School IPM Outcome Summary

Plan Name: School IPM

Plan Originator: Janet Hurley
Team Members: Michael E. Merchant, Don Renchie

County/Unit Name: Entomology and AG & Environmental Safety

Report Type: Final

1. Relevance/Issue Description. Includes scope and severity of the issue. Justification for why the plan was conducted. Include use of PACs/task forces or other volunteer groups involved in the issue identification.
Since 1995. all Texas public schools are required by state law to conduct all indoor and outdoor pest control activities according to integrated pest management (IPM) principles. Under current state law every public school district must appoint an IPM Coordinator. Under this law the IPM Coordinator is required to attend a six-hour training class to become a certified to oversee the school districts IPM program. Coordinator training must consist of information about Texas Structural Pest Control Board law and regulations, basic principals of IPM, and pesticide safety. Potential benefits of school IPM programs include improved indoor air quality, reduction of pesticide exposures among students and staff, and improved pest control. Another benefit of the school IPM program team is personal assistance with developing and improving the school IPM program. While the state requires that IPM Coordinators receive 6 hours of training, the law and regulations do not provide adequate assistance to IPM Coordinators needing guidance about their program and specific pest problems, the Southwest Technical Resource Center for IPM in Schools offers personal assistance to any school district in Texas. There are currently 4.3 million students in 7,824 campuses and 1,036 school districts around the state.

2. Target Audience.
Administrators, IPM Coordinators, Maintenance & Operations personnel, pest management professionals
Each independent school district must appoint an IPM Coordinator. This position is anyone from Superintendent to a grounds or maintenance workers.

3. Response or what educational activities, events, and/or experiences were delivered to address the issue described above.
• **Conduct 4 regional trainings throughout state, plus individually requested training** • **Maintain school IPM website with technical resources available** • **Bi-monthly newsletter – School Pest News** • **School site audits – onsite (in-district) training**

- **IPM Budget Calculator – training and introduction to the new software development**
- **School IPM statewide survey – mail and face-to-face interviews**

ADD ADDITIONAL DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION ON EDUCATIONAL RESPONSE – OPTIONAL

In 2006, we conducted 4 regional two-day IPM Coordinator trainings and 5 independent one-day IPM Coordinator training. Trained 125 individuals for day 1 and 76 on day 2. Evaluation results for Day 1 are listed below.

The school IPM website averages 1,500 distinct host served each month. With approximately 1.5 GB of data transferred each month, this includes downloads of the newsletter and IPM forms like inspection reports.

School Pest News was distributed to 1,050 members four times in 2006.

The majority of school site audits occurred in conjunction with the face-to-face interviews from the school IPM survey.

The IPM Budget Calculator was demonstrated to 84 individuals with the majority of the trainings done in conjunction with our two-day IPM Coordinator training.

The school IPM statewide survey was sent to 1,036 school districts, with 555 responding. Overall, the mandated law for school IPM in Texas shows that schools are in compliance with the law almost 90% or more in most areas of the regulations. However, there is room for improvement in the areas of non-chemical control measures, understanding low-toxicity products, and the importance of monitoring in an IPM program. From the face-to-face interviews it was shown that IPM Coordinators can not adequately document how much chemical has been used at each service visit. Many of the pest control service tickets do not always contain all the information needed to make that determination. Many service tickets are instead invoices only indicating when the school was serviced. In other cases treatments were made when there was no indication of a pest.

4. Partnerships and Collaborators.

INSERT COLLABORATORS FROM PLAN HERE: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Texas Department of Agriculture, Texas Structural Pest Control Board, Texas Pest Control Association, Texas Association of School Boards (TASB), and Texas Association of School Business Officials (TASBO).

ADD TEXT ON INVOLVEMENT OF COLLABORATORS AND/OR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION HERE

5. Evaluation Strategy.

INSERT OUTCOME INDICATOR FROM PLAN HERE: Skill - knowledge

An evaluation instrument will be given as a measure of pre and post knowledge of IPM and Texas Structural Pest Control Board regulations. Skills will also be measured through demonstration teaching during our regional IPM Coordinator training.

6. Results/What happened as a result of this program.

LIST YOUR EVALUATION RESULTS HERE:

LIST YOUR PARTICIPANT QUOTES HERE:
Demonstration – reading & understanding labels, all area's were concise; very informative; great program; instructors with lecturing on presentations and not just a video; the preparation of the instructors and ability to answer questions; being able to understand the program and content; the instructors work well together – different teaching styles; the information provided applies practically to what I do; just keep hammering the basic info – we tend to 'forget' some of the details. It was very information and not rushed, speakers took time to make sure everything was understood.

7. Summary of program benefits. Include any social, environmental, and economic impacts as a result of the program.

WRITE YOUR RESULTS AND IMPACTS STATEMENTS HERE:
For the calendar year 2006 the SWTRC trained 197 school personnel from 130 school districts and 9 pest control companies in IPM principles. The http://schoolipm.tamu.edu web site has had a broad impact to a wider audience receiving an average 1,500 distinct host served each month, this is an increase of 500 responses from 2003. The bi-monthly newsletter which started in August 2002 has a current readership of 1,055 members. When this newsletter first started it had 300 members. Each year this number increases in two ways, the first in through our regional school IPM trainings and the second is through individuals who visited the school IPM website. The overwhelming response from schools to this newsletter has been favorable, they notice when we miss an issue and there are always individuals who respond to each edition of the newsletter with favorable comments.

The Southwest Technical Resource Center impacts school districts throughout Texas by offering support for the IPM coordinator for the school district, plus offer information to pest control companies contracting with schools. Many of our clientele inform us that without our support and dedication to delivering quality educational programs and our support, they would not be successful in their jobs.

8. Acknowledgements (List committee members, others who helped, those who gave support, etc.)

LIST ANY ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS HERE:
Jerry Millsaps, IPM Coordinator, Safety & Environmental Coordinator, Lubbock ISD
Ray Brown, IPM Coordinator, Conroe ISD
Dixie Mathews, Custodial Supervisor and IPM Coordinator, Arlington ISD
Walter "Buster" Terry, Grounds and Custodial Supervisor, Corpus Christi ISD we would like to thank these individuals for their assistance and cooperation for hosting our 2006 regional IPM

Coordinator training.

9. Future Program Actions

WRITE YOUR PLANS FOR FUTURE ACTIONS HERE: