

Committee and Liaison Reports
AAPSE Board of Directors Meeting, Honolulu, HI
August 10, 2003

Table of Contents	Page
AAPSE Committee Reports	
Articles of Incorporation and By-Laws	2
Auditing	3
Committee on Committees	3
E-Services	3
Issues and Evaluation	4
Membership/Public Relations	4
Nominations and Elections	5
Non-English Language Materials for Pesticide Safety Education	6
Recognition and Resolutions Committee	8
Urban IPM Education and Outreach Committee	11
Liaison Reports	
AAPCO	11
Certification and Training Advisory Group (CTAG)	13
Endangered Species	15
International Harmonization and classification of pesticides	15
National Pesticide Stewardship Alliance (NPSA)	15
Pesticides and National Strategies for Health Care Providers	17
States FIFRA Issues Research and Evaluation Group (SFIREG)	18
SFIREG Policy Operations and Management	19
SFIREG W/C on Water Quality and Pesticide Disposal	19
Appendix	
CTAG Subcommittee Request for Input	21
Background Information on CTAG Workgroup Effort	23

Report to the AAPSE Board of Directors
August 10, 2003

Committee: Articles of Incorporation and By-Laws
Report by: Roger Flashinski, CES, Chair
Members: Carol Ramsay, CES
Carl Rew, SLA
Richard Pont, EPA
Ann Hazelrigg, CES

Activities:

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

The Board of Directors asked the Committee to prepare language to revise the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws that would eliminate the Retired Membership category. This change also would allow a member who retires to retain the same category of membership that he or she held before retirement.

Why the Change?

The AAPSE Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws clearly differentiates between Full and Retired members but both documents are less clear whether or not former Full members of AAPSE who have retired may hold an elected position. Being that it may greatly benefit AAPSE to elect a retired Full member to serve our association in this capacity, members are being asked to vote whether we wish to change the A.I. and B.L. to eliminate the retired category altogether and, instead, state that a retiring member in good standing (paid up dues) may retain the same category of membership that he or she held before retirement.

VOTING RESULTS

The following vote and explanation were posed to all Full Members on January 8, 2003: "I wish to modify the AAPSE Articles of Incorporation and the Bylaws to eliminate the Retired Membership category and allow retired members in good standing to retain the same category of membership and all of its privileges as they held prior to retirement."

Voting on the above amendment ended on March 31, 2003. The motion carried and the resolution was adopted.

The final and approved copies of the A.I. and B.L. were emailed to Mike Weaver on April 4, 2003 for placement on the AAPSE web site.

TABLE OF ELIGIBILITY

A revised Table of Eligibility was created to reflect the amended A.I. and B.L. This table summarizes a member's eligibility to hold office and voting privilege by category of membership.

ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION:

At this time, the Committee is not aware of any issues for consideration nor suggesting any recommendations that would require a change in either the Articles of incorporation or the Bylaws.

Committee: **Auditing**
Report by: Chair: Paul Baker
Members: George Hamilton and Carol Ramsay

Purpose: To insure that funds are accounted for based on bylaws and 501 (C 3) requirements.

Summary of activities: The auditing committee met at the last annual meeting to audit the books of the AAPSE association. The committee found the funds in order.

Issues: Based on the current status, the only issues would be membership expansion to include one or two new members and term limitations all members.

Committee: Committee on Committees

Chair: Wayne Buhler, July 28, 2003.

Committee's Purpose: Liaison between AAPSE President and AAPSE committee chairs and liaisons to relay requests for annual reports and other business.

Summary of activities: Compiled and emailed annual reports from committee chairs and liaisons to AAPSE Executive Board members before the Annual Certification and Training Meeting in Honolulu. List of newly appointed Chairs and Liaisons will be obtained from AAPSE President and submitted to M. Weaver for posting to the AAPSE Web Site.

Committee: E-Services Committee

1. Services Advisory Committee Membership
 - a. Chair: Larry Schulze
 - b. Members: Bob Bellinger, Gary Fish, Cindy Folck, Rich Pope, Carol Ramsay, Mike Weaver
2. Committee Charge
 - a. To serve as a sounding board and an advisory body to the Executive Committee of the American Association of Pesticide Safety Educators (AAPSE) on matters relating to the web site, ListServ, potential on-line training, and other AAPSE-sponsored electronic initiatives.
 - i. Objectives:
 - (1) Develop recommendations and guidelines for procedures associated with postings to the web site, use of the ListServ, and tracking the status of articles submitted to the *Journal of Pesticide Safety Educators*,
 - (2) Serve in an advisory capacity in support of the AAPSE webmaster on routine organization, maintenance and operation of the web site,
 - (3) Respond to specific issues identified on an occasional basis by the

AAPSE Executive Committee

- b. This Committee is initially organized as an ad hoc committee for a period of two years from the time Committee of establishment (July 12, 2002) unless otherwise extended by the Executive Committee by subsequent action.
- 3. Summary of Activities
 - a. Determined need and created an AAPSE ListServ Policy. Adopted by AAPSE Executive Committee, April 2003. See on AAPSE web site under "Governance."
 - b. June and July, 2003. Created draft of AAPSE Internet Link Policy. Forwarded to AAPSE Executive Committee for review, edit, and adoption.
 - c. By consensus decision, a link was established from the AAPSE web site to the Pesticide Safety Education Web Portal (<http://pep.wsu.edu/psp/>)
 - d. By consensus decision, the need was recognized and established for a shortened duplicate web address for the Journal of Pesticide Safety (<http://JPSE.org>).
- 4. Issues for consideration by the AAPSE Executive Committee and/or Board of Directors
 - a. The draft AAPSE Internet Link Policy is ready for edit and/or adoption
 - b. By consensus decision, the E-Services Advisory Committee recommends that the AAPSE Committee on Committee be responsible for the maintenance of the "AAPSE Committee" web files and links at <http://www.vtpp.ext.vt.edu:8080/aapsecomselect.html>. This web page with links lists the AAPSE committees, their members, and the AAPSE liaisons.

