

**Minutes, January 30<sup>th</sup>, 2015**  
**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/>**

Jim Burnette welcomed everyone to the meeting.

**1. Updates on Activities of the National Stakeholder Team**

Carol Black indicated that edits and images had been received from Team members for the online and color print versions of [Teaching Consumers to Use Pesticides Safely: A Mission of Land-Grant University Pesticide Safety Education Programs](#). She had incorporated a number of images into the color print version, but the designer preferred a one-sided format. The link at the bottom right of the color print version will be changed so that it goes directly to the online version (which contains many hyperlinked examples of how PSEP educates consumers). Carol invited final feedback on the online and print versions of the Consumer document (both attached to the agenda). All comments on the call were favorable – team members should provide any final edits by February 9.

Fred Whitford and Kerry Richards have volunteered to use “Teaching Consumers” and other examples from their own outreach programs to invite CSPA to join the team. Jeff Case of CropLife America has also requested “Teaching Consumers”.

The Consumer documents complement a growing list of documents developed to support PSEP. Whether you are a Goal 1 state seeking to strengthen your program, a robust state working to ensure continued support, or a team member championing PSEP, three documents - Effective LGU PSEPs, The Value of Robust PSEPs, and Teaching Consumers - will assist you in promoting PSEP. The PSEP and SLA surveys help Team members understand the current state, and anyone can use or extract from the various PowerPoints to explain the challenges and importance of PSEP. Both Effective LGU PSEPs and The Value of Robust PSEPs have been endorsed by AAPSE (endorsed version of the latter just posted). All of these resources are on the Team’s public website - <http://psep.us/>. Continue to contact anyone on the Team’s Steering Committee (Jim Burnette, Carol Black, Dave Scott, Carol Somody) with needs.

Dave Scott indicated that a template will be prepared to help PSEPs, SLAs, etc. consider the potential use of EPA Supplemental Environmental Projects (SEP) penalty funds in support of PSEPs.

Jim Burnette provided an update on his efforts to schedule the national IPM dialogue. NIFA and all other invited parties have agreed to participate, but many changes at EPA have made it difficult to identify an appropriate participant. David Epstein and Jim both

indicated that Jack Housenger was willing to identify a representative. Mike Page offered Bob McNally as a possible candidate.

## **2. Online/Distance Education Survey of PSEPs and SLAs – Status; Team Discussion of Key Questions**

Carol Black explained that the 2010 paper by the Certification Training and Assessment Group (CTAG) - [Pesticide Applicator Recertification: Online Training –Course Design and Structure](#) was written to help those preparing online/DE courses for recertification credit. However, SLAs are now getting requests for less traditional internet offerings, e.g. GoToMeeting, Google Hangouts, national/regional webinars, one-on-one training. CTAG wants to assist in evaluating these new options. In addition, the 25 Goal 1 states are required to assess the PSEP's current or potential use of on-line/DE. A first draft survey will go to CTAG, AAPSE, AAPCO, the Stakeholder Team and the Goal 1 PSEP and SLA reps within the next week, with 30 days to provide edits and comments. Questions will involve types of training (synchronous vs asynchronous, proctored vs non-proctored), proof of active participation, SLA approval criteria, PSEP/SLA collaboration, etc. Target month to send the survey out is May, with a summary presentation at the 2015 [PACT meeting](#). Kerry Richards and Jim Burnette reiterated that proof of active participation is a challenge, and Jim added that proof of identity was also critical. Carol Black mentioned that a participant having to submit random codes located within a presentation was one example of mechanisms for proof of active participation.

The PSEP-IMI business plan and the EPA proposal to change the Certification of Pesticide Applicators Regulation are among the many [topics](#) that will be discussed at PACT. Kerry Richards said there would be tours on the first day. Thia Walker asked how the business plan topic would be handled; Carol Black replied that it would be an overview (an actual workshop is being held at the Southern Region PSEP meeting on June 3 AM in Lexington, KY). Carol Black noted that Goal 1 states would also be offered a forum to meet and talk about challenges, etc. on Thursday afternoon after PACT ends.

