Syllabus
FW 620 - Ecological Policy - 3 credits
Oregon State University
Spring - 2016

Course Content:

Emphasis is on current and controversial North American and international ecological policy issues. Primary focus is exploring the role of scientists, technocrats, elected and appointed officials, the public, and interest/advocacy groups in ecological policy analysis and implementation. Specific topics and case studies considered are: (1) basic principles of policy analysis; (2) managing wildfire on public lands; (3) balancing competing demands for scarce water supplies; (4) managing large predatory wildlife, especially wolves, cougars, and grizzlies; (5) recovering and sustaining wild salmon runs; (6) determining appropriate use of genetically modified organisms; (7) resolving multiple use conflicts in managing public forests; (8) tackling human-caused climate change; (9) assessing the political clashes over whaling and other marine mammals; and (10) unscrambling conflict and controversy over marine protected areas and ecosystem management.

Instructor:

Robert T. Lackey
Professor of Fisheries
Office: Weniger 459
Voice: (541) 737-0569
Email: Robert.Lackey@oregonstate.edu
Web: http://fw.oregonstate.edu/content/robert-lackey

Dr. Bob Lackey is professor of fisheries science at Oregon State University. In 2008 he retired after 27 years with the Environmental Protection Agency’s national research laboratory in Corvallis where he served as Deputy Director, Associate Director for Science, among other senior science and management jobs. Since his very first fisheries job mucking out raceways in a California trout hatchery, he has worked on an assortment of natural resource issues from various positions in government and academia. His professional assignments involved diverse aspects of natural resource management, but mostly he has operated at the interface between science and policy. He has published over 100 articles in scientific journals. Dr. Lackey has long been an educator, having taught at five North American universities and currently teaches a graduate course in ecological policy at Oregon State University. Canadian by birth, he is a U.S.-Canadian dual-citizen living in Corvallis, Oregon.
Target Audience:

Graduate students in natural resources, environmental sciences, ecological sciences, natural resource and ecological economics, oceanography, civil engineering, marine resource management, political science, environmental ethics, and others with a background and interest in ecological policy, environmental protection, and natural resource management issues.

Prerequisites:

This is a graduate level class. Students are expected to have an academic background and current understanding of natural resources, environmental science, ecological sciences, natural resource economics, ecological economics, marine resource management, oceanography, geosciences, political science, or similar discipline, or have the consent of the professor.

Grading:

Individual student performance will be assessed on an A → F basis (A = 4.0, A- = 3.7, B+ = 3.3, etc.) and determined by grading each student’s written products: (1) the quality of the critiques of assigned articles submitted; and (2) the quality, frequency, and timeliness of participation in the Canvas Discussion Board.

First, over the 10-week term, each student is required to write at least eight (8) 1,000 – 1,500 word critiques evaluating weekly topics (a topic consists of a policy backgrounder and two assigned articles) and submit the critique in Microsoft Word format (or equivalent) by midnight of the following Saturday (see class schedule on the following pages). Late submissions will be accepted, but penalized substantially. An example of the format and style of the critiques is posted in Canvas and this template should be used precisely to guide the writing and formatting of each critique. For grading purposes, the eight (8) critiques having the highest grades will be used to assess each student’s overall performance. Consequently, a student has the option, without penalty, to skip 2 of the 10 possible critiques.

Second, over the 10-week term, each student will substantively and regularly participate on the Canvas Discussion Board on a weekly basis. Each week (Sunday) I will post a discussion topic on the Discussion Board and your participation is required. Regular participation by individual students is defined minimally as at least five (5) posts per week, preferably more. Each student’s contribution to the weekly on-line discussions will be evaluated in terms of content, originality, frequency, and timeliness. You are expected to participate in the Discussion Board each week even if you elect not to write a critique for that week. Taken as a whole, the grade for assessment of student performance in Canvas discussions will count the equivalent of two (2) critiques.

Third, the overall grade for the course will be determined by averaging the 8 highest weekly critique grades and the 2 grades for participation in the Discussion Board. There will be no examinations.
Required Reading:

Assigned policy/science articles (20) and “policy backgrounders” (10) are required reading [see class schedule on following pages]. Copies of all required articles and backgrounders are posted in Canvas. Optional articles are also posted in Canvas and you are encouraged to at least skim these to learn additional perspectives regarding the case study. There is no text book for this course.

Student Learning Goals and Assessment:

- Understand and explain in clear and logical writing the basic principles of contemporary ecological policy and ecological policy analysis (as measured by the quality of the weekly critiques of policy case studies and contributions to the Discussion Board).

- Evaluate and assess in clear and understandable writing how contemporary natural resource management and environmental protection issues are analyzed from a policy perspective (as measured by the quality of the weekly critiques of policy case studies and contributions to the Discussion Board).

- Analyze a series of ecological policy case studies using a range of perspectives and viewpoints presented in this course on how science interconnects with ecological policy analysis and decision-making (as measured by the quality of the weekly critiques of policy case studies and contributions to the Discussion Board).

