

## **NCERA-222 Annual Meeting 2015**

Notes recorded by Daren Mueller, Iowa State University  
Reviewed, edited, and approved by committee members

@ IPM Symposium in Salt Lake City, UT  
March 23, 2015

NIFA National Meeting with all regional committees – Welcome from Marty

Introductions – individuals, names & states/tiles

### **ARDP – Bob Nowerski**

- 67 proposals; 18 funded
- ARDP – annual proposals; EIP every three years; RCP every 4 years
- Proposal deadline 4/7/2015; \$4M available; \$175K - \$300K

### **Smith-Lever – Marty Draper**

- Priority Area Comparison – get table from Marty (pic taken)
- 2014 Primary Program Area Priorities
- EIP continuations Mid-May RFA to each PD
- Application should only describe FY2015 activities
- File progress report as soon as possible within the 90 days
- No cost extensions → only at the end of the award (not midterm)
- Only need to file a budget for that 1 year

### **Regional Coordination Program Area (RCP) – Herb Bolton**

- Increasing Collaboration & Cooperation for IPM Outcomes & Impacts
- Integrating Extension & Research Activities: An Exploratory Study. Journal of Extension, Vol. 52, No. , Feb 2014 → described the different cultures within each community (Research & Extension. Opportunities in 4 years suggested by the research indicate the same areas that NIFA is implementing in CPPM)
- Increase in number of universities participating in the IPM Center coordination

### **Joe LaForest: Regional Integrated Pest Management Centers**

- Online communications
- Project management – Basecamp
- Impact Assessment – The Toolkit for Assessing IPM Outcomes & Impacts
- Newsletter generation & tracking – MailChimp
- Weather & Pest Models – USpest.org
- Content Delivery – Bugwood

### **NIFA Reporting Guidance & Tips – Herb**

- Tools – [nifa.usda.gov/tool/report](http://nifa.usda.gov/tool/report) → REEport Guide for Project Directors

- Progress Report – submit within 90 days AFTER anniversary OR 90 days BEFORE if you have a continuation
- IPM Project → KA 216 must put that in REEport in the Knowledge Area classification
- Final Report → take out all references to continuation, because the project has finished
- Use nontechnical language
- No images/tables.

### Discussion/Q&A

- Marty will send back REEports if they don't reflect what's needed. Make sure you put things in the appropriate sections
- Sue – also can help assist people with National & Regional Pest Alerts
- Advise for dealing with projects that have a lot of cooperators.
  - think about some of the things you're doing and how you can use other programs to supplement what you're doing
  - supplement with ARDP funding
  - supplement with AFRI funding
- Why are EIP applicants required to resubmit for funding every single year?
  - because of the funding mechanism. EIP is funded on an annual continuation basis. Don't have enough money to give the grant all in one year, so they do have to get the applications each year when they get their annual budgets.
  - Do we have to rewrite the application, or can we just copy and paste from the original
    - yes, if they're the same every year. If you've got changes in the program. If you have things broken out by year, then only include the stuff for that year.
    - “our hands are tied” → [it would be nice to know that they were actually working on trying to change things rather than just being paper-pushers]
    - what proportion of the Universities allowed the waiver of indirect costs? ~45%
    - Request to share the information about the waivers so that folks can share the information with their institutions

### Notes for Regional NCERA 222 meeting

**Attendees:** Franny Miller (chair), Jim Jasinski (vice chair), Daren Mueller (recorder), Jean Haley (more reliable recorder), Bob Wright, Suzanne Bissonette, Jaime Pinero, Lee Miller, Sue Ratcliffe, Lynnae Jess, Kelly Tillman, Connie Strunck, Pat Beauzey, Jan Knodel, Bryan Jensen, John Obermeyer, Bill Hutchison, Joy Landis, Larry Olsen, Rick Foster, Wendy Winterstein, Marty Draper

### NATIONAL IPM MEETING UPDATE – Jim Jasinski

- no official notes distributed
- ESCOP/ECOP discussion – we got representation on the committee
- See report online... Frank and Ed did not distribute notes.