Committee: Issues and Evaluations

Chair: Win Hock, reporting July 18, 2003

Committee Members: Variable depending on the issue.

Statement of Purpose: Study and develop position papers and analyses of pesticide legislative and regulatory issues and policies that affect the professional responsibilities of AAPSE's membership.

Summary of Activities:

No activity since February, 2002.

Future Issues for Consideration:

- 1. Continue to give support and comments to EPA on the drift labeling statements as needed.
- 2. Be prepared to address other proposed regulatory and labeling changes and respond to EPA

Committee: Membership/Public Relations

Chairpersons: Joanne Kick-Raack (reporting) and Randy Rivera

According to the treasurer, there are currently 171 paid members for 2003.

Over the past year, the membership committee solicited input from members on the design of

a membership lapel pin and submitted the top three designs to the Board. The blue and gold pin will be distributed at the national meeting in Hawaii during the "members and friends" reception sponsored by AAPSE on Monday evening. The chairs would like to thank Cindy Folck for developing the initial designs and working with the vendor to get them produced.

The membership committee will have a poster and brochures in the exhibit area of the national conference. The committee would like to remind members that it has AAPSE posters (2 copies) that can be shipped to members who would like to display it at various meetings.

Also, the membership committee benefits greatly from the hard work of the treasurer. The co-chairs would particularly like to thank Carol Ramsay for all her efforts in maintaining the membership list and collecting dues and sending renewal letters to members. It is suggested that the incoming treasurer, Dean Herzfeld, be appointed to the committee to handle the membership dues since Carol Ramsay will be stepping down. Joanne Kick-Raack has requested to be replaced as co-chair as soon as the incoming President can appoint a new committee chair.

Committee: Nominations and Elections

Chairperson: Carrie R. Foss

The 2003 Nominations and Elections Committee included representation from each region. Members of the committee were as follows: Janet Fults (Western), Andrew Thostenson (North Central), Ron Gardner (Northeast), Colleen Hudak (Southern), and Carrie Foss (committee chair).

Pat Hipkins, former N&E Committee chair, completed a guidance document for the N&E Committee. The document was extremely helpful to the current committee for organizing the AAPSE nominations and elections process. Pat had compiled information and direction from her previous experience on the committee and developed a timeline for the tasks of the committee. The document also included information on conducting elections electronically.

The N&E Committee met via teleconference during October 2002 to discuss the nominations and elections procedures and timeline and to agree on the responsibilities of each committee member. We discussed the list of suggested nominees that had been received from each region and agreed on the contacts to be made. The committee met again in early December via teleconference and communicated by email on each member's progress between the meetings. A tentative slate of candidates for the AAPSE President-Elect, Secretary and Treasurer positions was formed. The slate of candidates was finalized during the first week of June.

Bios were collected from each of the candidates and submitted to the AAPSE webmaster, Mike Weaver. The bios were reformatted for consistency and posted on the AAPSE website for the election. The slate of candidates was submitted to the AAPSE secretary, Bob

Bellinger. The election was posted on the secretary's website and held electronically June 13 through June 27, 2003. An email was sent by the N&E committee chairperson encouraging all full members to vote. The AAPSE Secretary announced the election results to the membership via email immediately following the election; President Elect - Joanne Kick-Raack, Secretary - Bob Wolf, and Treasurer - Dean Herzfeld.

Suggestions and changes for future N&E Committees:

1. In the guidance document, the timeline shows that one month prior to the election, the N&E Committee should "Prepare the official e-ballot, which must include voting instructions and eligibility requirements as well as biographical sketches/candidate statements." It would be more efficient for the committee if they can follow these instructions and run the election from a committee member's website versus the AAPSE secretary's website as was done in this election. The rest of the procedures related to the election process could be followed by the N&E Committee according to the guidance document, such as "Obtain election results from designated e-vote recipients and counters."
2. In the guidance document, the timeline shows that approximately two weeks prior to the election, the N&E Committee chair should "Remind AAPSE members about voting procedures (when, how) via the AAPSE listserve. Announcements regarding the slate, listing of bios/cs, etc. should alert the membership to the upcoming election..." This task was not completed for this election, so there was no lead time that would have allowed members to discuss the slate or ask questions of the candidates.
3. It may be useful to change the guidance document to allow for 3 weeks for the election. This would provide more time for voting, particularly during a period when members may be traveling and out of the office.