Students with Disabilities:

Accommodations are collaborative efforts between students, faculty, and Disability Access Services (DAS). Students with accommodations approved through DAS are responsible for contacting the faculty member in charge of the course prior to or during the first week of the term to discuss accommodations. Students who believe they are eligible for accommodations, but who have not yet obtained approval through DAS, should contact DAS immediately at (541) 737-4098.
Expectations for Student Conduct:

Students are expected to maintain proper academic conduct in all aspects of FW 620. This includes treating peers with respect and meeting the conduct expectations of Oregon State University regarding cheating or other behaviors. To review these general expectations of the University, please visit the following web site:

http://studentlife.oregonstate.edu/studentconduct/offenses-0

FW 620 involves considerable writing for each student. Students are expected to be honest and ethical in their academic work. This includes use of the work of students currently or previously enrolled in this class. The following relevant text is taken from the OSU web site:

Academic or scholarly dishonesty is defined as an act of deception in which a student seeks to claim credit for the work or effort of another person, or uses unauthorized materials or fabricated information in any academic work or research, either through the student's own efforts or the efforts of another. It includes:

**CHEATING** - use or attempted use of unauthorized materials, information or study aids, or an act of deceit by which a student attempts to misrepresent mastery of academic effort or information. This includes but is not limited to unauthorized copying or collaboration on a test or assignment, using prohibited materials and texts, any misuse of an electronic device, or using any deceptive means to gain academic credit.

**FABRICATION** - falsification or invention of any information including but not limited to falsifying research, inventing or exaggerating data, or listing incorrect or fictitious references.

**ASSISTING** - helping another commit an act of academic dishonesty. This includes but is not limited to paying or bribing someone to acquire a test or assignment, changing someone's grades or academic records, taking a test/doing an assignment for someone else by any means, including misuse of an electronic device. It is a violation of Oregon state law to create and offer to sell part or all of an educational assignment to another person.

**TAMPERING** - altering or interfering with evaluation instruments or documents.

**PLAGIARISM** - representing the words or ideas of another person or presenting someone else's words, ideas, artistry or data as one's own. Plagiarism includes but is not limited to copying another person's work (including unpublished material) without appropriate referencing, presenting someone else's opinions and theories as one's own, or working jointly on a project and then submitting it as one's own.

For further information and expectations for Ecampus students, please visit the following university web site:

http://ecampus.oregonstate.edu/services/student-services/success/
Class Schedule and Assignments

Week 1 —— Introduction to Ecological Policy Analysis  (March 27)

Nine axioms or general principles about ecological policy will be presented and described in detail this week. Understanding these axioms will be essential to analyzing the case studies that will follow in Weeks 2 – 10. As you study the case studies presented in subsequent weeks, you will need to refer back to these nine axioms.

Background: Lackey, Robert T. — An Introduction to Ecological Policy
Reading #1: See Canvas “Weekly Topics” for specific article to read.
Reading #2: See Canvas “Weekly Topics” for specific article to read.
Critique due: April 2

Week 2 —— Wildfire Policy  (April 3)

One of the most challenging questions facing managers of public lands is developing a scientifically sound and publicly supported policy toward wildfire — one that meets society’s goals for those lands and is based on the best available scientific information. The diversity of opinion (policy preferences) is wide, even extreme, on what characteristics the desired policy should encompass. The wide range of opinion is based, in part, on the fact that many individuals and organizations have strong and vested interests in the outcome of the policy debate.

Background: Lackey, Robert T. — An Introduction to Wildfire Policy
Reading #1: See Canvas “Weekly Topics” for specific article to read.
Reading #2: See Canvas “Weekly Topics” for specific article to read.
Critique due: April 9

Week 3 —— Water Policy  (April 10)

The “water wars” have long been a fact of life in many areas of the western United States and are likely to be so for the foreseeable future. Recent court cases in the California Central Valley and the Oregon/California Klamath Basin are front and center on the policy and political scene. Dam removal (and construction) are hot topics in many States. Overall, many western regions continue to suffer from severe and long-term water shortages, especially for high quality water. The seemingly insatiable demand for freshwater shows little sign of letting up, nor do most analysts expect much change anytime soon. Many ecological policy issues are driven by competition for scarce water resources.

Background: Lackey, Robert T. — An Introduction to Water Policy
Reading #1: See Canvas “Weekly Topics” for specific article to read.
Reading #2: See Canvas “Weekly Topics” for specific article to read.
Critique due: April 16
Week 4 —— Wolf, Cougar, and Grizzly Policy  (April 17)

    Developing a politically acceptable policy about large predatory mammals (e.g., wolves, cougars, and grizzlies) is challenging. As is true in many localities, much of the Oregon public supports their presence (cougars) or their reintroduction (wolves). Conversely, many residents (especially those in rural regions) are vehemently opposed in large part because of concerns about predation on livestock, pets, and wildlife (especially deer and other important game species).