## **USDA NIFA funding discussion**

### CPPM - EIP review

- 6 were outstanding (reduced by 5%), 3 were high (reduced by 36%), 3 were medium (reduced by 59%)
- overall NC region received more funding (southern region dropped in funding)
- part of the success was due to the citation of regional priorities

### ARDP (4 RIPM + PMAP) –

- NCIPM Center no longer manages RIPM program. It is now a national program; Bob Nowierski is now the lead.
- North Central Region lost several hundred thousand \$\$ based on # of proposals funded. Our region submitted the least amount of proposals and had the least amount be funded (2).
- Suggestion made by Sue to get the ARDP RFA out by October. Having it due in April, with only a 5 week turnaround is really hurting us.
  - o Marty – trying to get things through sooner, probably no October, but trying to at least get it out by December
  - o ARDP has an automatic no cost extension at the end of the 3 years, simply by notification from your grants management office
  - o Sue – biggest benefit this group could provide is to provide that list of priorities

### **Membership of the National IPM committee**

- Want formal members on the National IPM Coordinating Committee.
  - o There will be 3 voting members from this committee
  - o 3 members to be staggered, so that they don't just have a group come in and then leave.
  - o 3-year commitment to attend national IPM meeting. Funding will need to be provided by the individual, if no travel money, centers may be able to help). An email will be sent to IPM coordinators in case one of the three attendees cannot attend to identify the replacement. Additional members can attend, but will not be voting members at the meeting.
  - o No solution proposed if more than 1 person volunteers
- Larry Olson makes the motion to adopt the National IPM Meeting attendance policy
- Bob Wright seconds the motion
- Sue says she will make it work to help with travel to IPM meeting, if need be.

### **Sonny Ramaswamy update**

- 1 big thing: anything related to this program needs to have the NIFA stamp on it (not just USDA). NIFA needs to get the credit that it deserves.

- Search for the “official identifier” on the NIFA site
- There are no guidelines for such a request...but here are some basic points
  - o Don't over-credit NIFA if they don't have anything to do with it.
  - o Guidelines are quite cloudy if authors have split appointments or there are several authors.
  - o Use best judgment and contact national leader if you have questions. Be ready to explain why you didn't include it.
  - o Should include NIFA branding on websites if the website is related to your IPM program.
  - o Bottom line – if the publication or website will not be there without NIFA – then include the identifier.
  - o Marty is most interested in the Outcomes being completed. He won't send a report back because NIFA wasn't credited

### **Non-IPM symposium year meeting (?)**

3-day meeting structure that Jim VanKirk was proposing: 1 full day is NCERA-222, 2<sup>nd</sup> day is ARDP, 3<sup>rd</sup> day is Working Groups, when there is no national IPM symposium.

- Sue Ratcliffe has invited RIPM PIs in the past; ARPD PIs are a possibility now.
- Possibly look at GO TO MEETING as an option
- Is there an interesting HATCH project that needs to be shared with IPM coordinators?  
Can Marty provide us a list of possible projects?
- Mechanism for engaging researchers – offer up webinars though centers?
- Marty – addressing the sharing approach is the important piece.
- Note to future Vice Chairs: there are a lot of meetings that crop up that you need to attend. So the idea of consolidating the meetings is a good idea

### **ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT – Wendy Wintersteen**

#### **Critical issue for North Central region:**

1. Monarch Butterflies: Summer breeding ground of the monarch butterfly is in the north central region. The decline of this population is directly related to our increased control of weeds within these states. Milkweeds are the primary habitat. Different milkweed species have impacts. This is one critical issue we should be considering within our region.
2. Emerald Ash Borer (EAB): continues to spread.
3. Pesticide resistance and the vision of EPA for handling this issue

#### **Last year: meeting in Madison**

Hoping we would impact USDA policies. Had agreement with ESCOP/ECOP, and though had an agreement with USDA about not moving the consolidation lines.

- Not successful yet.
- Chance of growing funds is slim.
- This puts us in an adversarial position with NIFA – no one wants this!
- Letter sent requesting further clarification about why were we unsuccessful. See handout
- Positive note: funding lines look good in President's budget. Significant increase for competitive grants for AFRI proposed, not sure if it will stick.

