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History

• Western Region IPM Center group formed Summer 2006
  - Several conference calls - first Nov 06
  - Met in Portland Sep 24-25, 2007

• SRIPM working group proposed by Jim VanKirk in April, 2007
  - Met in Atlanta May 24-25

• NCIPM group
  - First conference call - May 2008

• NERIPM group recently funded
  - Now recruiting members
Northeastern Region School IPM Working Group

- Plan to have a meeting in October
- New England Information Network (ProNewEngland) hosting meeting on May 19 to identify sIPM needs and opportunities
- This will give the NEIPM work group a jumpstart
- UMASS just completed a sIPM survey of New England schools that will be shared at the May meeting

Northeastern Region School IPM Working Group

- Overall goal: Develop a working group that assists states in the NE to meet the National PMSP goal of IPM implementation in all schools by 2015
Northeastern Region
School IPM Working Group

Objectives and Anticipated Impact

• Organize a group of diverse and representative sIPM stakeholders in the NE US.
• Cooperate with sIPM efforts throughout the US to reduce duplication and facilitate sharing
• Serve as a multiplier of K-12 teaching and learning tools to improve Understanding of IPM
• Identify needs, opportunities and priorities for research, extension, education and implementation of sIPM in the NE
• Develop a focused working group project for 2009

North Central Region
School IPM Working Group

• First conference call May 2007
• Initial group of 11 members
• Want to recruit representatives from all 12 states in the region
• Plan to meet in Aug in conjunction with Marc Lame’s pilot project in Missouri
North Central Region
School IPM Working Group

- Members to include representatives from:
  - Structural
  - Parents
  - School administration
  - School operations
  - EPA regional reps (5, 7, & 8)
  - Department of health
  - Extension personnel from MN, NE, IA, Wisc
  - SLA personnel from MI, MO, and IA

Western Region School
IPM Working Group

- 2006
  - 15 contacts from 7 western states
- 2007
  - 30 participants from 9 states
- 2008
  - Added Hawai’i and New Mexico
Western Region School IPM Working Group

Karl Arne U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Jadyn Dobrahner U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Sherry Glick U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Mary Grisier U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Pat Copps Orkin, Inc.
William Currie International Pest Management Institute, Inc.
Jack Marlowe Eden Advanced Pest Technologies
Lyndon Hawkins Nopesticides.com
Paul Cardosi EcoLab, Inc.
Paul Baker University of Arizona
Al Fournier University of Arizona Maricopa Agricultural Center
Dawn Gouge University of Arizona Maricopa Agricultural Center
Jennifer Snyder University of Arizona Maricopa Agricultural Center
Belinda Messenger California Department of Pesticide Regulation
Kyrroh Sevco Program Manager Ecology Action
Assefa Gebre-Amlak Colorado State University

Western Region School IPM Working Group

- Sandra McDonald Colorado State University
- John W. Scott Colorado Department of Agriculture
- William Lanier Montana State University
- Jon Carpenter Nevada Department of Agriculture
- Sara Leverette Oregon Environmental Council
- Tim Stock Oregon State University
- Diane G. Alston Utah State University
- Clark Burgess Utah Department of Agriculture & Food
- Erin W. Hodgson Utah State University
- Maggie Shao Utah State University
- Gregg Smith Salt Lake City School District
- Carrie Foss Washington State University
- Alexandre Latchininsky University of Wyoming
- L.C. 'Fudd' Graham Auburn University
- Tom Green IPM Institute of North America, Inc.
- Faith M. Oi University of Florida
New Objectives
Conference Call April, 2008

• Expand the WRIPM to include Hawai’i, Alaska, New Mexico and Idaho
• Expand assessment of sIPM programs and activities in newly included western states
• Conduct national assessment of sIPM implementation tools using eXtension website
• Identify regional and national networking opportunities and promote workgroup involvement on projects that involve awareness, implementation and assessment of sIPM
• Promote work group objectives, members, activities, and resource findings to a national audience.

