

Final Minutes, November 20th, 2014
National Stakeholder Team for Pesticide Safety Education Program
(PSEP) Funding

All documents and minutes of the Team and its workgroups are posted at <http://psep.us/>

1. Welcome to New Team Members (attachment 1 in agenda)

Three additional members have joined since the last meeting. If you would like to invite someone who supports PSEP to join the Team, please reach out to them.

The two documents below, once final, will be submitted to AAPSE for review and, hopefully, endorsement. The team continues to produce documents because questions continue to arise, both within and beyond the team, and the goal is to give everyone easy access to answers that have been prepared with input from many team members. If you have concerns or identify a need, please contact one of the Steering Committee members (Jim Burnette, Carol Black, Dave Scott, Carol Somody)

ADDENDUM: We would like to thank Andrew Thostenson for his two years of dedicated service to the Steering Committee of the National Stakeholder Team. Andrew will remain on the team as the representative of North Dakota's PSEP (and continue to maintain our website).

2. The Value of Robust Land-Grant University Pesticide Safety Education Programs (attachment 2 in agenda – send final edits by November 24)

No further edits were provided on the call.

3. Teaching Consumers to Use Pesticides Safely - A Mission of Land-Grant University Pesticide Safety Education Programs (attachment 3 in agenda – send edits to this draft by December 1)

Carol B. asked if this document captured the breadth of who the “consumer” is (e.g. general public, non-professionals), and if it captured all the activities and reach of PSEPs.

Tim Drake supported the use of “consumer”. Cheryl Smith said that “teaching” should stay in the title and noted that the use of “general public” later in the document expanded the meaning to those who need a better understanding of pesticides even if they are not using them.

Mimi Rose pointed out that the entire channel must be included – not just retailers, but internet sales as well.

Candace Bartholomew asked about reordering the sentence “The first priority of PSEP consumer education is to teach safe use of pesticides – the chemical component of IPM...” so that it more clearly focused on IPM. Carol S. felt that this would change the emphasis. Carol B. noted that it is easier, in society today, to say PSEP does IPM. Fred Whitford said that, in practice, his Master Gardener talks adequately cover both IPM and the PSE component.

ACTION: Please send proposed language changes for consideration.

Carol B. said the final document would have utility with deans and other administrators, in PSEP business planning discussions, etc., by showing that PSEP works with audiences beyond certified applicators to teach PSE as a critical need.

Fred Whitford suggested that the document clearly show the reach of PSEP to diverse consumer audiences (e.g. minorities), and that photos be added for greater effect.

Ronda Hirnyck noted that the Western IPM Center now uses an editor to improve appearance and suggested a brochure format that could be posted on websites and also printed.

ACTION: Please send photos to Carol B. for consideration.

Kerry Richards noted that, in the IPM RFA, 50K per year is available for projects having a strong association with PSEP. Carol B. said this has been ongoing and is utilized.

Carol S. asked that everyone read the document from the perspective of engaging consumer products associations, e.g. Consumer Specialty Products Association (CSPA), about the important service that PSEP provides to consumers. In addition, any links to IPM resources prepared by PSEPs with significant attention to PSE would be appreciated, to include with the examples.

Paul Andre asked if the document was intended for PSEP use or for consumers. Carol B. responded that the primary intended use is by PSEPs and other team members who are trying to engage stakeholders (deans, associations, etc.) in understanding the impact of PSEP on consumers. It is not intended for consumer use.

Fred Whitford said that every new administrator, dean, etc. gets invited to learn what he does. If the document is colorful, administrators, lawn care associations, etc. will like it, and it will be a good tool to support PSEP efforts in a state. At the national level, Kerry Richards and Fred volunteered to invite CSPA to join the team when the final version of the document is ready.

Paul Andre noted that the links were valuable in a “live” document but not in a hard copy.

ACTION: Carol B. will attempt two versions - a glossy version with photos and no hyperlinks (for printing) and a web version with hyperlinks to all the example resources.

Ron Gardner indicated that “pesticide use” means something different to the general public and will offer some of his documents that were written for this audience.

4. Discuss utility of a survey about on-line/DE recertification options and challenges (synchronous vs asynchronous, proctored vs non-proctored)

Carol B. explained that on-line/distance education for recertification credits continues to be discussed by the Certification and Training Assessment Group (CTAG). There has also been discussion on this team about the need for PSEPs to include on-line/DE options to increase their educational reach. In addition, the 25 “Goal 1” states are required, as part of their 3-year contracts, to do an assessment of their current or potential use of on-line and distance education. One Goal 1 state has asked if a survey could be done to identify techniques that are being used at different universities for on-line/DE.

Currently, most on-line/DE education is done asynchronously (the student can take the class 24/7, with no real-time connection to the teacher) and non-proctored. State Lead Agencies are beginning to get requests for approval of webinars, Skype, Google, etc. This raises various questions, e.g. how to monitor/ensure active participation.

Carol B. asked if the team believed that a survey would be helpful to determine what on-line/DE efforts are already being done, the parameters, how the level of engagement and proof of identity are assessed, the SLA position, etc. The PSEP might be asked about their current and desired state, and what production and delivery demands exist; the SLA would need to comment on if/what they would approve. (The question of whether the survey should be done by the PSEP in collaboration with the SLA appeared to be impacted by whether on-line/DE was already being utilized in the state and other factors, but it is certainly a required collaboration in Goal 1 states.)

Paul Andre asked if the survey would focus on commercial or private recertification; Carol B. said both (also dependent on recertification requirements in the state).

Kerry Richards noted that reciprocity is already a problem between states – should AAPCO as well as CTAG be looking at this? Carol B. responded that some states are setting standards that will not allow ease of approval of online classes (different state policies to follow).

Ron Gardner commented on the difficulties with multi-state approvals in the 10 states that his PSEP serves. Carol B. added that reciprocity was very time-consuming in the 21 states that her PSEP serves.

Carol B. feels that one well-designed survey can cover the needs of CTAG, this Team, and Goal 1 states.

ACTION: Team members are asked to submit questions that they would like to see included in the survey, from both perspectives - PSEP development and delivery, and SLA approval.

5. Other

Dave Scott continues work on the potential use of EPA Supplemental Environmental Projects (SEPs) in support of pesticide safety education. Jim Burnett continues work on setting up the first national dialogue on IPM support of pesticide safety education. (Both efforts could provide additional funding for PSEP, while the latter seeks broader support.)

Goal 1 PSEPs and SLAs should have received meeting announcements for the next two optional Goal 1 teleconferences.

The next Full Team Meeting will be January 30th at 11 AM ET.

ADDENDUM: The Steering Committee of the National Stakeholder Team has held 4 optional teleconferences for Goal 1 advisory committee members. These have been well-attended by Goal 1 PSEPs and SLAs, and excellent questions have been asked. Process, contracts, key documents, definitions, work plans, funding options, and stakeholder engagement have been among the topics discussed. Since states vary in their current level of stakeholder engagement, talking points will also vary (background about the Goal 1 initiative, state statistics about certified applicators and other audiences, the value of a robust PSEP, planned activities of the stakeholder team, etc.)