#### Provided feedback to NIFA about the RFA

- Question about a how to increase the capacity of the review panels
- Reviewers need an adequate amount of time to review proposals. There wasn't much time to review them last year. Marty – 1 month to review 12 proposals. Couldn't extend it this time because of when they had to get them processed.
- Perhaps provide the panels with a list of things not to do (i.e., don't review this proposal on things that aren't in it)
- Marty – things that struck the panel:
  - o When they were clear about their evaluation plans and how evaluation was going to be pulled in (plan for evaluation)
  - o Clear objectives on what they want to accomplish. Hurt when the activities weren't clear and unclear how they related to the outcomes
  - o Specifics added (biggest criticism was that there was not information for about projects, how to get things done)
- Marty – they try to guide the reviewers, but they bring their own biases and are not always prepared. In the past, there have been efforts to bring in science/researchers, but that hasn't been a good experience for the researchers because the focus is on extension.

#### **FEEDBACK AND COMMENTS ON CPPM RFA, ARDP, renewals, and REEports**

##### Comments

- Frannie – wants more details on reviews, even positive reviews.
- Timing of release of RFP – try to get in a time that makes more sense (not field season) or have it out for a longer period of time

- Page length – 18 pages for EIP, CPPM, etc. Is this enough for a program – Recommendation was to keep narrative short so you don't exhaust reviewers; the capacity of the reviewers to absorb the information is limited. More pages won't help.
- Joy – liked the EIP this round – was less prescriptive.
- eXtension and RIPMC tech offerings (Joe LaForest presentation) – is this redundant? Why does USDA support eXtension and not groups that help IPM programs such as what Joe presented (e.g., Bugwood et al.)?
  - ➔ Herb: not really. And if you don't have any reason to include eXtension, then don't mention it. Have to support eXtension because they have to.
- Kelly T – every proposal goes through an evaluation specialist to review the logic model and evaluation component. Take advantage of Jean's expertise to help with those evaluation sections
  - ➔ write your narrative as if that's the only thing that someone might read
  - ➔ Reviewers: Primary, secondary, tertiary, and evaluators
- Jean can review evaluation sections of proposals ➔ Please give her at least a week turnaround, and assume that other states are doing the same.

How are ARDP focus areas identified?

- Strategic plans, feedback from stakeholders, Pest Management Strategic Plans, etc.

When will we get REEport notices?

- We will get a REEport notice in May – Second year paperwork due at that time.
- Don't delay getting reports in – USDA is very backed up...get them in before new awards from other USDA proposals.

Bob N. wants people to review proposals. Many are going to virtual reviews. Internet and equipment limitations

How do you present an on-going project in new EIP grants? Sustaining project? How do you build in a program that's already been established?

- Marty – it should be OK. Make sure the wording does not indicate that there is duplication.

## **CONTINUATION OF NCERA 222?**

Current project will need to have paperwork submitted

NCERA-222 discussion about whether or not continue to have this official committee. Bob Wright – nonofficial comm. won't have an administration rep, won't have the official connection with NIFA. Pro/con?

Marty – this is the same discussion that the Corn Disease Working Group committee had, because they were tired of the bureaucracy and paperwork. They decided that it wasn't worth it, but they continue to meet and they also put out an annual report.

#### Advantages to keep NCERA222

- This is the a great way for Extension to document that they are doing multistate work
- Small amount of travel for each state (if the state allows this)
- 25% of federal funds need to be multi-state (this contributes to this requirement)
- Improve communication
- NIFA representation
- Brings value to extension directors
- Some need to be part of a multi-state committee

#### Disadvantages to keep NCERA222

- Extra paperwork
- NIMMS does not fit this committee very well

#### Idea from Wendy – Modified NCERA 222

- Stop some of the excessive work we are doing.
  - o No need to have every state develop a lengthy report
  - o We could come to each meeting and say that each state will share 1 innovative approach to programming, and 1 outcome where they measured and outcome that others could use and share.
  - o Increase the capacity to do evaluation
  - o Emphasize Center's role

Jim Jasinski will write the new proposal – will send around draft for comments.

We can also write a proposal to NCIPM Center for a working group to facilitate a product on emerging issues – create a video on emerging issues.

Vote: Modified NCERA-222 wins

#### **REGIONAL PRIORITIES**

- Importance of this is that these priorities are used to cite importance of projects applying for funding
- Committee formed to attempt to revisit the priorities and slim them down a bit
- Daren's list – would like the priorities to line up with what NIFA was saying. Made the priorities broader and then listed focal areas.
- Worked on Google doc to finalize the list and posted it on Wiggiio

Where do we want to post the priorities?