Identification of Priority Goals and Regional Objectives

Research Priorities
1. Health issues and pesticides (connection between asthma, absenteeism, pests, and pesticide use) (21)
2. Cost of IPM in time and money (before and after comparison) (11)
3. Efficacy of reduced risk and pesticides (10)
4. Architectural design benefits (8)
5. IPM sustainability (why and how to make it sustainable) (6)
6. Academic performance (as related to pests and pesticides) (5)
7. How to market IPM (reduced jargon) (5)
8. Bed bugs (4)
9. Pest surveys in schools (follow-up) (4)
10. Policy options (local, state, federal) (3)
Education Priorities

1. Outreach and tools to stakeholders [working] in [or with] the school system to
2. Drive demand for IPM (i.e., legislatures, superintendents, school staff, parents/PTOs, plumbers, roofers, carpenters, etc.) (26)
3. PCO training (to establish a standard such as technician certification) and
4. Outreach to the PCO organizations (15)
5. Incorporate sIPM as part of green building standards (e.g., Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design / Council of Educational Facility Planers) (14)
6. Broad public awareness campaign (P.S.A.) on risks associated with pesticides and what IPM is (13)

Barriers to IPM Implementation

1. Admin. and school board buy-in (18)
2. Lack of funding and support for university staff and school maintenance (14)
3. Time and resources for staff (11)
4. Lack of incentives to do IPM (10)
5. Poor RFPs (7)
6. For-profit business model to establish/reinforce that money can be made (6)
Pest Issues

1. Identification, biology, and behavior for all pests (15)
2. Landscape and Turf weeds (13)
3. Health issues related to pest presence (consequences of not treating) (12)
4. Ant identification (odorous house, argentine, fire, and carpenter) (11)
5. Clarity: what are proper thresholds? (6)
6. Invasive weeds (4)
7. Mice and rats (4)
8. Perceived pests (4)
9. Pigeons – pest birds (4)
10. Bed bugs (3)

http://cals.arizona.edu/apmc/westernschoolIPM.html

Southern Region School IPM Working Group

Fudd Graham  Auburn University
John Hopkins  University of Arkansas Cooperative Extension Service
Faith Oi  University of Florida IFAS
Rebecca Baldwin  University of Florida IFAS
Gretchen Pettis  University of Georgia Cooperative Extension
Paul Guillibeau  University of Georgia Cooperative Extension
William Witt  University of Kentucky Plant and Soil Sciences
Mary Grodner  Louisiana State University AGCenter, CES
Dale Pollet  Louisiana State University AGCenter, CES
Blake Layton  Mississippi State University
Greg Lookabaugh  Texas Association of School Business Officials
Mike Page  Florida Dept of Ag and Consumer Services
Wayne Garfinkel  EPA Region 4
Herb Bolton  USDA-CSREES
Southern Region School IPM Working Group

Godfrey Nalyanya  North Carolina State University
Jim Criswell    Oklahoma State University
Tom Royer      Oklahoma State University
Leslie Godfrey Clemson University Department of Pesticide Regulation
Karen Vail    University of Tennessee
Janet Hurley  Texas AgriLife Extension
Michael Merchant Texas AgriLife Extension
Don Renchie   Texas AgriLife Extension
Dini Miller   Virginia Tech
Jim VanKirk   Southern Region IPM Center
Rosemary Hallberg Southern Region IPM Center
Steve Toth    NC State University
Tom Green     IPM Institute of North America
Dawn Gouge   University of Arizona

Composition of this group/where to we go from here

• State Lead Agencies (ASPRO)
• Other regional school IPM workgroups
• School representatives (Association of School Business Officials and National School Plant Management Association)
• Regional EPA representatives
• Industry
Identification of Priority Goals and Regional Objectives

Research

- Need efficacy data, with emphasis on low toxic approaches - 14
- Need study on total cost of IPM over the short term, mid term, and long term of in-house versus outsourced PM service - 12
- Need research that investigates relationships among medical problems, pests and pesticide exposure - 11

Extension

- One full-time paid staff per state devoted to IPM in schools - 9
- Have information for PCOs packaged differently from that for parents and schools and administrators - 9
- Professional marketing—need to get word out to general public - 9
- Regional publication system designed like the fire ants system - 7
- Poster or laminated handouts for people in schools identifying pests. Need photos of all life stages and evidence. Needs to be hand-held, as in flip card. ID Guide - 7
- See some mechanism for limited license holders—custodians that have IPM duties, where they could train. Peer to peer education with nontraditional pest managers - 5
- Collaborating as a group on peer review journal articles on what we know so the data is out there - 5
- Web site or clearinghouse where ALL of the pesticides used in schools can be viewed and has relative toxicity—have all in one place - 4
Regulatory

