

Notes from the Tennessee School IPM Advisory Board Meeting

Porter Building Conference Room,
Tennessee Department of Agriculture,
Nashville, TN
28 July 2014

After reviewing the goals of and tools provided by the University of Tennessee Extension School Integrated Pest Management (IPM) program (see agenda below), we asked the stakeholders present to answer the following questions. The questions were asked with the purpose of improving adoption of the school IPM program in all schools by 2015 in accordance with the National PMSP's (Pest Management Strategic Plan). After answers were provided, we then asked stakeholders to rank the answers using stickers. Points for answers were determined by summing the value of stickers placed by an answer: first choice (red sticker) = 3 points, second choice (orange sticker) = 2 points and third choice (green sticker) = 1 point. Below are the questions and the top three answers for each question as well as a summary of other answers.

1. Why aren't more schools participating in school IPM demonstrations?

Answers:

- I. Accountability ; schools are not required to report to any agency or authority - 20 pts
- II. Budget restraints - 16 points
- III. Low priority - 8 points

Other answers included that service in an IPM program cost more and there is a lack of understanding on the part of schools of the service differential and secondly that the IPM program takes more time and that there may be a lack of willingness to do the work

2. What can be done to encourage schools to participate?

Answers:

- I. Require recordkeeping and IPM - 14 points
- II. More emphasis from Tennessee government on using IPM in schools - 10 points
- III. Recommend certification in school IPM to pest management professional - 8 points

Other answers suggested providing data to convince schools why they should participate and mandating the practice of school IPM.

3. Will a subcategory 7 certification (This would be additional training for commercial pesticide applicators with a certification in Industrial, Institutional, and Structural & Health Related Pest Control with emphasis on applying IPM principles in schools) increase the use of IPM in schools?

Answers:

- I. Possibly; this is a way to educate - 18 points

- II. Maybe, depends on bid criteria; if the school does not require the use of IPM in the bid, then the certification won't matter - 13 points

Four respondents listed yes, this option would definitely increase the use of IPM in schools, but did not vote for them.

4. What stakeholder groups have we neglected to include in the process and how do we increase their participation?

Answers:

- I. Pest control operators - 11 points
- II. Appeal to parent groups to help create changes; educate them while educating school administration - 10 points
- III. Two answers tied for third place: 1) School nurses- attend Tennessee Association of School Nurses 9 points 2) the suggestion to educate stakeholders, but mandate the adoption of school IPM if education does not work - 9 points

Other responses included educating legislatures and exploring mandates. Darrell Hensley added science teachers after reviewing the minutes.

5. What additional content should be included in the newsletter?

Answers:

- I. Keep us up to date on new problems and concerns - 24 points
- II. Report on the results of work with demonstration sites - 10 points
- III. Keep us up to date on new issues 8 points

6. What additional content should be included on the school IPM website?

Answers:

- I. A video on a successful IPM program in Tennessee - 21 points
- II. Link to Tennessee Department of Agriculture Online Pesticide System - 6 points
<http://agriculture.tn.gov/>

Darrell Hensley added [Pesticide Safety Education Program](http://psep.utk.edu), psep.utk.edu as a link.

Below are the issues or comments that arose during Dr. Vail's overview of the school IPM program.

School personnel apply pesticides not realizing that this is against the law. How do we increase awareness of this issue?

How is eating in the classroom or outside of the cafeteria handled? Many schools have a breakfast in the classroom program. As long as garbage is emptied daily, desks are wiped and floors are swept or mopped, there appears to be no problem with an increase in pests.

The age of the school has to be taken into account when dealing with pests; older buildings tend to have more nooks and crannies for pest to hide. Often openings are left in ceiling or

walls after pumping repairs are made or wiring for new technology is added. Buildings deteriorate as they age.

School absence cannot be linked to asthma cause because of the privacy issue so there is not really a good way to link the practice of school IPM to the health of individuals with asthma and allergies. However, days absent could be calculated on a county wide basis and data could be compared from counties that use IPM to those that do not.

Head lice are a very emotional issue. Perhaps we need more education on what can be done to reduce the risk of spread from child to child. One stakeholder reported that problems with air quality after spraying for lice led to cancellation of school on a Monday even though spraying was done on the weekend. Spraying a school for head lice is not necessary; at most the lice live only a day or two off a host.