- NCIPM Center
- Wiggio
- Remember to promote it from within the IPM specialists in each state.

### **Coordination and Collaboration: Challenges and Opportunities**

Possible roadbumps for collaboration

- Some states may have trouble with collaboration – for example, Illinois is going to have a problem very soon because there won't be any faculty soon
- Big problem with competitive grants context – reluctance to share information on what they're each working on.

Possible ways to facilitate multi-state collaboration

- Daren – would be interesting to know which kinds of facilities and resources other states have.
- Can the NCIPM Center develop a 1-pager on how we collaborate? The 1-pager can either be submit to Marty Draper to give to reviewers and/or put on the IPM webpage?
- Is there something that we could do as a group, like some of the other regional committees – like a publication or something
- Jean is available to do evaluation training in your states. Basic format has been to do general evaluation training in the first part and then looking specifically at your EIP proposals to develop work plans and instruments where possible. She can do a workshop for any EIP program, if they cover cost. Work plans and instruments being developed ahead of time.

Some federal grants and regional projects facilitate collaboration

- Ex., iPIPE - lead by Scott Isard has a new AFRI project
- Commodity group projects
- NCIPM Working Groups

Other thoughts

- o Helping people understand what IPM is – is there something we could do together to develop the elevator speech



- o Lynnae – we are still supporting the development of PMSPs and Crop Profiles. Lynnae can facilitate these. The PMSPs go a long way for grant proposals. PMSP also could be a Working Group project
- o Each IPM coordinator can contact other states to see how they can work together
- o 1994 Tribal colleges are a possibility for partnerships

## **BUSINESS MEETING**

Everybody needs to submit their state reports: 3 people still need to do it – post to Wiggiio

Approve 2014 Minutes

- Rick Foster moves to approve
- Frannie Miller seconds
- All votes were in favor

Elect the co-chair

- Pat Beauzay has been nominated
- Bob makes the motion and Susan seconded the motion to have Pat be vice-chair
- All votes were in favor

Set dates and location of 2016 meeting

- University of Kansas – Dr. Chip Taylor – Monarch Watch (everyone should sign up); Haskell University is also in Lawrence.
- Or Columbus, OH – March 22-23 or 23-24, 2016
- Or Mexico and monarch overwintering – education in-service – Jamie will check on logistics
  - January or February
  - May be a separate trip
  - Maybe there is a way that there is a connection/opportunity for some joint discussions with the gov't of Mexico on the Monarch Butterfly. It really comes down to no milkweed for them to reproduce.

## **NCERA 222 - 2014 Annual Committee Report**

Jim Jasinski, Ohio State University Extension, Chair

Reviewed by Patrick Beauzay, North Dakota State University, Vice Chair

May 10, 2015

1. Impact Nugget: A concise statement of advancements, accomplishments and impacts.

All 12 North Central state IPM programs have reported a tremendous variety of programming that encompasses both urban and rural audiences, field crop and specialty crop issues such as soybean cyst nematode, glyphosate resistance, and spotted wing drosophila, pesticide safety and education advancements, and new technological enhancements to IPM such as MyFields and Tree Doctor smartphone apps that have reached thousands of people.

2. New Facilities and Equipment. Include production areas, sensors, instruments, and control systems purchased/installed.

-None reported

3. Unique Project Related Findings. List anything noteworthy and unique learned this year.

There continues to be considerable work in the area of smartphone app development from several states, and a general interest in the application of Unmanned Aerial Vehicles in pest management, which is also being pursued by several states.

4. Accomplishment Summaries. Draft one to three short paragraphs (2 to 5 sentences each) that summarize research or outreach accomplishments that relate to the project objectives. Please use language that the general public can readily comprehend.

It is the charge of all 12 North Central state IPM programs to use multiple outlets and venues such as field days, workshops, and other training opportunities to annually provide the citizens of each state (growers, homeowners, Dept's. of Agriculture officials, Agricultural Chemical Industry representatives, commodity associations, and other stakeholders) with current pest management information relevant to their area of focus.