• Special certification for school IPM for ALL pesticide applicators who apply at the school - 16

Mission Statement

The Southern Region School IPM Working Group is dedicated to promoting the use and adoption of School Integrated Pest Management by:

• Setting goals and priorities that minimize and balance risks of pests and pest management strategies

• Collaborating and sharing resources with colleagues

• Identifying and pursuing resources together

• Producing and presenting new resources that are economically acceptable and practical
eXtension is an educational partnership of Land-Grant Colleges to improve outreach and engagement.
eXtension VISION

- Any time, any place format for any device
- Available to clients 24/7/365
- Increases visibility of CES
- Promotes collaborative development and reduces duplication
- National shared strength - local customized focus
The eXtension platform hosts information being built by each content-focused team, called a

**Community of Practice (CoP)**
A network of subject matter content providers
- faculty / county educators
- professionals
- government agency representation
- industry experts
- clients

who share knowledge or competence in a specific content area and are willing to work together to develop and share that knowledge through educational products and programs.

Community of Practice (CoP) =

There are now 21 CoPs

- 8 started in 2005
- 13 started in 2006
- Each CoP receives funding to organize their team and launch their site (up to $75,000)
  - Some teams have been able to start without this funding
Resource Areas

Community
- Diversity Across Higher Education
- Entrepreneurs & Their Communities
- Gardens, Lawns & Landscapes
- Geospatial Technologies
- Imported Fire Ants

Disaster Issues
- Agrosecurity And Floods

Family
- Family Caregiving
- Parenting
- Personal Finance

Farm
- Beef Cattle
- Cotton
- Dairy
- Horses
- Livestock And Poultry
- Environmental Learning Centers

Pest Management
- Wildlife Damage Management

Youth
- Science, Engineering, And Technology For Youth

More resource areas are being added every month.
Misc. Items

- Existing material
- Editing
- New material
- Calendar
- Post events in news
- Sponsors
- Credit from my institution
- Evolving
Joining a CoP is as easy as

1. Go to people.extension.org and create an eXtension ID.

2. Indicate which Communities of Practice you would like to join (e-mail sent to team leaders).
Joining a CoP is as easy as

1. Go to people.extension.org and create an eXtensionID

2. Indicate which Communities of Practice you would like to join (e-mail sent to team leaders).

3. Take a short Wiki training to learn how to contribute to the site.

WIKI What?? or How do I figure this out?

- Breeze Technology - On-line meeting
- Conference Calls
- On-line training by eXtension staff
We are alike and all want the same thing

- Implement assessment programs to identify implementation status and prioritize needed improvements in individual school systems, e.g., IPM STAR.
- Establish highly visible demonstrations throughout the US.
- Develop a national school IPM coalition of stakeholder organizations to coordinate implementation of proven approaches nationwide.
- Partner with private pest management organizations, e.g., pest management professionals to create and implement effective and economical IPM service relationships.
- Create incentives for implementation, e.g., reduced liability costs, recognition and publicity.

Create structural and landscape maintenance IPM contract specifications for use by school purchasing agents.
- Increase funding for management, coordination, education, research and implementation.
- Activate environmental health and safety professionals by creating awareness of the need, potential and effective methodology for success.
- Establish appropriately trained IPM Coordinators in school systems.
- Establish efficient communication networks among stakeholders.
- Provide funding for school assessments including active participation by local actors including Extension.
We all want the same thing
Verifiable IPM

• Control is based on pest biology
  - How does the insect behave?
  - What is the reproduction cycle?
• Inspection and monitoring results
  - No pests, no pesticide applications
• It is site specific
  - You don’t have the same thing everywhere - old buildings, new buildings, etc.
  - Location, Location, Location

Since we are so alike, we need to work together

• Increase funding opportunities by working within the framework of the National PMSP
• Promote regional cooperation within work groups
• Promote national cooperation between work groups
Regional IPM Centers
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