

Coleman, E.A., Mwangi, E., 2013. Women's participation in forest management: A cross-country analysis. *Global Environmental Change* 23, 193–205. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2012.10.005>

Galiè, A., Farnworth, C.R., 2019. Power through: A new concept in the empowerment discourse. *Global Food Security* 21, 13–17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfs.2019.07.001>

Violato Espada, A.L. and K.A. Kainer. 2023. Women and timber management: From assigned cook to strategic decision-maker of community land use. *Land Use Policy* 127:106560. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2023.106560>

Rocheleau, D., B. Thomas-Slayter, and D. Edmunds. 1995. Gendered resource mapping: Focusing on women's spaces in the landscape. *Cultural Survival Quarterly*, Winter: 62-68.

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.

Recommended

Mangroves

Friess, D.A., K. Rogers, C.E. Lovelock, K.W. Krauss, S.E. Hamilton, S.Y. Lee, R. Lucas, J. Primavera, A. Rajaran and S. Shi. 2019. The state of the world's mangrove forests: Past, present, and future. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*. 44:89-115.

Cormier-Salem, Marie-Christine. 2020. Let the Women Harvest the Mangrove. *Carbon Policy, and Environmental Injustice*. Sustainability 9 (8). doi:10.3390/su9081485.

Oct 25 TBD

**Nov 1 Collaborative (or co-management)
Case study: Communities and wildlife in Guyana**

Berkes, F. 2009. Evolution of co-management: Role of knowledge generation, bridging organizations and social learning. *Journal of Environmental Management* 90:1692-1702.

Hallett, M.T., A.A. Kinahan, R. McGregor, T. Baggallay, T. Babb, H. Barnabus, A. Wilson, F.M. Li, W.W. Boone, and B. Bankovich. 2019. Impact of low-intensity hunting on game species in and around the Kanaku Mountains Protected Area, Guyana. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution* 7:412.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2019.00412>

Recommended

Wildlife

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/>

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.

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.

Soliku, O. and U. Schrami. 2020. Protected areas management: A comparison of perceived outcomes associated with different co-management types. *Forest Policy and Economics* 118: 102256.

Albornoz, C. and J. Glückler. 2020. Co-management of small-scale fisheries in Chile from a network governance perspective. *Environments* 7, 104.

Diver, S. 2016. Co-management as a Catalyst: Pathways to Post-colonial Forestry in the Klamath Basin, California. *Human Ecology*, 44(5), 533–546. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10745-016-9851-8>.

Nov 8

Research partnerships

Case studies: Brazilian sustainable use reserves & Mexican ejidos

Perry, M., J. Sharp, K. Aanyu, J. Robinson, V. Duclos, and R. Ferdous. 2022. Research partnerships across international contexts: a practice of unity or plurality? *Development in Practice* 32 (5):635-646.

Humphries, S., K.A. Kainer, D. Rodriguez-Ward, A.L. Violato Espada, T.P. Holmes, P. Blanco Reyes, J. da Silva Santos, and M.M. Ribeiro da Silva. 2022. Pathways to community timber production: A comparative analysis of two well-established community-based forest enterprises in Mexico and Brazil.

Pages 65-87, *In*: Bulkan, J, J. Palmer, A.M. Larson and M. Hobley (eds.), Routledge Handbook of Community Forestry, Routledge, London.

Recommended

Partelow, S., Glaser, M., Solano Arce, S., Sá Leitão Barboza, R., & Schlüter, A. 2018. Mangroves, fishers, and the struggle for adaptive comanagement: Applying the social-ecological systems framework to a marine extractive reserve (Resex) in Brazil. *Ecology and Society*, 23(3). <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-10269-230319>

Partnerships (vs Helicopter Science)

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.

**See the following critique of the term “stakeholder” by Mark Reed: [Alternatives to the word ‘stakeholder’ \(fasttrackimpact.com\)](#)

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

Reed, M. J., Stringer, L. C., Fazey, I., Evely, A., & Kruijsen, J. (2014). Five principles for the practice of knowledge exchange in environmental management. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 146, 337–345. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2014.07.021>

Ramírez-Castañeda, V., E. Westeen...R.D. Tarvin. A set of principles and practical suggestions for equitable fieldwork in biology. 2022. *PNAS*: 119 (34): e2122667119 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2122667119>

Haelewaters, D., Hofmann, T. A., & Romero-Olivares, A. L. (2021). Ten simple rules for Global North researchers to stop perpetuating helicopter research in the Global South. *PLoS Computational Biology*, 17(8), e1009277. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1009277>

Ford, J.K., S. J. Riley, T. K. Lauricella, & J. A. Van Fossen. 2020. Factors Affecting Trust Among Natural Resources Stakeholders, Partners, and Strategic Alliance Members: A Meta-Analytic Investigation. *Frontiers in Communication* 5:9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2020.00009>

Crane, J. (2020). Dreaming partnership, enabling inequality: Administrative infrastructure in global health science. *Africa*, 90(1), 188-208. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0001972019001001>

Gavin, M. C., J. McCarter, F. Berkes, A.T.P. Mead, E. Sterling, R. Tang and N.J. Turner. 2018. Effective biodiversity conservation requires dynamic, pluralistic, partnership-based approaches. *Sustainability* 10(6): 1846.