Examples of this include programs in field crops that cover soybean cyst nematode, current issues with herbicide tolerant weeds. In specialty crops, programs and monitoring for invasive species such as Brown Marmorated Stink Bug and Spotted Wing Drosophila are essential to protect small fruit crops. In urban settings, programs on bed bugs and pesticide safety are important to safeguard human health and exposure.

While it is difficult to accurately determine the number of clientele impacted across the North Central region, it would be fair to say the number would conservatively be several thousand people whose livelihoods and health are enhanced by IPM programming.

5. Impact Statements. Please draft 2 or 3 impact statement summaries related to the

project objectives. Statements should be quantitative when possible and be oriented towards the general public. This is perhaps the most difficult yet most important part of the report. One impact per state is listed, though others could be provided upon request.

**IA** - Several thousand farmers and ag professionals attended educational events across Iowa this past year. These events included the ICM Conference, Crop Advantage Series, Pesticide Applicator Training meetings, etc. We completed end-of-meeting surveys at most of these. As an example, from our ICM Conference, which had nearly 1,000 attendees, we asked a question about “estimating the increase in profits for your operation or your customer's, on a per acre basis, by using information from this conference.” The average response was nearly \$5 per acre.

**IL** - Snapshot of 4 months PSEP Training Clinics and attendance 11/2014 to 3/2015: Private Training Clinics (primarily for farmers) 15 of 18 clinics conducted 2,887 attendees (average: 192) Commercial Training Clinics 18 of 26 clinics conducted 6,875 attendees (average: 382) **90% of attendees will implement at least one improved pesticide safety practice.** Based on practice change survey.

**IN** - 2014 Crop Management Workshops (CMWs), all-day, winter IPM and agronomic meetings, held in different locations of the state had over 900 in attendance despite the polar-vortex challenges. Nearly 40% of the participants indicated that they make or influence pest management decisions on 10,000 or more acres and 45% of the attendees monitored customer fields at least once per month. 90% indicated they would use the information presented for the upcoming growing season while 73% have already implemented crop production/IPM strategies into their operation from ideas that originated at past CMWs. 91 percent of those attending said they would apply the information on pest identification and treatment decisions to next season's crops and 88% of the participants indicated they would share what they learned with co-workers and/or customers.

**KS** - Development of a mobile-friendly decision support system called *MyFields.info*. This site improves stakeholder access to Extension resources/tools, while providing a unique platform for connecting users to tailored information to their field location and crops/varieties planted. For example, our Pest Sampler module allows the user to report pest species that will be monitored through real-time mapping to enable user-specific notifications. Key survey responses from 181 KS farmers during 2014 (Fig. 2):

- 1) 89% would use Extension resources more often if they were easier to find
- 2) 92% agree the MyFields.info would be an effective way to deliver Extension tools/resources
- 3) 87% are willing to create a MyFields account to access tools as they become available.

**MI** - The IPM Program led organization of cross-commodity IPM Academies in 2013 and 2014 by leveraging IPM Extension funds with a grant from NCR-SARE. The academies were

two-day events in East Lansing, Michigan. IPM Academy attendees were surveyed at the conference and via email post-conference. In 2014, a total of 14 of the 109 attendees responded to the post-survey. Over the last six months, the following percentages of participants indicated they adopted or expanded their use of the following IPM strategies or resources based on their experiences at the IPM Academy:

- 1) Scouted for insects and/or diseases (n=9) 82%
- 2) Scouted for beneficial insects (n=4) 36%
- 3) Increased their ability to identify pests, disease and/or beneficial insects (n=7) 64%
- 4) Referenced weather modeling to make management decisions (n=5) 46%
- 5) Only treated for pests when the economic threshold was reached (n=3) 27%
- 6) Supported beneficial insect habitat to promote pest control via natural enemies (n=5) 46%
- 7) Selected pest resistant plant varieties or cultivars (n=2) 18%
- 8) Eliminated or reduced pesticide applications (n=3) 27%
- 9) Improved sanitation practices (n=2) 18%
- 10) Utilized the least biologically disruptive pesticides when treatment was needed (n=5) 45%
- 11) Actively protected native pollinators (n=7) 64%
- 12) Subscribed to an MSUE News Digest or visited the MSUE website (n=4) 36%
- 13) Purchased or referenced MSUE publications (n=4) 36%

