**National School IPM Working Group Joint Steering and Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes, Monday, February 2nd at 11:30am CT**

1. **Roll:** Dawn Gouge, Janet Hurley, Kathy Murray, Deborah Young, Fudd Graham, Lesley Deem, Tim Stock, Michael Herring, Sherry Glick, Russell Noratel, Herb Bolton, Thomas Green, Mariel Snyder and Lauire Brajkovich
2. **Educational Component: IPM for Schools Videos**

Lauire Brajkovich is the program lead and supervisor for California Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR)'s School IPM Program. Laurie has fifteen years of experience in managing environmental compliance both in private industry and with state regulatory agencies. She has been working at DPR on the School IPM Program for the past 5 years. DPR’s School IPM Program facilitates the voluntary adoption of IPM policies and programs in schools throughout California, and assists school districts with their implementation of the Healthy Schools Act. She joined our call discuss her experience creating school IPM videos with DPR and the feedback and challenges that came up.

1. **How did you decide on content for the videos and the design/set-up?**

All the content of the videos were based on the in-person school IPM workshops the DPR has hosted since 2002. Topics included pests that have been a main concern for school districts in California, basic how-to of IPM and how to work with a contractor. All of the videos cover how to comply with the Healthy Schools Act.

1. **What was this process like, how long did it take?**

This project came down through the executive office and began in August 2013. DPR did not write any scripts, but worked off outlines and basic information they wanted covered. They also contracted with a video company, which ended up being one of the biggest challenges. They requested information through the state of California and received answers on pricing and time estimates. This information was used to write proposals. State contracting is long and tedious; it took 6 months to get the contract finalized.

DPR also needed to find schools to shoot the films at and eventually two schools volunteered. However, because they were filming in the summer there were only a small number of children to use in the videos and it was difficult to get parent permission.

1. **Were the films expensive to make?**

Laurie was unable to give us a specific number, but used the following comparison. In-person training classes run on a $15,000 grant and reach about 45 people. This price is relatively cheap when you do the cost break out. However, when comparing a 45 people audience to 5,000 hits on YouTube, then the break out is more expensive. Laurie said it was definitely worth the money.

1. **What were some challenges faced while making the films?**

Contracting was DPR’s biggest challenge. However, volunteer recruitment was a close second. The video company wanted volunteers to make full day commitments, which volunteers cannot always do. DPR tried to get contracts in place in order to pay individuals willing to stay all day, but this did not work out because of bidders.

Another challenge was finding actors. They settled on an actor but a week before filming he dropped out because of a union conflict. Union actors and non-union actors do not work together.

Laurie said that if they were to do it over again they would ask that contractors to send in the type of animation they intend to use for your project. It is great to see their past work, but unless they are willing to send you an idea of what they plan to do on your project, it is hard to tell what the end product will look like. Another suggestion from Laurie is to make the contractor pay all site fees and insurance. One other lesson learned was that filming is fast paced, a total of 15 days, 10 hours a day, filming nonstop. Details are overlooked and scenes had to be cut.

**Sherry question**: EPA region 9, match funding?

**Laurie:** the project was funded by end of year funds.

1. **What feedback have you received so far?**

Feedback from viewers has included that the videos were informative, engaging, easy to access, motivate you and make IPM seem easy.

1. **Plans for other films?**

DPR does not have any plans to make other videos in the near future. If they were to make another set, topics would include squirrels and birds.

1. **Plans for other School IPM projects in the near future?**

DPR’s next big project is to develop interactive training modules that include quizzes and a final test. There will be three levels: basic, intermediate and advanced. They will use Captivate software to make the modules engaging and incorporate video clips.

Tom question: are you able to track where YouTube viewers are from?

Laurie: Paul Verke deals with most of this information. If a person is logged into their YouTube account, then you can tell their gender, age and where they are logging in from. However, YouTube statistics seems to lag as to when information is available.

Janet question: What were the two school districts used in the videos?

Laurie: Modesto City Schools and Livermore Unified School District.

Tom question: will the training modules be free to users?

Laurie: yes, the three modules will be financially supported under the Healthy Schools Act.

Tom question: can people out of state participate?

Laurie: yes, modules should be up by January 2016.

Laurie stated that the courses will be interactive and timed so an individual cannot move onto the next slide until a certain amount of time has passed. The final exam at the end of the module will determine whether you receive a certificate. The modules have to last at least an hour in length, but may be a little longer.

Tom question: is Captivate software a onetime fee or are you charged per used?