Committee: Non-English Language Materials for Pesticide Safety Education

Committee Chair: Jennifer Weber, University of California at Davis

Committee Members (2002-2003):

Peyam Barghassa, NCDA&CS, North Carolina; Jeffrey Jenkins, Oregon State University; Pablo A. Kálnay, Springfield Extension Center, Illinois; Gerald Kinro, Hawaii Department of Agriculture; Bruce E. Paulsrud, University of Illinois; Myron Shenk, Oregon State University; Suzanne M. Snedeker, Cornell University; Hugh Smith, Hawaii Agricultural Research Center; Sabina F. Swift, University of Hawaii at Manoa; Flor Tovar, Washington State Department of Agriculture; Wade Trevathan, Oregon State University

Statement of Purpose

The AAPSE Committee on Non-English Language Materials for Pesticide Safety Education is working on several projects to assess and meet the linguistic needs of people who handle pesticides or work in areas where pesticides have been applied.

Activities

Language Trends. One of the committee's initial goals was to study language trends throughout the United States, with an emphasis on languages that are spoken or read by people who work directly with pesticides or in areas where pesticides have been applied. As a result of their survey work, committee members identified over 50 languages spoken by people who work with or around pesticides in the United States, U.S.-affiliated islands, and several tribal communities.

Bilingual English/Spanish Word Bank. Through the language trends survey, it was discovered that Spanish is the predominant language spoken and read by people who work with or around pesticides. Forty-six states reported a need for pesticide safety information in Spanish. Although programs and services may be available for translating pesticide applicator exams, study guides, and pesticide safety information, Spanish-language translators who are not familiar with pesticide terminology might have difficulties finding the appropriate words for terms such as "boom sprayer" and "pesticide handler." Therefore, committee members developed a bilingual English/Spanish word bank that contains approximately 750 pesticide-related terms pertaining to such topics as personal protective equipment, crops and crop pests, application equipment, environmental protection, and pesticide exposure. Committee members will create a review committee of bilingual pesticide experts who can review, edit and offer suggestions for a final word bank that can be used by translators.

Pesticide Safety Resources. The committee has begun work on a list of pesticide safety resources that are currently available in non-English languages. Committee members recognize that maintaining and updating such a list would be an ongoing process. However, even in its initial draft form, the list has served as a useful tool for determining gaps in resources available to speakers of non-English languages. When comparing the resources list to the results of the language trends survey, committee members were able to identify a need for more pesticide safety materials in Hmong, Cambodian, and Ilokano.

Funding and Translation Services. After identifying the need for more pesticide safety resources in Ilokano, two committee members worked together to locate funding, and translation, narration, and editing services to develop an Ilokano version of the video, *Pesticide Safety for Small Farms*. This video, which was originally created as a resource for Hmong, Cambodian, and Laotian small farm operators in California, will be used to extend pesticide safety information to Filipino farmers in Hawaii. The committee will continue to investigate the availability of funds, resources, and services for translating pesticide safety information.

Issues for Consideration. Committee members have gathered information on language trends, pesticide safety terminology, and resources that might be of interest to other AAPSE members. Once our findings are finalized, we will be interested in making this information readily available to others. Is it possible to house this information on the AAPSE website?

Committee: Recognitions and Resolutions Committee

Chairperson: Sandra McDonald

Members: Larry Olsen (MI-Ext), Dean Herzfeld (MN-Ext), Paul Baker (AZ-Ext), Larry Towle (DE-SLA), Richard Pont (US EPA), and Tom Delaney (Professional Lawn Care Assoc. of America)

Committee's purposes: to recommend to the Board parameters for awards to be given by AAPSE, and to determine a process for how to nominate/apply for awards and how decisions will be arrived at by the Committee.

Summary of activities since March 2002:

The committee has proposed the following awards:

AAPSE Fellows

AAPSE Honorary Membership

AAPSE Distinguished Achievement in the State Certification and Training Program

AAPSE Distinguished Achievement in the Tribal Certification and Training Program

AAPSE Distinguished Achievement in the EPA Certification and Training Program

AAPSE Distinguished Achievement in Cooperative Extension

AAPSE Distinguished Achievement in Pesticide Safety Education by Industry

Additional Program Awards are proposed for:

Promotional Materials

Short Publication

Long Publication

Newsletter

Series of Articles

Slide Set/Computerized Graphic Presentation

Radio

Video/Video Disk/CD

Television/Video conference

Computer Software/Application

Web Page

Mixed Materials

The Executive Committee recommended condensing the awards into the following:

AAPSE Fellows

AAPSE Honorary Membership

AAPSE Distinguished Achievement in Certification

AAPSE Distinguished Achievement in Training

Adding an exam category to the Program Awards

Issues for consideration by the AAPSE Board.

1. There is a question as to whether these should be biennial rather than annual awards. However, this is something we all need to think about. While it's certainly nicer to receive an award in front of peers at the C&T Workshop, we do have an official General Business

Meeting every year. AAPSE needs to consider the benefits of making annual awards (timely recognition of members' work, increased awareness of AAPSE and its mission on the part of administrators of those who win awards) and decide whether they should, in fact, be annual or biennial. The Board of Directors will consider this in particular, but your committee may wish to make a recommendation (and, of course, you may come to a different conclusion than I have).

Response: The majority of the R&R committee feels that biennial awards are sufficient, especially since we would prefer that the individuals be present in front of the majority of the members. Although the minority pointed out that two years is a long time in some situations (such as pending retirements or leaving a job etc.). The committee will accept the direction of the board. It does not mean we have to offer every award each year.