**MN** – Spotted Wing Drosophila (SWD), Raspberry - New Hands-On Identification meetings with Growers

Two new Hands-on ID workshops were conducted in 2014 on April 5 in St. Cloud and April 26 at the University of Minnesota Arboretum in Chaska. There were 25 attendees at each workshop and surveys were handed out to assess satisfaction of the attendees with the workshop. A total of 13 and 15 evaluations were received from attendees at the St. Cloud and Chaska locations, respectively. Attendees were asked to rate satisfaction with information, overall presentation, speaker quality, usefulness of workshop, and usefulness of visual aids on a scale from 1-5 scale (5 being very satisfied). For both workshops, 100% of respondents rated all categories either a 4 or 5. Comments indicate a majority learned something new and really appreciated the microscope use for hands on ID of flies and the provided samples of fruit with actual infestations of spotted wing drosophila larvae to examine.

**MO** - In response to the invasion of Spotted Wing Drosophila (SWD) detected in Missouri in 2013, the LU IPM program in collaboration with MU, implemented a multi-faceted research and extension program.

- 1) A state-wide monitoring system was developed with traps and training provided to 20 farmers or regional extension specialists. Information on presence, abundance, and temporal dynamics of SWD was sent through the MU PMN alerts and posted at the new IPM blog: <http://www.LU-IPM.net>. Over a 6-month period, this website which also posts management recommendations and other IPM information received 1,146 visitors, with 569 unique visits.

- 2) Three newsletter articles and four guide sheets on SWD were published. Two of the guide sheets were posted at the MU IPM program website and resulted in over 1,500 visits with > 570 unique visitors.
- 3) The LU IPM program documented mid-term impacts of a SARE-funded workshop on SWD that was conducted in November, 2013. A web-based 9-month post-workshop survey was conducted to the 42 educators that took the workshop. As a result of this training, 614 farmers from 243 farms were reached by the 24 Educators that filled out the post-workshop survey. Forty-two percent of the educators interacted with a total of 92 minority and/or limited-resource farmers. Overall, the implementation of this type of Extension IPM activities has proven successful, and the outcomes highlight the efforts that the LU IPM program is taking to train Extension educators within and outside Missouri in necessary IPM skills.
- 4) Research collaboration was established between Dr. Piñero and Dr. Bruce Barrett (Univ. of Missouri) through a grant funded by Missouri Department of Agriculture, which investigates aspects of the chemical and visual ecology of SWD.

**ND** - Glyphosate tolerant corn and soybean planting increased to nearly 7 million acres in North Dakota in 2014. Overuse of glyphosate, coupled with a lack of soil-applied herbicides, has resulted in a growing glyphosate-resistant weed problem.

**Response:** NDSU Extension weed specialists developed and delivered weed management programming through Extension weed management publications, the AgDakota list serve (aimed at agriculture professionals), and workshops, including the annual Wild World of Weeds workshop.

**Impacts:** Over 360 participants at the 2014 Wild World of Weeds workshop were polled to determine the use and value of NDSU Extension weed management information.

- 1) 86% use information in the North Dakota Weed Control Guide to manage weeds
- 2) 66% use NDSU Extension information disseminated through the AgDakota list serve
- 3) 75% will use NDSU Extension weed management recommendations, including use of soil-applied herbicides followed by foliar herbicides with different modes of action
- 4) 96% indicated that they have improved their overall weed management practices by using NDSU Extension weed management recommendations

**NE** - One-day field workshops by UNL Extension were held in August 2014 at 4 locations across soybean producing areas of Nebraska, with 536 participants. Participants farmed or influenced over 3 million acres of soybeans. This program was co-sponsored by the Nebraska Soybean Board. Participants reported major or significant improvements in knowledge of:

- 1) 63% Management or prevention of herbicide resistant weeds
- 2) 56% Role of natural enemies in crop insect control
- 3) 54% Seedling disease identification and use of seed treatments
- 4) 53% Identification and management of root and stem rot diseases

**OH** - Four workshops evaluated what knowledge target audiences gained on bed bug identification, prevention, and general IPM tactics. A total of 63 evaluation responses were obtained, and the vast majority of the respondents indicated that they were very satisfied with the presentation quality (89%) and overall workshop quality (95%). Bed bug identification went from 11 to 68% by the end of the workshop. Respondents also expressed their intentions to change their behaviors, with 68% indicating they never or rarely inspected a hotel room for signs of bed bugs, but after the workshop, 94% expressed that they planned to always do so. Seventy-four percent of respondents were very likely to share this information with other people.