    Backgrounder: Lackey, Robert T. — An Introduction to Wolf, Cougar, and Grizzly Policy
    Reading #1: See Canvas “Weekly Topics” for specific article to read.
    Reading #2: See Canvas “Weekly Topics” for specific article to read.
    Critique due: April 23

Week 5 —— Wild Salmon Policy  (April 24)

    The case study this week will be salmon policy, particularly current issues in California, Oregon, Idaho, Washington, and British Columbia. Efforts to restore runs of salmon have been undertaken in this region since the mid to late 1800s. Billions of dollars have been spent, but without much long-term success. As newspaper articles regularly highlight, the plight of commercial and recreational salmon fishermen along the West Coast of North America appears grim.

    Backgrounder: Lackey, Robert T. — An Introduction to Salmon Policy
    Reading #1: See Canvas “Weekly Topics” for specific article to read.
    Reading #2: See Canvas “Weekly Topics” for specific article to read.
    Critique due: April 30

Week 6 —— GMO Policy  (May 1)

    The debate over developing a consensus public policy concerning the use of genetic engineering (often called genetic modification) is mired in vitriolic political arguments involving an amorphous mix of values, preferences, and scientific information. Many proponents of using the technology argue that it has been demonstrated to be low risk and is essential to providing sufficient high quality food to meet human needs, especially in developing countries. Others, however, argue that resorting to genetic engineering is unnecessary (along with being dangerous) because people should not be forced to eat food produced by unproven technology.

    Backgrounder: Lackey, Robert T. — An Introduction to Genetic Engineering Policy
    Reading #1: See Canvas “Weekly Topics” for specific article to read.
    Reading #2: See Canvas “Weekly Topics” for specific article to read.
    Critique due: May 7
Week 7 —— Owl vs. Logging Policy  (May 8)

Public (owned by Federal or State governments) forests were created to attain public benefits, but exactly what are those benefits and who should receive them? To some segments of society, the public forests ought to be managed to achieve the goals and aspirations of local (usually rural) residents which typically means that consumptive, economic uses (especially timber harvest and mining) ought to be encouraged or at least be part of a multiple use approach. To other segments of society, the forests ought to preserve the biotic heritage of the nation and be managed more like wilderness areas or national parks with little or no commercial enterprise and strictly limited recreational activity.

Backgrounder: Lackey, Robert T. — An Introduction to Owl vs. Timber Policy
Reading #1: See Canvas “Weekly Topics” for specific article to read.
Reading #2: See Canvas “Weekly Topics” for specific article to read.
Critique due: May 14

Week 8 —— Climate Change Policy  (May 15)

Most of the public debate over climate change policy revolves around “facts” and “science”. The implied assumption appears to be that if we all agreed on the facts of the case (i.e., the science about climate change), the appropriate policy choice would be clear. However, the distribution of costs and benefits is arguably the most important factor in settling on a specific policy choice. As with all ecological policy issues, the most important factor is the perception of who receives the benefits vs. who will bear the costs.

Backgrounder: Lackey, Robert T. — An Introduction to Climate Change Policy
Reading #1: See Canvas “Weekly Topics” for specific article to read.
Reading #2: See Canvas “Weekly Topics” for specific article to read.
Critique due: May 21

Week 9 —— Whaling Policy  (May 22)

Developing publicly supported, biologically sound policies regarding marine mammals (generally) and whales (specifically) are among the most challenging facets of natural resource management. Conducting credible, realistic, and useful policy analysis is also exceptionally difficult. Many people view mammals very differently from fish and shellfish and therefore there are often drastically different and mutually exclusive competing policy goals. Policy analysis is complicated further because for marine mammals, society and individuals receive intangible benefits from preserving species, especially those in danger of extinction or those with charismatic qualities.

Backgrounder: Lackey, Robert T. — An Introduction to Whaling Policy
Reading #1: See Canvas “Weekly Topics” for specific article to read.
Reading #2: See Canvas “Weekly Topics” for specific article to read.
Critique due: May 28
For both marine protected areas (MPAs) and ecosystem management (EM), there are many definitions. For MPAs, most definitions describe an area of the ocean environment that has been reserved through law, policy, or regulation by a governmental organization to provide enhanced protection to part or all of the natural or cultural resources of the specified area. Common examples of marine protected areas are national and state parks and wildlife refuges. For ecosystem management (sometimes called ecosystem-based management), there are a wide range of definitions used to describe what remains an ambiguous and highly contentious notion. Both MPAs and EM gained popularity in response to the widespread realization that human pressures on ocean resources were challenging their sustainability.

**Backgrounder:** Lackey, Robert T. — An Introduction to Marine Protected Areas Policy

**Reading #1:** See Canvas “Weekly Topics” for specific article to read.

**Reading #2:** See Canvas “Weekly Topics” for specific article to read.

**Critique due:** June 4
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