2. As it stands, some categories have lots of members, while others have only a few, so that there will be far more competition in some award categories than others. The EC recommends combining categories of distinguished awards and reorienting them so they are for 1.) training and 2.) certification. This way, all members, regardless of whether they are from Extension, tribes, SLA, industry, or international, would be eligible for each. The R&R Committee would need to ensure there is ample opportunity and criteria for SLA members under any reorganization of categories.

Response: The R&R committee supports this idea. We will merge these awards into 2 awards: One focused on certification/licensing and one focused on education/training.

3. The EC wants to ensure that award classes allow for certification tools (i.e., exams) to qualify as well.

Response: We can add this category.

4. The number of awards to be given under each category should not be finite, but should be left to the discretion of the judges.

Response: The committee is divided on this issue. Some feel that the judges or the committee have all the information to make that determination. There may be times where two or three people are very deserving and fairness would compel us to providing the award to each of them. There is the concern of diluting the awards value and decreasing the level of standards when giving out awards if many are given out every year. A few committee members raised concerns about the length of the awards ceremony.

The R&R Committee feels strongly the Fellow and Honorary Member awards be limited to maximum of 2 per year. These are the highest awards we can offer and they need to be kept at the highest standard of contributions. Im divided between one or two Distinguished Achievement Awards per year. If we keep the limits on the number of awards given each year, we could provide an optional award (Special Recognition) for a deserving individual who falls between the criteria of the other awards or is very deserving for an award but that year a more deserving individual was given the regular award.

The committee will accept the boards direction on this issue.

5. The EC suggests establishing a maximum page limit for summaries and other submissions.

Response: The R&R committee agrees to limit the number of letters of support to three and to limit the number of pages in the body of the packet to 10. Additional information can still be provided as appendices.

6. The EC recommends omitting points for personal achievements, and noted that the amount of points given for letters of support seems low (10 points). The EC suggests adding the points (15) from the deleted personal achievements category to the letters of support, resulting in 25 points.

Response: the R&R committee agrees

7. Editorial comment -- "National Office" needs to be changed to something else -- perhaps R&R Committee Chair??

Response: The R&R committee agrees

8. There seems to be some repetition in the documents, and the EC was not sure of the difference between all of them, or how they fit together (this is probably in part due to the need to split up the documents to attach to e-mail.) The EC recommends the documents be slightly reorganized by the Committee so it is easier to understand the difference between them. There should be three parts: 1.) identification and description of the awards; 2.) qualifications for each; and 3.) criteria for judging.

Response: The R&R committee will reorganize the documents and will rewrite to include the ECs suggestions. The individual awards will remain as separate documents (this means repetition), so that an individual wanting to nominate someone for a specific award can directly download the procedures. A separate introductory document explaining all of the awards will also be created.

9. The EC would like the R&R Committee to develop some very general leaflets to be handed out at Hawaii to advertise the awards and solicit nominations for the next meeting. They should be released as DRAFT.

Response: Sounds good but who is going to put together the "Draft" leaflet??????????

10. The EC requests that the R&R Committee revise the proposal in line with the above recommendations, and send it to the Board in mid-July. I will put it on the agenda for the BOD meeting in Hawaii.

Response: As it is mid-July and the R&R committee has just gotten our act together to

respond and will be awaiting direction from the Board. We will not have all of the revision complete.

Committee: URBAN IPM EDUCATION AND OUTREACH

Chair: Ed Crow (Maryland Department of Agriculture)

Submitted: July 19, 2003

Committee: Jim Criswell (Oklahoma State University), Gary Fish Maine Board of Pesticides Control), Carrie Foss Washington State University Puyallup), Carl Martin Arizona Structural Pest Control Commission), Clyde Ogg (University of Nebraska)

Purpose: The committee has been charged with both a fact finding and recommendation function regarding IPM in schools.

At the March 2002 Board of Directors meeting the Board voted to create an IPM committee. Since its inception the committee has conducted several conference calls in conjunction with correspondence via E-mail. The initial conference call was used to determine issues associated with IPM and what the focus of the committee should be. It was felt that the committee should limit its work to IPM issues relating to the urban environment. The committee determined that there was a lack of information to assist states in the implementation of an IPM program for schools on a statewide basis. In order to address this need, the committee felt that a guidance document could be developed that provides information to states on the implementation process and key procedures that facilitate the implementation. It was determined that this would be accomplished through a telephone survey of some of the states that currently have an IPM program for schools in place. A survey was developed that identified key issues regarding the implementation process that was developed. The committee identified states, and a tribe, to be surveyed and each committee member was assigned two states. Surveys have been conducted, but the committee has not been able to finish the final guidance document.

The committee has also been monitoring the status of the federal bill, House Bill 121, that would amend FIFRA to require local educational agencies to implement IPM. In addition, the chair of AAPSE's IPM committee participated in a conference call with the Association of Structural Pest Control Regulatory Officials (ASPCRO) IPM Committee.

The committee would like to request further guidance from the Board on what the purpose and function of the committee should be.