White, R.M., B. Schmook, S. Calmé...J.L. Peña-Mondragón. 2023. Facilitating biodiversity conservation through partnerships to achieve transformative outcomes. *Conservation Biology*. 2023;e14057. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.14057>

Sustainable resource use - Mexico

Hajjar, Kozak and Innes. 2021. Is decentralization leading to 'real' decision-making power for forest-dependent communities? Case studies from Mexico and Brazil. *Ecology and Society* 17(1): 12.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.5751/ES-04570-170112>

Merino-Perez, L. 2013. Conservation and forest communities in Mexico: Experiences, visions, and rights (Chapter 3). Pages 25-44, In Porter-Bolland, L, I. Ruiz-Mallén, C. Camacho-Benavides and S.R. McCandless (eds.). *Community Action for Conservation: Mexican Experiences*. Springer, New York.

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.

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.

Ellis, E.A. and L. Porter-Bolland. 2008. Is community-based forest management more effective than protected areas? A comparison of land use/land cover change in two neighboring study areas of the Central Yucatan Peninsula, Mexico. *Forest Ecology and Management* 256:1971-1983.

Timber management

Edwards, D.P., J.A. Tobias, D. Sheil, E. Meijaard, and W.F. Laurance. 2014. Maintaining ecosystem function and services in logged tropical forests. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 29(9):511-520.

Humphries, S., T. Holmes, D.F. Carvalho de Andrade, D. McGrath and J. Batista Dantas. 2020. 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* 125:104336 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.06.005>

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.

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>

NTFPs

Shackleton, S. C.O. Delang and A. Angelsen. 2011. From subsistence to safety nets and cash income: Exploring the diverse values of non-timber forest products for livelihoods and poverty alleviation. Pages 55-81 (Chapter 3), In: Shackleton, S., C. Shackleton, and P. Shanley (eds.) *Non-Timber Forest Products in the Global Context*, Tropical Forestry vol 7, Springer-Verlag, Berlin. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-17983-9_3

Wadt, L.H.O., K.A. Kainer, C.L. Staudhammer, and R.O.P. Serrano. 2008. Sustainable forest use in Brazilian extractive reserves: Natural regeneration of Brazil nut in exploited populations. *Biological Conservation* 141:332-346. DOI: [10.1016/j.biocon.2007.10.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2007.10.007)

Kainer, K.A., L.H.O. Wadt and C.L. Staudhammer. 2018. The evolving role of *Bertholletia excelsa* in Amazonia: contributing to local livelihoods and forest conservation. *Desenvolvimento e Meio Ambiente* 48:477-497. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5380/dma.v48i0.58972>

Nov 15 Graduate research and collaborative spaces

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>

Nov 22 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.

Course Resources! (other readings)

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

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

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.

Bernard, H.R. 2011. [Research Methods in Anthropology](#): Qualitative and quantitative approaches. AltaMira Press. Plymouth, UK.

Biggs, R., A. de Vos, R. Preiser, H. Clements, K. Maciejewski, and M. Schlüter (eds.). 2022. *The Routledge Handbook of Research Methods for Social-Ecological Systems*. Routledge, NY.

Schimmel, J. 2012. *Writing Science: How to write papers that get cited and proposals that get funded*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Glasman-Deal, H. 2010. *Science research writing: For non-native speakers of English*. Imperial College Press, London.

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/Publ_Peer-Review-Booklet.pdf

IPBES (2019), Global assessment report of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, Brondízio, E. S., Settele, J., Díaz, S., Ngo, H. T. (eds). IPBES secretariat, Bonn, Germany. 1144 pages. [202206 IPBES GLOBAL REPORT FULL DIGITAL MARCH 2022.pdf](#)

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.

ASSIGNMENT: Readings comments

Each week, 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 and stimulate dialogue prior to each class.

You must read all required readings every week. You also are **required to post comments on the required readings for 10 (of 12 possible) class periods**. I do not want a summary or abstract 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 arguments? Why or why not? 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 insights. Each student should post his or her comments by Wednesday night so that I can integrate them into the Friday 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, Aug 28, you are required to post your comments in the following forum "Aug 30: 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 1000-1500 words (single-spaced) paper that reflects your thoughts on the questions below. This assignment is not an academic paper. It is not a synopsis of the conservation-development debate, but rather, a personal reflection. It is **due Wednesday, August 28** to give me time to read the essays prior to Friday's class. Please upload a copy on Canvas and worth 10% of your grade.