Information on the Quality Pro certification administered by the National Pest Management Association mentioned during the meeting may be found here:

<http://npmaqualitypro.com/WhatIS/>. They do have a certification program for schools (<https://www.npmaqualitypro.org/qualitypro-schools/>).

Schools choose pest control companies with low bids and retain them until the number of complaints escalates beyond tolerance. The program is hard to implement; perhaps work with purchasing agents would help. The UT school IPM program did conduct regional meetings for purchasing officers in the past. Practicing school IPM may be a budgetary issue. Maybe it is cheaper to spray than to do repairs. Ms. Barnwell pointed out that while IPM may be more costly initially because of needed repairs over the long run IPM is not more expensive.

Opinions varied on requiring a certification in subcategory 7 (a certification in Industrial, Institutional, and Structural & Health Related Pest Control with emphasis on applying IMP principles in schools) for pest management professional working in schools. Some thought that there are enough regulations in place and that obtaining a certification in subcategory 7 should be voluntary. Others thought if education of stakeholders involved in procuring and applying pest management in schools has not convinced them to practice IPM in schools, mandating that pest management professionals be certified in subcategory 7 before servicing schools may be a good option.

Lastly noted was a grant proposal to work on the ecology of the vectors responsible for La Crosse encephalitis. Incidence of La Crosse encephalitis has increased in the Southern Appalachian region, researchers would like to determine what factors have contributed to the rise. For more information on La Crosse see <http://www.cdc.gov/LAC/index.html>.

If the grant is funded, the school IPM program would work with school facility managers to inform them of practices to put in place to reduce mosquito breeding habitat. The team would also develop mosquito prevention and control educational materials that would be distributed to students and parents. If a LaCrosse Virus rapid detection assay is developed, the school IPM team will work with school personnel to develop a sustainable monitoring program.

We thank Carrie Lykins, UT Communications Specialist, Entomology & Plant Pathology, for assisting with the ZOOM online presentation.

Agenda for the School IPM Advisory Board Meeting

Monday, July 28, 2014

Tennessee Department of Agriculture
Porter Building
436 Hogan Road
Nashville, TN 37220
(Phone 615-837-5150)

Karen Vail
Chair, TN School IPM Advisory Board
Professor and Extension Urban Entomologist
Entomology and Plant Pathology
2505 EJ Chapman Drive
370 Plant Biotechnology Building
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37996-4560
kvail@utk.edu
<http://schoolipm.utk.edu>
(865)974-7138
(865)974-8868 FAX

- 1:30 CST Introductions: Board Members & UT YEAH
Introduction to School IPM
Update of UT Extension Efforts to Increase IPM Adoption in Tennessee
- 1:45 Discuss amending *Suggested Guidelines for Managing Pests in Tennessee's Schools: Adopting Integrated Pest Management* (http://schoolipm.utk.edu/documents/ipm_SCHOOLSmanual_pb1603.pdf) for use in conjunction with the Industrial, Institutional, Structural and Health Related Pest Manual, PB 1732, as a supplemental training guide for pest management professionals (PMPs) working in Tennessee schools.
- 2:00 LaCrosse Encephalitis: History in East TN and Grant Proposal
- 2:30 Break
- 2:45 Stakeholder Input: What can we do to promote and improve the school IPM program in Tennessee?
- 3:30 Conclude

Stakeholders present

Name	Affiliation
Carter Garner	Tennessee Department of Health, Division of Environmental Health
Darrell Hensley	Pesticide Safety Education Program (PSEP) University of Tennessee (UT) Extension
Phil Hurst	Tennessee Department of Agriculture (TDA)
Robert Leslie	Williamson County Schools and Tennessee School Plant Management Association
Larry Moorehead	Moore County UT Extension
Kevin Sherrill	Sherrill Pest Control
Sara Smith	Tennessee Coordinated School Health Program
Rachel Sumner	NosprayNashville
Pat Barnwell	UT School IPM Program, Entomology & Plant Pathology
Karen Vail	UT School IPM Program, Entomology & Plant Pathology