Laurie: We bought the software for $600. It is much like power point; it is just software to help you build the course. Once the modules are made, they will be uploaded onto a site hosted by the university. The university uses different software that works in tandem with the Captivate software to assist with statistical analysis. Captivate is Adobe.

Laurie stated that starting this year the DPR will have all data of pesticide use for all school districts in California. They will be reviewing that data over the next several years and determining how they can improve IPM in schools. Laurie works on School IPM, CEU and review and audit classes, technical licensing projects, exams, study guides and any legislation that involves licensing. Two more long-term position will be instated at DPR, mandated in legislation this July.

1. **Stop School Pests**

We are in the final stages of reviewing the Custodian, Grounds, Facility Manager, Admin, Food and Teacher Modules. The Nurse and Maintenance modules are expected to be complete and ready for review by the end of the month.

We will receive the NPMA updated booklet and questions in mid-February and begin creating the exam and quiz questions for the individual roles.

Dawn stated that the largest responses of feedback for the modules have come from PMPs who are questioning why there are no training materials for them to review specific to their role. Dawn suggested creating training materials for the PMP role that would encourage PMPs to participate in the NPMA material.

1. **SIPM at IPM Symposium**

The schedule has been released for the IPM Symposium school sessions.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Thurs. March 26 9:45-10:45 | Thurs. March 26 11:00-12:00 | Thurs. March 26 1:45-2:45 | Thurs. March 26 3:00-4:00 |
| 12 - Tools for Successful IPM in Schools and Childcare Centers: Collaborating Resources for National IPM Training Program and Best Management Practices - (1/4) - Dawn Gouge, Lynn Braband | 31 - Tools for Successful IPM in Schools and Childcare Centers: Measuring, evaluating verifiable School IPM (2/4) L.C. Fudd Graham, Janet Hurley, Kaci Buhl | 19 - Tools for Successful IPM in Schools and Childcare Centers: Improving Environmental Health and Literacy through School IPM Partnerships (4/4) Kathy Murray, Ruth Kerzee, Seth Dibblee | 21 Glick (school IPM-3/4) |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Smart, Sensible and Sustainable Approach to Implementing Your School IPM Program (WorkingSession) Abstract below: |  |  |
| In EPA’s efforts to continue building the business case for a successful school IPM program, we are inviting experts from State university extensions  who provide educational programs and problem-solving assistance to citizens that are based on years of research and experience, school district officials who make critical decisions about sensitive issues with many variables including incorporating pest management strategies,  and other leading School IPM advocates to join us in a working session.  By implementing IPM, EPA has a goal to realize fewer pests, reduced pesticide applications, possible money savings and improved environmental health for the nation’s most precious resource, our children . Come prepared to share your documented examples and success stories! Protecting children’s health is a top priority at EPA. We recommend schools use integrated pest management (IPM) - a Smart, Sensible, and Sustainable approach to pest control. Smart because IPM creates a safer and healthier learning environment by managing pests and reducing children’s exposure to pests and pesticides. Sensible since practical strategies are used to reduce sources of food, water, and shelter for pests in school buildings and grounds. Sustainable because the emphasis is on prevention that makes it an economically advantageous approach. | | |

Also, our Steering Committee/Stop School Pests meeting will take place **March 24th, Tuesday evening from 6:30 – 8:30 PM. Location TBD.** Please send Dawn your agenda item requests.

1. **2020 School IPM Strategic Plan**

Almost all the reviewed sections have been sent in and are incorporated into the Strategic Plan.

1. **Regional Updates** 
   1. **North Central**

Unfortunately the NC grant was not renewed so work on the NC working group calls will no longer take place and the School IPM eNewsletter will no longer be released. Funding has been down in the NC region and our national initiatives (Steering Committee class and School IPM eNewsletter) were not seen to align with the North Central goals.

* 1. **Northeastern**

Kathy is working on her turf-seeding project. The Northeastern working group continues to hold calls as needed, working independently and together.

* 1. **Western**

Tim is working on coordinating school IPM training. Dawn is preparing for a number of trainings coming up as well.

* 1. **Southern**

School IPM is doing well in Texas, training for 2015 will start on the 18th and 19th. EPA Centers of Expertise personnel will attend the two-day training and Janet is reviewing some of the Stop School Pests modules to integrate into the second day of training to gain some initial feedback. We are still waiting to hear on our workgroup proposal.

Next call: **Monday, March 2nd at 11:30am CT**