NE School IPM Working Group Priorities

Ranked by NE School IPM Working Group members via on-line survey conducted June 2010

School I	School IPM MANAGEMENT (implementation) needs that should receive priority for		
funding and implementation in the Northeast, listed in descending order of importance.			
Rank			
1	Identify and piggyback with ongoing environmental health efforts and coordinate with partners in promoting IPM to help schools (including child care facilities, private and public pre K-12 schools) to meet health, high performance and safety, economic, and energy efficiency goals.		
2	At school district and/or local school level, establish or use existing diverse local stakeholder committees to advocate for policies and procedures that implement proven IPM strategies and practices.		
3	Track adoption of IPM practices in schools and disseminate economic, environmental and/or health impacts of IPM (eg case studies, research data).		
3	Assist schools in prioritizing major pest management needs especially with current budgetary constraints.		
4	Form a stakeholder coalition to advocate for establishment of IPM laws and policies where none exist.		
5	Implement and enforce existing laws and policies at the highest level of economic and regulatory accountability.		
6	Recognize schools, organizations and pest management providers that practice verifiable high level IPM.		
	comments (submitted by individual members):		
	Biggest priority should be to assist in the transfer of existing information to schools, school districts, and states that do not currently use IPM without the seemingly wasteful need for re-invention of existing successful programs. It seems we spend a lot of time coming up with the same IPM programs and call it development and implementation, when all it is re-issuing of accepted and known successful programs.		
	local, regional and national efforts are all necessary		

School IPM RESEARCH needs that should receive priority for funding and implementation		
in the Northeast, listed in descending order of importance.		
Rank		
1	Identify efficacious least-risk products and tools to manage pests.	

2	Evaluate building design, construction, renovation, and maintenance criteria (such as 'green buildings', LEED(Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design), LEED for Schools EB (Existing Buildings), CHPS (Coalition of High Performing Schools), EPA(Environmental Protection Agency) Tools for Schools (Indoor Air Quality), HealthySEAT (School Environmental Assessment Tool), sports fields and landscape design criteria, etc) for presence of IPM principles and practices and rates of adoption and provide recommendations for inclusion of IPM principles/tactics in these criteria.
3	Compile data/information on effects of pesticides and pests on children's health and academic performance, and the influence of IPM in addressing health and performance indicators.
4	Evaluate efficacy and risk/benefits of EPA-exempt (25b) products.
5	Research on the impact of pest management on indoor and outdoor school environmental health (eg school's well water, school gardens, use on adjacent properties).
6	Develop analysis tools and conduct in-depth inspections of schools to determine what pest management practices are really being used.
7	Research and evaluate outreach methods to determine most effective methods for school/community audiences.
8	Compile, update, and evaluate state requirements and resources for school IPM.
9	Research effective teaching methods to teach students and teachers about IPM
	Comments (submitted by individual members):
	Right now the biggest need is to identify what "green" school/building/program initiatives are compatible with IPM and in what ways. For instance, is composting outside of facilities compatible with an IPM approach if it attracts more pests to schools which are limited in their response to the pests?
	Research on impact of pest management on environmental health should include 25b products. The outcome of this research should identify least-risk products and tools too.

School IPM REGULATION needs that should receive priority for funding and		
implementation in the Northeast, listed in descending order of importance.		
Rank		
1	Identify and promote interagency cooperation among regulatory, environmental,	
	health, insurance, education, and other agencies.	
2	Enforce existing IPM laws and policies, at the level of fiduciary and regulatory	
Z	accountability, and establish these laws and policies where none exist.	
2	Incorporate IPM into school wellness legislation.	
3	Encourage states to adopt certification programs for indoor and outdoor school	
	IPM providers.	

4	Evaluate regulatory approaches to use of EPA exempt (25b) products and determine if these products are accessible for use by schools under existing state and federal regulations.
5	Review Pesticide Safety Education core standards and make recommendations to include IPM principles and practices.
6	Advocate for change at federal level (SEPA: School Environmental Protection Act, NCLB: No Child Left Behind, HHPS Act).
7	Advocate for funds for enforcement of pesticide regulations
8	Quantify costs to regulatory agencies for enforcement of school IPM regulations.
9	Include students and teachers in OSHA-like protections.

School I	School IPM EDUCATION/OUTREACH needs that should receive priority for funding an		
implementation in the Northeast, listed in descending order of importance.			
Rank			
1	Develop and utilize educational methods appropriate for the audience (for example for facilities directors, administrators, teachers, rural, suburban and urban audiences) and conduct outreach to all stakeholder groups (teachers, athletic managers and coaches, staff, students, facilities managers, administration, policy makers, regulators, vendors, building owners, occupants, community members, families).		
2	Implement/promote K-12 curriculum-based education. Promote IPM Service Learning for example using school buildings/grounds and community settings. Promote inclusion of IPM in education standards.		
3	Outreach to schools and the public about turf management options that are sustainable, organic, and/or use IPM management practices.		
4	Conduct pilot demonstrations in schools in the northeast region.		
5	Educate policy makers about the needs and benefits of IPM in terms of dollars, health, environment and academic performance. Advocate for funds for IPM education.		
6	Coordinate and piggyback education efforts with parallel efforts (ie 'Tools for Schools' type programs).		
7	Work with vendors of pest management, custodial services and supplies and other services to provide IPM education, supplies and service.		
8	Educate school IPM coordinators/facilities director on how to interpret service tickets/invoices from pest control providers. Develop model IPM service records for use in promoting easily understood and comprehensive service records including non-pesticide solutions.		
9	Improve linkages between regulatory agencies and Cooperative Extension.		
10	Promote inclusion of IPM lessons into teacher education programs at universities.		
	Comments (submitted by individual members):		

addressing the first item in the list should include 1) IPM lessons for teacher education at universities, 2) educating policy makers, 3) sustainable turf practices, 4) K-12 education, and more.