AAPCO Liaison Report

TO: Marvin Lawson, President
Association of American Pesticide Control Officials (AAPCO)

FROM: Ed Crow, AAPCO / AAPSE Liaison, reporting July 30, 2003
Maryland Department of Agriculture

I appreciate the opportunity to serve AAPCO as the liaison to the American Association of Pesticide Safety Educators (AAPSE). The following report contains information on significant activities of the partnering association that have occurred since my appointment in early April 2003. These activities include:

1. EPA announced that FY 03 Pesticide Safety Education Program (PSEP) pass through funding could be cut from their budget. As a result, AAPSE took on a very active role in petitioning EPA to maintain funding. Responses were prepared and submitted to EPA justifying the continued funding. The responses included impacts, both short and long term, that the loss of funding would have on pesticide safety education. Recommendations on resolving long term issues regarding the funding was also submitted to EPA. AAPSE provided ongoing correspondence and participated in meetings with EPA and USDA over the PSEP funding issue.
2. AAPSE provided comments to EPA's Field and External Affairs Division on the draft document on the proposed Field Implementation Plan for the Endangered Species Protection Program. The AAPSE Board felt it was important to provide comments on the Plan from an educational and outreach perspective. AAPSE provided comments on the following issues: Review of Pesticides; Bulletin Distribution Procedures; Amending Pesticide Labels to Reference County Bulletins; Enhancing Monitoring Programs; Public Participation; and, Implementation Timing.
3. The Southern Region Pesticide Safety Education Center (PSEC) continues to offer a train-the-trainer course for county agents, pesticide coordinators and state regulatory personnel responsible for implementing pesticide training courses or enforcing pesticide use laws and regulations.
4. AAPSE has established a Committee on Non-English Language Materials for Pesticide Safety Education that has been working on several projects to assess and meet the linguistic needs of people who handle pesticides or work in areas where pesticides have been applied. They have conducted a survey to assess language trends for individuals that handle or work around pesticides. Since Spanish is the predominant non-English language the committee has developed a bilingual English/Spanish word bank to assist translators with the translation of pesticide related terminology. The committee has also initiated work on developing a list pesticide safety resources that are currently available in non-English languages that will be an ongoing process.
5. AAPSE has been actively involved with the national initiative for Pesticides and National Strategies for Health Care Providers. This has been accomplished through AAPSE's liaison and participation by other AAPSE representatives on committees and review teams for the initiative. A National Forum was recently held in which AAPSE played an active role and submitted companion documents to the Initiative's National Strategies for Health Care Providers: Pesticides Initiative Implementation Plan document.

6. A committee has been established by AAPSE to examine the feasibility of offering a Professional Development Meeting in 2004 and possible topics for the meeting. These AAPSE sponsored meeting are to offered in the alternating years of the National Pesticide Applicator Training Workshop and are intended for the professional development of individuals associated with pesticide education.
7. AAPSE continues to be involved (in various roles) with EPA and others, to ensure representation of AAPSE's interests. AAPSE has appointed Winand Hock to serve as the new AAPSE representative to the Certification and Training Advisory Group (CTAG) and Richard Pope to SFIREG's Working Committee on Water Quality and Pesticide Disposal (WQ&PD). AAPSE also maintains an ongoing relationship with EPA and USDA through correspondence and meetings.

If you have any additional questions or if I can be of further assistance please feel free to contact me at (410)841-5710 or crowea@mda.state.md.us.

Certification and Training Assessment Group (CTAG)

AAPSE Liaison: Win Hock, reporting 7/19/03

Membership: EPA, SLA, Cooperative Extension, USDA, SFIREG, Structural Pest Control Board, AAPCO, AAPSE, TPPC, AFPMB

Statement of Purpose: CTAG's mission is to develop and implement proposals that will strengthen federal, state, territory, and tribal pesticide certification and training programs which ultimately enhances the knowledge, skills and attitudes of pesticide users to ensure safe and effective pest management.

Summary of Activities:

The CTAG Board of Directors met on March 12-13, 2003, in Arlington, VA. The meeting was facilitated by Gina Davis, Co-chair. Items discussed include:

1. The CTAG "50/50 match" issue paper (which would increase the FIFRA grant funding match requirement for C&T programs from 50 percent of the cost of the program to be consistent with the 85 percent federal match requirement for other FIFRA grant programs) has been accepted by the SFIREG Pesticide Operations & Management (POM) committee.

2. CTAG's issue paper on requiring monitored, written, closed-book exams was presented to the SFIREG POM Committee in October, 2002, for review and discussion. At that time, the POM Committee determined that additional information was necessary relative to state authorities/prohibitions for exam administration, before the discussion could continue. Additional information was presented to the POM committee in April 2003. The POM committee accepted the new information and supports CTAG's recommendation to require monitored, written closed-book exams for state plan approval.

3. The CTAG issue paper recommending a minimum age requirement of 16 years old for certification for both private and commercial applicators of restricted use pesticides was accepted by the full SFIREG in June, 2002, and received a letter of support from AAPCO.

4. The CTAG Board discussed ways to bring CTAG issues to a wider network of stakeholders and how to do this on a more frequent basis. The Board would like to continue to schedule stakeholder briefings. The Board will examine issues and needs at each Board meeting and decide what briefings should be scheduled in the succeeding six month period.

5. Development of a Standardized Reporting Template to report C & T activity. Programming of the template is approximately 95% complete. The final version of the template will be announced in August 2003 at both the AAPCO Summer Meeting and the National C&T Meeting. A training session, including a manual for users, will be held at the National C&T Meeting in August, 2003.

6. Positive Identification - The draft issue paper addresses positive identification (photo ID) for certification exams, recertification training and pesticide sales.

