

NR 5984
Virginia Tech
Summer 2009

Landcare

DRAFT SYLLABUS

Instructor

David Robertson

Overview

Landcare is sustainable land management that integrates conservation and development goals to improve a broad range of economic, social, and environmental conditions (the triple bottom line: 3BL) in local communities throughout global society. Landcare includes sustainable agriculture, forestry, landscaping, and related land management practices. Successful landcare requires collaboration on the part of landowners working cooperatively with their neighbors and strategic partners to achieve shared objectives that no one can accomplish alone. The term “landcare” was coined in Australia in the 1980s and has since spread to many other countries where the landcare movement and industry takes distinct forms in response to specific national and local context. In the United States, a variety of public and private partners—including state and federal agencies, the National Associations of Conservation Districts (NACD), Resource Conservation and Development Councils (NARC&DC), and Regional Councils (NARC), and numerous local-regional partners—are promoting the landcare concept. Landcare practitioners include homeowners, landscapers, farmers, foresters, and related natural resource stewards. As they say in Australia: “everyone, everywhere”. This course will explore the historical development of the fast growing landcare movement and industry and examine some of the factors affecting its continued success.

Learning Objectives

Upon successful completion of this course, students should be able to:

- Think critically and creatively about the science, policy, and practice of landcare
- Demonstrate a broad, transdisciplinary understanding of landcare
- Situate landcare within past, current, and evolving socio-cultural context
- Communicate effectively with specific audiences regarding landcare:
 - Define key terms and concepts
 - Identify contributing disciplines, professions, and cultural perspectives
 - Identify significant people, projects and publications
 - Describe the history, current status, and future prospects of landcare
- Describe the actual and possible impacts on landcare by government (federal, state, local), university, extension, civic, corporate, and other institutions
- Conduct independent research and writing regarding landcare in action.

Evaluation/ Grading Criteria

- Discussion & Participation 40%
- Short Assignments 30%
- Final Project 30%

Critical and creative thinking are the keys to success in this course!

Methods

This course includes required readings, class discussion, independent research, peer review, critical and creative thinking and writing.

Sample Reading List

- Cary, J., and T. Webb. 2000. Community landcare, the National Landcare Program, and the landcare movement: the social dimensions of landcare. Social Sciences Centre, Bureau of Rural Sciences, Canberra.
- Curtis, A., and M. A. Lockwood. 2000. Landcare and catchment management in Australia: lessons for state-sponsored community participation. *Society & Natural Resources* 13:61-73.
- Garrity, D. P. 2002. Landcare on the poverty-protection interface in an Asian watershed. *Conservation Ecology* 6:12.
- McCarthy, James 2005. Rural geography: multifunctional rural geographies reactionary or radical? *Progress in Human Geography* 29 (6):773-782.
- Sanford, M. 2006. Extirpating the agriculture versus conservation dichotomy. *Conservation Biology* 20(1):253-4.
- Banks, J. E. 2004. Divided culture: integrating agriculture and conservation biology. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 2:537-545.
- Stepp, J. R. 2003. Remarkable properties of human ecosystems. *Conservation Ecology* 7(3):11 [online].
- Pickett, S. T. A. 2005. Biocomplexity in coupled natural-human systems: a multidimensional framework. *Ecosystems* 8:225-232.
- Newell, B., et al. 2005. A conceptual template for integrative human-environment research. *Global Environmental Change* 15:229-307.
- Trosper, R. L. 2005. Emergence unites ecology and society. *Ecology & Society* 10(1):14 [online].
- Hobbs, R. J., et al. 2006. Novel ecosystems: theoretical and management aspects of the new ecological world order. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 15:1-7.
- Foster, D., et al. 2003. The importance of land use legacies to ecology and conservation. *BioScience* 53(1):77-88.
- Cundill, G., et al. 2005. Foghorns to the future: using knowledge and transdisciplinarity to navigate complex systems. *Ecology & Society* 10(2):8 [online].
- Cumming, G. S., and J. Collier. 2005. Change and identity in complex systems. *Ecology & Society* 10(1):29 [online].
- Costanza, R. 2003. A vision of the future of science: reintegrating the study of humans and the rest of nature. *Futures* 35:651-671.

- Berlik, M. et al. 2002. The illusion of preservation: a global environmental argument for the local production of natural resources. *Journal of Biogeography* 29:1557-1568.
- Berkes, F. 2004. Rethinking community-based conservation. *Conservation Biology* 18(3):621-630.
- Parkins, J. R., and R. E. Mitchell. 2005. Public participation as public debate: a deliberative turn in natural resource management. *Society and Natural Resources* 18:529-540.
- Moore, E. A., and T. M. Koontz. 2003. A typology of collaborative watershed groups: citizen-based, agency-based, and mixed partnerships. *Society and Natural Resources* 16:452-460.
- Margerum, R. D., and D. Whittall. 2004. The challenges and implications of collaborative management on a river basin scale. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 47(3):407-427.
- Lubell, M., et al. 2002. Watershed partnerships and the emergence of collective action institutions. *American Journal of Political Science* 46(1):148-163.
- Leach, W. D., and N. W. Pelkey. 2001. Making watershed partnerships work: a review of the empirical literature. *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management* 127(6):378-385.
- Habron, G. 2003. Role of adaptive management for watershed councils. *Environmental Management* 31(1):29-41.
- Cheng, A., and S. Daniels. 2005. Getting to "we": examining the relationship between geographic scale and ingroup emergence in collaborative watershed planning. *Research in Human Ecology* 12(1):30-43.
- Bidwell, R., and C. Ryan. 2006. Collaborative partnership design: the implications of organizational affiliation for watershed partnerships. *Society and Natural Resources* 19:827-843.
- Curtin, C. 2002. Integration of science and community-based conservation in the Mexico/U.S. borderlands. *Conservation Biology* 16(4):880-886.
- Conley, A., and M. A. Moote. 2003. Evaluating collaborative natural resource management. *Society & Natural Resources*. 15:371-386.
- Campbell, L., and A. Vainio-Mattila. 2003. Participatory development and community-based conservation: opportunities missed from lessons learned? *Human Ecology* 31(3): 417-437.
- Koontz, T. M. 2005. We finished the plan, so now what? Impacts of collaborative stakeholder participation on land use policy. *The Policy Studies Journal* 33(3):459-481.
- Lane, M. B., and T. Corbett. 2005. The tyranny of localism: indigenous participation in community-based environmental management. *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning* 7(2):141-159.
- Gray, I., et al. 2005. Rural community and leadership in the management of natural resources: tensions between theory and policy. *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning* 7(2):125-139.

- Gorg, C. 2007. Landscape governance: the “politics of scale” and the “natural” conditions of places. *Geoforum* 38:954-966.
- Glasmeier, A. K., and T. Farrigan. 2005. Understanding community forestry: a qualitative meta-study of the concept, the process, and its potential for poverty alleviation in the United States case. *The Geographical Journal* 171(1):56-69.
- Dzingirai, V. 2003. The new scramble for the African countryside. *Development and Change* 34(2):243-263.