



Module syllabus: *The basis of monitoring of natural habitats*

1. Overall information

Module coordinator	Dr Agnieszka Błońska
Contact	agnieszka.blonska@us.edu.pl; 322009451
ECTS	2
Method for the verification of learning outcomes	The final grade for the module is weighted on the average of the following student activities: - active participation in laboratory classes (continuous evaluation of practical skills and reports) (0.6) - written final exam (0.4) To be awarded a final grade, the student must have passed each activity of the module. Grades: below 51% – fail (F); 52-60% – with minimum academic criteria (E); 61-65% – satisfactory (D); 66-75% – good (C); 76-85% – very good (B), ≥ 85% – excellent (A)

2. Description of student activity and work

Lecture/discussion session	
Responsible instructors	dr hab. Agnieszka Kompała-Bąba, dr Agnieszka Błońska, dr Teresa Nowak
Content	The assumptions, scope and legal basis for monitoring Methodology for monitoring plant species and natural habitats Overview of the selected natural habitats that are being monitored and their state of preservation Overview of the selected plant species that are subjected to monitoring
Number of didactic hours (contact hours)	10
Literature	Mróz W. (ed.) 2010. Monitoring siedlisk przyrodniczych. Przewodnik metodyczny. Część I, II, III. IVGIOŚ, Warszawa. Mróz W. (red.) 2013. Monitoring of natural habitats. Methodological guide. GIOŚ, Warszawa. Mróz W., Bąba W. 2013. 6210* Xerothermic grasslands Festuco-Brometea. Methodological guide. GIOŚ, Warszawa, s. 45–54. The Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora. Perzanowska J. (red.) 2010. Monitoring gatunków roślin. Przewodnik metodyczny. Część I, II, III GIOŚ, Warszawa. Korzeniak J. 2009. National monitoring of threats and the effectiveness of vascular plant protection in Poland. Z. Mirek, A. Nikel (eds.), Rare, relict and endangered plants and fungi in Poland, Chapter: National monitoring of threats and the effectiveness of vascular plant protection in Poland, Publisher: W. Szafer Institute of





	Botany, Polish Academy of Sciences, Kraków, pp.31-40 http://siedliska.gios.gov.pl/ http://natura2000.gdos.gov.pl/
--	--

Laboratory	
Responsible instructors	dr hab. Agnieszka Kompała-Bąba, dr Agnieszka Błońska, dr Teresa Nowak
Laboratory projects	Analysing the forms for field observations and the codes of the risks Assessing the parameters of the state of a habitat and the indicators of the specific structure and function of natural habitats Identifying the indicators of the population and habitat state and their valorisation Assessing the risks and the actual impacts Learning the characteristics of selected species and natural habitats Fieldwork: Students learn how to correctly recognise natural habitats, monitor species and monitor a natural habitat in detail in accordance with the methodology of the nationwide system for monitoring species and habitats
Methodology of laboratory classes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• analysing sample completed forms for monitoring species and habitats, sample monitoring reports• discussing the methodology of monitoring• fieldwork during which students will monitor habitats and species in accordance with the methodology of the national monitoring system using observation and monitoring equipment
Number of didactic hours (contact hours)	20
Literature	Mróz W. (red.) 2010. Monitoring siedlisk przyrodniczych. Przewodnik metodyczny. Część I, II, III. IVGIOŚ, Warszawa. Perzanowska J. (red.) 2010. Monitoring gatunków roślin. Przewodnik metodyczny. Część I, II, III GIOŚ, Warszawa. The Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora http://siedliska.gios.gov.pl/ http://natura2000.gdos.gov.pl/

3. Forms of verification

Continuous evaluation of knowledge, activity and practical skills	
Grades	Grades are awarded on a scale of A-F, where A is the best and F is a fail. <u>An excellent performance (A)</u> – the student actively participates in the field courses, independently monitors habitats and species in accordance with the adopted methodology, properly recognises the species and natural habitats, can use the relevé method, correctly evaluates the indicators of the conservation state of the habitat/population perspectives of their protection as well as any threats





	<p><u>A good performance</u> (C) – student correctly monitors habitats and species, correctly identifies the observed habitat and species, creates a phytosociological relevé, in most cases correctly assesses the indicators of the structure and function, identifies any hazards and assesses the perspectives</p> <p><u>A satisfactory performance</u> (E) – has difficulties in correctly identifying species and natural habitats, monitors habitats and species with the help of the instructor, has difficulty with correctly assessing some indicators of the structure and function, identifying any risks, etc.</p> <p><u>a performance that does not meet the minimum academic criteria</u> (F) – cannot correctly identify species and habitats and monitor independently, Makes mistakes in assessing the indicators of the structure and function.</p>
--	--

Reports from realised laboratory projects

Evaluation	<p>The student fills out the plant species and natural habitat field form on the basis of their independent observations of the species and habitats in the field and evaluates the conservation status of the habitat and the population of species and the perspectives of protection and threats.</p> <p>Grades for reports are awarded on a scale of A-F, where A is the best and F is a fail.</p> <p>An excellent report (A) – without any essential errors</p> <p>Fail (F) – no report</p>
------------	--

Final exam

Grades	<p>The final exam will cover the issues related to the identification of species and natural habitats, the methodology for monitoring plants and natural habitats.</p> <p>Grades are awarded on a scale of A-F, where A is the highest and F is failing fail. below 51% – fail (F); 52-60% – with minimum academic criteria (E); 61-65% – satisfactory (D); 66-75% – good (C); 76-85% – very good (B), $\geq 85\%$ – excellent (A)</p>
--------	---