- (1) Do you think biodiversity conservation and human well-being can both be attained? Do you see this as a dichotomy with significant tradeoffs? Or as issues that can be reconciled? Should one be prioritized over another?
- (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) What has led you to feel the way you do? To come to the conclusions you have reached? Have you had experiences or an upbringing, for example, that 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 at least some of the themes of the course, to be developed over the semester. The intent is to offer an opportunity 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. 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 ***draft title*** and 3 to 4 bullets that describe the paper content will be turned in via Canvas on **September 13**. 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 & bibliography

By **September 27**, all students will submit a ***preliminary statement (of 500-1000 words) 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). **Please highlight in yellow** the bibliographic sources that come from the CFM syllabus. ***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 3 other students for peer reviews. Your review peers will receive an electronic copy of your preliminary statement (please upload to [Preliminary statement & bibliography](#)) and you will receive theirs. Due **October 4**, you will provide a written peer review (*Peer review I*) of each (of 2 to 3) preliminary statements. In other words, you will be reviewing the preliminary statements of 2 to 3 students, and they in turn, will be reviewing yours.

The 'Best Practices' section (pages 14-19) of the following guide provides some nice guiding questions: 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/Public_Peer-Review-Booklet.pdf ([Links to an external site.](#))

Getting started.

- Please approach this peer review as a reader, not an evaluator.
- Be constructive, through, and thoughtful.. Be encouraging.
- Your objective is to help your peers:
 - a) more clearly articulate what they hope to accomplish and
 - b) to write for a wide audience.
- Please read the paper from start to finish to give you an overview of what the paper is trying to achieve.
- Provide both 1) Overview comments and 2) Detailed comments to each of your peers.

1) Overview comments. Your responses to the following questions will provide the content for a paragraph or two of overview comments.

- Please reiterate what you understand is the main aim of the paper.
- Does this preliminary statement convey a clear and valid motivation for pursuing the research (if a proposal) or writing up the research findings (if for an analytical paper)?
- Does the preliminary statement follow logically from prior knowledge? Is it timely?
- Are the preliminary research questions clear?
- Does the author seem to have the data necessary (for an analytical paper) or seem to know how to access the literatures and/or methods needed (for a proposal) to pursue the questions?
- Does the bibliography seem to target the right literatures (relevant recent and past research) to pursue the research? Do you have additional bibliographic suggestions?
- Does the title reflect the contents? Is it engaging?

2) Detailed comments. Using Comments within Track Changes, please also provide more detailed comments about sentences, phrasing or ideas within the text of the preliminary statement. You may also possibly provide editorial (grammar, spelling) suggestions directly on the preliminary statement.

You will need to do the 2 following tasks on Canvas to successfully complete this assignment:

- 1) Go to Peer Reviews in the original assignment and upload a copy of the corresponding peer review to each student in your peer review cohort as a file attachment in comments. Only upload to each student in your cohort your review of their particular paper. **Note:** The link to your peer reviews will not be available until your own assignment has been submitted.
- 2) Upload copies (please join them into one file) of your reviews into this assignment **Peer Review I** in Canvas where I can also view them and give feedback.

These reviews are worth 10% of your total grade. If you have any difficulty, post to [Technical Support](#).

Draft

Students will prepare a complete draft of the proposal or paper; these ***drafts are required, but not graded***. Please review the grading criteria for the final paper (see Table below) so that you are clearly aware of what is expected. **Please highlight in yellow** the bibliographic sources that come from the CFM syllabus. Please upload one copy via Canvas by **November 8** at the latest, and I will provide written feedback. Similarly, please submit one copy for feedback to one of your original peer group members, as assigned by me. *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 (Please see the end of these instructions to learn whose paper you review and vice versa). Upload a copy of your review here via Canvas for my review. This second peer review is worth 10% of your total grade and is due **November 15**.

I expect that reviews will include changes directly on the draft (using Track Changes, for example), coupled with helpful suggestions/comments, both through a separate series of paragraphs and 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...

Please follow the same general guidelines for Peer Review I instructions.

Reviews are assigned as follows:

Go to the Peer Reviews link in the original [Draft research paper](#) assignment to view your assigned student's paper. Upload a copy of the peer review as a file attachment in comments. **Note:** The link to your peer review will not be available until your own assignment has been submitted.

Also upload a copy of your review into this assignment **Peer Review II** in Canvas where I can view them and give feedback.