**SD** - The sixth annual SDSU IPM Field School for Agronomy Professionals was held at the Volga SDSU Research Farm located south of Volga, SD on July 29 & 30, 2014. The school was co-hosted with the South Dakota Agri-Business Association and SDSU Extension Plant Science. Attendance for the event included 72 professional agronomists. Seven topic areas featuring wheat, corn, and soybeans were covered over the two days by SDSU Extension Plant Science Specialists, Extension Field Specialists and NRCS personnel. Each participant received a notebook containing session handouts, reference materials, scouting clipboard, and a hand-lens. A pre and post-test was given asking questions on material covered in the sessions. The pre and post-test showed an average increase of 39 % correct answers after completing the two days of sessions. A survey to the participants in December 2014 will see if there will be a change in behavior and management because of practices learned from the hands-on field training.

**WI** - The University of Wisconsin IPM Program cooperated with campus-based extension specialists to produce and develop content for 50 YouTube videos which totaled more than 18 hours of instruction. An evaluation was sent to those people who accessed the videos after they completed the exam. There were more than 640 views and 100 % of respondents indicated the videos better prepared them to take the exam. Specifically, regarding the IPM videos the follow results were obtained from the evaluation:

- 1) On a 6 point scale of 1=Not at all and 6=Very much, participants were asked "To what degree did videos better prepare you for CCA exam". The pest management videos scored a mean of 4.65
- 2) 90% felt the pest management videos increased their knowledge of PEST IDENTIFICATION "moderately" or "very much"
- 3) 85% felt the pest management videos increased their knowledge of PEST LIFE CYCLE "moderately" or "very much"
- 4) 80% felt the pest management videos increased their knowledge of PREVENTING PEST RESISTANCE "moderately" or "very much"
- 5) 75% felt the pest management videos increased their knowledge of USING AN INTEGRATED APPROACH TO PEST MANAGEMENT "moderately" or "very much"
- 6) 95% would recommend these videos to others studying for the CCA exam.

6. Published Written Works. Include scientific publications, trade magazine articles, books,

posters, websites developed, and any other relevant printed works produced.

Although not formally listed, all states have some type of newsletter related to field crops or specialty crops that report IPM information on a weekly basis during the season, and often produce sporadic issues during the non-peak season as well.

Potter, B.D. Southwest Minnesota IPM Stuff. An electronic newsletter. (1997-present). <http://swroc.cfans.umn.edu/ResearchandOutreach/PestManagement/index.htm>

Potter, B.D. and K.R. Ostlie. 2014. Should you skip the Bt traits in your 2015 corn crop to cut production costs? <http://blog-crop-news.extension.umn.edu/2014/09/should-you-skip-bt-traits-in-your-2015.html>

Koch, R., and B. Potter. 2014. Scouting for soybean aphid. <http://www.extension.umn.edu/agriculture/soybean/pest/docs/soybean-aphid-scouting.pdf>

Potter, B.D. 2013 & 2014. University of Minnesota cooperative black cutworm reporting network newsletter. <http://swroc.cfans.umn.edu/ResearchandOutreach/PestManagement/CutwormNetwork/index.htm>

7. Scientific and Outreach Oral Presentations. Include workshops, colloquia, conferences, symposia, and industry meetings in which you presented and/or organized.

Conceived, organized, and implemented two IPM workshops (Unmanned Aerial Vehicles and Working Group Achievements) at the 8<sup>th</sup> International IPM Symposium held in Salt Lake City, UT from March 23-26, 2015. More details will be reported in the 2015 annual report.

8. Fund leveraging, specifically, collaborative grants between stations and members.  
-None reported.

9. Other relevant accomplishments and activities:

Three representatives of the NCERA 222 committee attended the National IPM Coordinating Committee meeting in Washington, D.C. September 22-24, 2014. From that meeting, a formal three year rotation of attendance at this meeting was formulated based on current Vice Chair, Chair, and Past Chair.

There are several new members on the committee replacing existing members from MN, MO, and SD.

Patrick Beauzay from North Dakota State University was selected as the incoming Vice Chair on this committee for 2015.