It has been brought to my attention that in designing this course I was, perhaps, over-ambitious on your behalf. I'm not surprised by this critique, and actually struggled with the question when designing the course and had some nagging fear that I was asking too much. I'm still learning the craft of teaching (and I still don't quite "get" the trimester system), so I appreciate this type of feedback. In response, I am making some changes to the two papers due for this course that should reduce the workload somewhat.

1) I am reassigning groups for the final group project/paper, as follows:
   - Group 1: Mary and Julie
   - Group 2: Ryan, Genevieve, and Sarah
   - Group 3: Laura, Neeha, and Renee

2) Group papers should be 13-15 pages (double-spaced, 12 pt font, 1" margins) in length.

3) Propositional papers will be incorporated into the final group paper as part of the literature review for the group paper. This has two important implications:
   A) Group members need to meet in their new groups soon to coordinate their propositional paper topics so as to minimize overlap, and to agree topics/cases for the final group paper (my use of "agree" in this sentence is British English, by the by).
   B) Therefore, you may need to change the focus of your propositional paper from what you have worked on to date (i.e. your 2 paragraph extended propositions). I apologize for this but fortunately you are still in the early stages of this process.

4) Although propositional papers will make up part of the group paper, at least 1/3 of the final group paper must be new material. The new material must examine a specific case of either:
   A) a resource management approach or sector involving or impacting local communities (e.g. community forestry, extractive reserves, ecotourism, etc.),
   B) a particular community-based conservation project (e.g. the Annapurna Conservation Area Project, CAMPFIRE in Zaire, BOSCOSA in Costa Rica, etc.), or
   C) the social justice and biodiversity conservation impacts of a particular Protected Area (e.g. Amboseli in Kenya, Royal Chitwan National Park in Nepal, SI-A-PAZ in Nicaragua)

5) Due dates change slightly, as follows:
   A) Currently, the second extended propositional paper (2 pages) is due next Thursday. To give you a little more time because you might need to change things, these will be due at the end of the day on Friday, 5 May instead.
   B) I am eliminating the early draft of the propositional paper so the final version is due on Thursday, 11 May instead of 18 May. I will grade this paper and give extensive feedback that I expect you to incorporate into your final group papers.
C) Group bibliographies for the final paper are due next week Thursday (4 May) instead of Tuesday (this assignment is simply to give you a deadline and incentive to do library searches early).

D) Title and Outline for final group papers will be due Thursday, 18 May.

E) Deadline for the final group papers remains the same - noon on Monday 29 May.

**Example of revised assignment**

Your propositional papers should be general enough to apply to a range of possible cases/examples. For example, say I am doing my final paper with Bjork and Sting. Our group paper will examine Amboseli National Park in Kenya. We decide that my propositional paper will argue that justifications for coercive conservation are partly built on the classic "degradation discourse", Bjork's paper will argue that biodiversity protection can play a role in poverty reduction, and Sting will discuss how Western ideas about wilderness, the idea that humans are separate from nature, spread and shape conservation globally. For our final paper, we conduct some research about Amboseli and jointly develop 4 or 5 pages describing the park, its history, problems, successes, etc. We then work together to combine our three propositional papers into a coherent statement that situates and illuminates the Amboseli case, and relate the case back to these other sections.

For example, if we find that Amboseli involved evicting former residents, we might say that this is because the park is built on Western notions of wilderness preservation that require excluding humans from natural areas. We might go on to argue that the formation of the park and associated evictions of residents (a form of coercive conservation) was justified on the grounds that the local people were causing damage to the land, using the degradation discourse. Finally, building on Bjork's prop. paper, we examine recent efforts to involve locals in the management of Amboseli and conclude that there is potential for the Maasai to benefit from the park if such and such policies are adopted. We literally cut and paste our way to a single, integrated paper that then needs to be polished.