If you encounter any problems, post to [Technical Support](#) for assistance.

Final paper

Finally, students will turn an electronic copy of their ***final paper*** by **December 4** (the last day of UF classes). The length of the paper should be between 8-10 single-spaced pages (or 4000-5000 words), excluding tables, figures and bibliography. **Please include:** Title of document, if paper is a proposal or

analytical paper, and word count (without tables, figures and bibliography). Please know that this final version will be checked against Turnitin. I strongly recommend that you also look at the [Turnitin](#) results to check for plagiarism and determine if you need tips on how to avoid it.

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 some issues relevant to community-based resource management as discussed in the course. Integrated some course literature into document (highlighted in yellow).	5

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

ASSIGNMENTS: Knowledge exchange document

This in-class assignment is to get you started in thinking about a knowledge exchange strategy for your graduate program/research. Beyond your academic papers, how might you communicate with those interested in your research plan and/or findings? This assignment is due on **Friday, November 22** and is worth 5% of your 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.
 - ✓ Counseling and Wellness resources <https://counseling.ufl.edu/services/guide-to-services/>
 - ✓ U Matter, We Care <http://www.umatter.ufl.edu/>
 - ✓ Career Connections Center <http://career.ufl.edu/>

- [The Disability Resource Center](#) coordinates the needed accommodations of students with disabilities. This includes registering disabilities, recommending academic accommodations within the classroom, accessing special adaptive computer equipment, providing interpretation services and mediating faculty-student disability related issues. Students requesting classroom accommodation must first register with the Dean of Students Office. The Dean of Students Office will provide documentation to the student who must then provide this documentation to the Instructor when requesting accommodation. 0001 Reid Hall, 352-392-8565.
- The [Hitchcock Field & Fork Pantry](#) is a free resource to support UF undergraduate and graduate students, faculty, and staff experiencing any level of food insecurity. Experiencing food insecurity may mean you have faced challenges to meeting your needs in quantity and nutritional quality of food. For example, food insecurity may look like eating ramen because you can't afford foods you consider healthy, nutritious, or appropriate for yourself, to outright skipping meals or eating smaller meals. If you're not sure about whether you fit the criteria, come anyway! You only need to bring your UFID; you do not need to prove that you are in need.

UF Policies

- **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 honesty:** As a student at the University of Florida, you have committed yourself to uphold the Honor Code, which includes the following pledge: "We, the members of the University of Florida community, pledge to hold ourselves and our peers to the highest standards of honesty and integrity." You are expected to exhibit behavior consistent with this commitment to the UF academic community, and on all work submitted for credit at the University of Florida, the following pledge is either required or implied: "On my honor, I have neither given nor received unauthorized aid in doing this assignment." It is assumed that you will complete all work independently in each course unless the instructor provides explicit permission for you to collaborate on course tasks (e.g. assignments, papers, quizzes, exams). Furthermore, as part of your obligation to uphold the Honor Code, you should report any condition that facilitates academic misconduct or appropriate personnel. It is your individual responsibility to know and comply with all university policies and procedures regarding academic integrity and the Student Honor Code. Violations of the Honor Code at the University of Florida will not be tolerated. Violations will be reported to the Dean of Students Office for consideration of disciplinary action. For more information regarding the Student Honor Code, please see: <https://policy.ufl.edu/regulation/4-040/>.
- **Student complaint processes:** The School of Forest, Fisheries, & Geomatics Sciences cares about your experience and we will make every effort to address course concerns. We request that our online students complete a course satisfaction survey each semester, which is a time for you to voice your thoughts on how your course is being delivered. You can also submit feedback anytime. If you have a more urgent concern, your first point of contact should be the Academic Coordinator or the Graduate/Undergraduate Coordinator for the program offering the course. You may also submit a complaint directly to UF administration: <https://registrar.ufl.edu/complaint.html>
- **Student assessment of instruction** is an important part of efforts to improve teaching and learning. At approximately the mid-point of the semester, the School of Forest, Fisheries, & Geomatics Sciences will request anonymous feedback on student satisfaction on various aspects of this course. These surveys will be sent out through Canvas and are not required but encouraged. This is not the

UF Faculty Evaluation! At the end of the semester, students are expected to provide professional and respectful feedback on the quality of instruction in this course by completing course evaluations online via GatorEvals.

- Guidance on how to give feedback in a professional and respectful manner is available at <https://gatorevals.aa.ufl.edu/students/>
- Students will be notified when the evaluation period opens, and can complete evaluations through the email they receive from GatorEvals, in their Canvas course menu under GatorEvals, or via <https://ufl.bluera.com/ufl/>
- Summaries of course evaluation results are available to students at <https://gatorevals.aa.ufl.edu/public-results/>