## **3. PSEP Educational Resource Priority Needs List**

Background and proposed next steps were covered by Carol Somody:

PSEPs have increasing educational resource needs (topics, format, audience, etc.) There are also 25 states pursuing a time-intensive three-year goal to become more robust and sustainable (Goal 1), which makes it very difficult for them to assist in resource development.

The PSEP-IMI password-protected website, which is in development, will only be accessible to 50-100 people (all LGU PSEP coordinators and/or their second in command). There are four compilers (one/USDA region) contacting all PSEPs for resources that they are willing to post on the website (or, at least, to post a description

of the resource and contact information). There will actually be three categories of resources on the website:

- 1) Existing resources that are subject to the conditions of use specified by the owner of the resource.
- 2) Enhanced resources created with PSEP-IMI funding that are subject to the conditions of use specified by the owner of the resource.
- 3) New resources created with PSEP-IMI funding that can be customized, extracted, etc. by PSEPs, but ONLY for their use and use by land-grant university and state lead agency partners who assist them with pesticide safety education.

New resources (item 3) currently allow no copyright by any entity of the university. Carol has asked that the copyright issue for new resources be revisited, for PSEPs utilizing these resources to create state-specific versions, and desiring to copyright their customized versions. We realize that some of you copyright, and the reasons. So the funders will be discussing a process with CLA legal counsel, whereby a PSEP can copyright their customized versions, if desired.

PROPOSED next steps were then outlined on the call, and comments on this process are requested from Team members:

- a) A first draft PSEP Educational Resource Priority Needs List will be sent to the 50 PSEP coordinators. These individuals will be asked to review, modify, and prioritize the list, from their perspective. Proposed needs should have flexibility for use in core, category, and recertification training. Remember that the registrants cannot see what is compiled on the password-protected website, or what individual PSEPs have “behind-the-scenes”, so there is a great need for PSEPs to respond so that priority needs can be accurately assessed. (Attachment 2 contains the resources in development under RFP#1 - also posted on <http://psep.us/>)
- b) A second draft will be circulated to the 50 PSEP coordinators for review and comment before finalizing the list.
- c) The PSEPs will then be asked to indicate if they have any resources similar to what is on the Priority Needs List, which they are willing (with funding) to nationalize for the password-protected website.
- d) Discussions will be held with PSEPs prior to funding of priority needs (done by PSEPs or Extension experts under their supervision).

#### **4. Other**

Attachment 3 is a draft Summary of Stakeholder Team Activities for 2014 – please send any edits.

Goal 1 PSEPs and SLAs should have received meeting announcements for the next two optional Goal 1 teleconferences sponsored by the Steering Committee of the National Stakeholder Team. The Steering Committee is also willing to assist compilers or PSEPs who are being contacted by compilers, if there are questions.

The 25 Goal 1 states have been provided with some information that may be of interest to other PSEPs that are concerned about their sustainability, for example:

- Draft Talking Points - Engaging Potential Members of State Stakeholder Teams
- How the CPARD database can help PSEP determine its audiences

Contact someone on the Team's Steering Committee if you would like this information.

Carol thanked everyone on the team who is working to strengthen the LGU PSEPs – she counted 70 members of the team that are currently spending significant time on these efforts, in one or more ways; plus there is an greatly expanded network of Goal 1 advisory committee and stakeholder team members.

Paul Andre noted that, as team members look at resources, online training, etc., they should avoid only looking to the future – anything developed must be backward compatible (e.g. some growers won't use computers) and resources must be easy to read.

Mickey Taylor agreed and said that there are still many farmers with barely a 6<sup>th</sup> grade education.

Mike Wierda indicated that Arizona recently had its first Goal 1 stakeholder team meeting, and that it was suggested that a sales pitch/elevator speech be prepared for stakeholder team members – why PSEP is important, etc. Members of the AZ stakeholder team understood that PSEP funding was being cut, and believed that some organizations would be willing to support PSEP.

Mike also indicated that there was a new FASEB journal article on ADHD and pesticides (<http://www.fasebj.org/content/early/2015/01/27/fj.14-260901.full.pdf>).

Jim summarized the key points of the meeting and Team action steps, and adjourned the meeting.