7. Remote Testing - A CTAG Subgroup is charged to identify the advantages and disadvantages of remote testing; examine the economics of remote testing including possible loss of revenue to SLA programs; develop a draft paper on testing issues including remote testing and exam security as well as minimum standards for testing performed by certification programs (including how and where tests are administered, how they are proctored, and similar issues); and draft a set of minimum national standards for testing issues.

8. Mechanisms to Improve the Skills of Educators - A CTAG Subgroup is charged to identify alternative methods to improve the skills of trainers/educators; explore and recommend alternative approaches to setting up regional/national Pesticide Education and Safety Training Centers (or their equivalent) for providing pesticide safety educators with opportunities to update skills and knowledge through periodic training workshops and to promote an exchange among trainers/educators; identify and evaluate measures to facilitate USDA or EPA requiring some form of professional development or improvement for pesticide trainers and educators; and coordinate activities with APPSE to avoid duplication of efforts. The issue papers currently under development contain some recommendations for minimum national standards for trainer qualifications and recommendations for performance measures.

9. WPS Integration - This CTAG Subgroup is charged to develop an outline of the steps necessary to implement the WPS white paper proposal to integrate the pesticide handler training requirements of the Worker Protection Standard into the pesticide applicator certification and training program; develop an outline of proposed minimum national standards for WPS training, testing and licensing and review and evaluate the potential economic impact of WPS integration on SLA/CES programs.

10. Tiered Classification - *Pesticide Classification /Short Term* - In the short term, the

primary changes involve certification of dealers of restricted pesticides and creation of a “super” restricted pesticide level (Restricted Use 1.)

Pesticide Classification - Long Term - This issue paper is tied to the Global Harmonization System toxicity data and will involve significant regulatory changes and could take five or ten or even fifteen years to fully implement.

11. EPA's Strategic Plan for Homeland Security - EPA will work with the States, Territories, Tribes, and Other Partners to Enhance Security in the Chemical and Oil Industry. EPA will work to ensure that the sale, distribution, use, storage, and disposal of chemical pesticides and other non-pesticidal chemicals are adequately safeguarded from threats posed by terrorism. As part of this effort, EPA will develop and broaden its technical expertise to identify the riskiest pesticide chemicals, develop and expand the available information on chemical pesticides and in assessing risks of exposure to those chemicals, and work to share this information with state, local, and tribal governments.

Endangered Species

AAPSE Liaison: Susan Whitney, reporting July 9, 2003

Statement of the Liaison's Committee's purpose:
Respond to EPA Proposed Regulations and attend EPA Task Force Meetings

Summary of activities since March 2002
Drafted comments to EPA Proposed Regulations for consideration of the AAPSE Board.

Issues for consideration by the AAPSE Board:
Make sure Liaison is invited to EPA Endangered Species Task Force meetings.

International Harmonization and Classification of Pesticides

Liaison: Candace Bartholomew

There has been no activity with regards to global harmonization until the week of July 21, 2003. Mary Frances Lowe of EPA has called a conference call to begin developing strategy for implementation of global harmonization with regard to hazardous chemicals. The conference call is scheduled for July 31, 2003.

National Pesticide Stewardship Association (NPSA) Liaison

Liaison: Pat Hipkins (VA-ES) - August, 2003

Statement of the Committee's purpose: The purpose of this liaison is to represent AAPSE's

interests to -- and channel input from -- NPSA. Like AAPSE, NPSA is a relatively new organization. NPSA is actively involved in different aspects of pesticide stewardship – activities that have a positive impact on the safety and efficacy of pesticides.

Summary of activities since March 2002:

- planning the 4th annual conference in Tucson, AZ (October 19-22);

- continuing to promote/support container recycling and pesticide product disposal efforts in the states;

- planning a "worst-first" disposal program;

Overview of proposed pilot:

This is intended to be a cooperative effort, depending on the participation of the ag chemical industry, the keen interest of the hazardous waste sector, the motivation of some selected states, and educational/public relations interests of universities. NPSA is focusing on "worst-first" because significant momentum for states to start and/or maintain collections programs due to budget considerations. States have been the prime driver of pesticide collection programs, and nearly all states have lost the financial capacity to continue, much less move forward. This pilot will, hopefully, be a way to bridge the gap in services AND to serve as a reminder that collection work is NOT done! Although it will focus on the "worst" unusable/banned pesticides, it will enable clients who have other pesticides they wish to dispose of to bring them in on a pay-as-you-go basis...and hopefully, NPSA will be able to leverage collecting companies to keep prices low. (Perhaps selected states will be able to add funds, also.) Right now, funding is TBA -- NPSA is seeking funding from members and their organizations, agencies, and corporations. There is a there is a homeland security component to this project...which may help get funding...plans will be firming up over the summer, and at the 4th annual national meeting.

-continuing to update website: <http://npsalliance.org>/to add reports, projects, position papers, membership information, etc.;

-initiating contacts with the retail sector and registrants of pesticide products for residential/home grounds pesticides to improve communications regarding recalls and voluntary cancellations (specifically, FQPA-prompted use terminations) to avoid misuse, illegal sale, and improper disposal;

- sent a comment letter (02/02) to EPA re: label language on container management, which made recommendations re: label organization, incorrect information (ex. re: container burning), and non-instructive "recommendations". NPSA recommended, for example, that labels reference state container recycling programs; and
- sent a letter to EPA supporting the reinstatement of PSEP funding.

