Calculating landscape indices in FRAGSTATS	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Introduction				
Briefly describe the utility of landscape metrics in landscape ecology and the background, purpose, and utility of FRAGSTATS for research and management (http://www.umass.edu/landeco/research/fragstats/fragstats.html). Outline the objectives of the lab.				
Methods				
Briefly describe (and provide figures for) the landscapes you're using in the lab. List and describe the metrics calculated, with a justification for why you chose the two additional metrics (what information do they add?).				
Results				
Should include: • Table(s) with the results of the eight metrics calculated for the 30x30, 100x100, and 500x500m landscapes (Lab 7) • Table(s) with the results of the eight metrics calculated for the 1800, 1900, and 2000 landscapes (Lab 9) Provide a narrative to guide the reader through any important trends or changes in the metrics between the landscapes.				
Discussion				
Provide context and explanation for any patterns or changes in the metrics that you described in the results, with particular attention paid to: • How the variation in metrics between the Lab 7 landscapes (changing minimum mapping unit) might influence or change their ecological interpretation • The ecological implications of being able to measure landscape changes over time, as in the Lab 9 landscapes • In general what are some potential research or management implications for these changes? From a broad perspective, discuss the utility and weakness of these landscape metrics for research and management, also discuss any weaknesses of the FRAGSTATS program (hint: use the link above and take a look at the original McGarigal & Marks 1995 GTR).				
Literature cited:				
Include at least **two** citation(s) [including McGarigal & Marks 1995] to provide context and support in the Introduction and/or Discussion. Citation style should be consistent, the literature cited section correctly formatted, and all claims properly referenced.				
General:				
• Report is logically and effectively organized, results and interpretations can easily be understood by reader • Writing is clear and concise with correct spelling and sentence construction, jargon and/or slang are not used • Scientific names are included (when appropriate) and spelled correctly • Tables and figures are consistent, correctly formatted, and referenced within the text • Metric units are consistently used and number of significant figures is appropriate				