6. Issues for consideration by the AAPSE Board:

- NPSA would like to cement a stronger relationship with AAPSE, and hopes the AAPSE BOD will join NPSA in fostering a closer relationship between the two organizations.

Background:

NPSA hoped AAPSE would join NPSA, but AAPSE's constitution and by-laws do

not allow it. Right now, an AAPSE member serves as NPSA liaison. In addition, some AAPSE members are also active NPSA members. Mary Grodner [former AAPSE President and current AAPSE liaison to the States FIFRA Issues Research and Evaluation Group (SFIREG)] serves on the NPSA BOD.

- NPSA wants to bring active/interested contributors on board in leadership roles at a faster rate. Thus, the NPSA Board wants to implement the Advisory Council as provided for in the organization's by-laws. (If/when an AC forms, it will allow NPSA to invite a number of key and important stewardship organizations. It is most likely that AAPSE will be one of those organizations...an invitation may come as soon as later this year. Therefore, the AAPSE BOD may wish to consider appointee prospect(s) -- this may be in addition to OR instead of having an AAPSE-NPSA liaison?)
- If the pilot "worst-first" collection program takes place, it will surely involve pesticide safety educators and regulators, many of whom are AAPSE members.
- If the AAPSE BOD has programs or efforts that involve the common interests of the two organizations, please do bring them to NPSA.

Pesticides and National Strategies for Health Care Providers

Liaison: Amy Brown, University of Maryland, Report submitted July 22, 2003

Summary of activities since March 2002

This project is a national initiative to improve the capability of primary health care providers to integrate pesticides into primary health care education and practice, with the goal of improved recognition and treatment of pesticide-related illnesses. The project was developed through a collaborative effort of EPA, USDA, the US Department of Health and Human Services, the US Department of Labor, and the National Environmental Education and Training Foundation (NEETF). AAPSE has been represented through its liaison, and through the service of additional AAPSE representatives on committees and review teams (see 2002 report for details on representation).

In June 2003, a National Forum was held in Washington, DC to promote the Initiative. National leaders in medical and nursing education and heads of professional organizations participated in the Forum. Attending AAPSE members included Amy Brown, Jim Criswell, Terry Miller, Larry Olsen, Kerry Richards, and Jennifer Weber. During the Forum, organizers publicly released the document, *National Strategies for Health Care Providers: Pesticides Initiative Implementation Plan*, developed by interdisciplinary teams of primary health care providers, medical and nursing school faculty, pesticide safety educators and public health professionals. Also distributed were two companion documents: *National Pesticide Practice Skills Guidelines for Medical & Nursing Education* and *National Pesticide Practice Skills Guidelines for Medical & Nursing Practice*. The companion documents were co-authored by Amy Brown and reviewed by Kerry Richards and Pat O'Connor-Marer.

In a related matter, AAPSE members Suzanne Snedeker and Amy Brown were invited to participate in the International Symposium on Agricultural Exposures and Cancer in Oxford, England, November 18 – 21, 2002. AAPSE was sought by the authors of the Agricultural Health Study (AHS), one of the primary studies discussed during the symposium, to consider collaborations with the AHS to develop and distribute information. Currently, study outcomes are published in scientific journals, but the authors would like to see broader distribution of the results to applicators and to health care providers. Snedeker and Brown will continue to pursue this possibility. Wayne Buhler, an AAPSE member, is a participant in a grant-funded project at North Carolina State University (Julia Storm, P.I.), to produce short summaries of AHS studies aimed at pesticide applicators. Brown will work with Buhler, Storm, Snedeker, and the authors of AHS to prevent or minimize duplication of effort, ensure that publications are made available through AAPSE's resources, and develop methods to target direct communication to health care providers.

Issues for consideration by the AAPSE Board of Directors

On June 18, 2003, Brown asked the Executive Committee to bring the following motions (based on input from herself and from Kerry Richards) before the Board of Directors. The Executive Committee approved the request, and the Board is asked to consider the actions.

1. Prepare a letter of support stressing the importance of including recognition and treatment of pesticide exposure symptoms into existing curricula for medical and nursing students. The letter would be available to be sent to nursing and medical schools. The National Environmental Education & Training Foundation (NEETF) would handle distribution.
2. Encourage AAPSE members and other trainers to include exposure and symptom recognition into applicator training, stressing the importance of applicators communicating appropriate and complete information when seeking treatment for illness. The purpose would be to encourage a more complete environmental history.
3. Encourage AAPSE members to be prepared to serve as resources on pesticide information for health care providers. Throughout the Forum, and throughout the last few years in preparing for the Forum, AAPSE has promoted using SLAs and county Extension as credible, best-informed contacts for the health care providers seeking information on pest management. AAPSE members should ensure their agencies (including county Extension offices) have educational materials on safe use of pesticides, IPM, and alternatives to pesticides.

Liaison to full SFIREG

Mary L. Grodner

No Members

To provide a voice for AAPSE's concerns to SFIREG

There are 2 full SFIREG meetings each year and AAPSE needs representation to express

AAPSE's concerns and to respond the SLA's & EPA's questions. I am frequently asked to for opinions about what may be possible or feasible for our members. The minutes of the meetings are all posted on the APPCO web site and I urge all AAPSE members to read them. Sometimes the discussions can give you some insight into a problem or issue or a "heads up" about something that may come in the future.

Issues for the Board: None at present except to maintain the good working relationship we have with SFIREG.

SFIREG POLICY, OPERATIONS & MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Jim T Criswell, July 21, 2003

Purpose of POM is to address label and policy issues confronting state lead agencies.

POM meets twice a year – once in Washington, DC and once in the states. The activities are a response to concerns raised by states and CES on label or policy issues individually or through Regional SFIREG meetings. Their focus is to bring these issues to EPA's attention and work towards resolution when problems exist.

Potential considerations for AAPSE are three issues that have continually been discussed the past year. The first is multiple REIs on pesticide labels. EPA is being encouraged by grower groups and registrants to place multiple REIs on pesticide labels. The REIs would be based on work activities or crop growth stage on a specific crop. SLAs are not keen on this issue from the enforcement side. AAPSE may want to consider if multiple REIs would create an education problem under both WPS and general applicator education programming. The second issue is greenhouse labeling. Presently, EPA states that a pesticide can be used in a greenhouse if the site/crop is on the label and the label does not prohibit the use of the product in a greenhouse. AAPSE may wish to consider if this also presents an issue in the C&T education/certification arena. One area that surfaces quickly is the use of homeowner products by small greenhouse/nursery operations to circumvent WPS. These products do not have WPS wording on their label as they were not intended for commercial use. The third issue that has surfaced is providing testing and training to persons with reading disabilities. Oklahoma and Utah have had legal issues with providing testing to applicators that cannot read or have great difficulty reading. Each state's legal office required the C&T program to provide assisted testing for these applicators. The issue is when does one not provide testing to a person that has great difficulty reading or cannot read.

These three are presented as possible Board consideration of issues. Full POM minutes are available on the AAPCO website.

SFIREG Working Committee on Water Quality and Pesticide Disposal

Ronald D. Gardner, AAPSE Liaison, Reporting July 21, 2003

Committee's purpose: The SFIREG Working Committee on Water Quality and Pesticide Disposal has its primary focus pesticide issues dealing with water quality and disposal issues. It plays a valuable role in maintaining information exchange and cooperation between the states and EPA to enable states to play a meaningful role in the development of pesticide policies and regulations. Working Committees or WCs report to the full SFIREG; their primary function is to research and develop issues. Therefore, the bulk of their work will be to engage in in-depth discussions of issues and of approaches to resolving the issues.

Summary of activities:

The Working Committee met three times since March of 2002. The minutes of these meetings can be found on the AAPCO web site: <http://aapco.ceris.purdue.edu/>.

Leading issues of interest:

- Water Quality Registration Review Issue: WC's new initiative to develop a process for reviewing potential new federal pesticide registrations with water quality concerns. A WC draft document dated April 29 and entitled "A Process to Provide State Input to US EPA on New Pesticide Registrations with Water Quality Related Concerns" was presented to the WC at the April meeting in 2002.
- The "Headwaters vs. Talent" case was discussed along with the ramifications of potentially needing a NPDES permit for all application of pesticides to "waters of the United States."
- Review of Label Statements for Disposal. There was a discussion of 4 labels, presented by means of overheads, for which there was no apparent consistency in disposal statements. The issue is: What constitutes legitimate on-site disposal? Why does a prohibition on open dumping appear on one label but not on another? ACTION ITEM: Jeff Comstock designated Gary Bahr as the chairperson for the disposal labeling review effort, with Phil Pitzer and Craig Romary also participating. Dennis Howard will assist in a consulting capacity. The purpose of the group will be to review label statement options in consultation with the NPSA in an effort to develop consistency from label to label and avoid enforcement vagaries.
- Registration Authority Project: A project gathering material on the strengths and weaknesses of state registration statutes were started. The data will be turned over to Ron Gardner, who described his idea for a matrix to organize the data. Gerard Kennedy agreed to work with Gardner on this project. Members of the WC were assigned to gather pesticide registration data from states in their regions.

Appendix

TO: AAPSE Board members
FROM: Amy E. Brown, July 15, 2003
RE: CTAG Subcommittee request for input

AAPSE Board members are requested to read this memo and the accompanying background document in preparation for discussion at the Board of Directors meeting in Hawaii.

The pesticide applicator certification and training program is undergoing an assessment by CTAG (Certification and Training Assessment Group). This assessment is a joint effort of the Cooperative Extension Service, State Lead Agencies, and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). CTAG's charge is to determine what changes should be considered to improve the professionalism of certified applicators. The AAPSE Board has been asked to consider the preliminary CTAG concept for national trainer standards.

A subgroup, Methods to Improve Trainer Skills, was designated. The original charge to the CTAG Subgroup was to:

- C Identify alternative methods to improve the skills of trainers/educators.
- C Explore and recommend alternative approaches to setting up regional/national Pesticide Education and Safety Training Centers (or their equivalent) for providing pesticide safety educators with opportunities to update skills and knowledge through periodic training workshops and to promote an exchange among trainers/educators.
- C Identify and evaluate measures to facilitate USDA or EPA requiring some form of professional development or improvement for pesticide trainers and educators.
- C Coordinate activities with AAPSE to avoid duplication of efforts.

The CTAG Subgroup also was asked to:

- C Submit a draft white paper on mechanisms to improve the skills of trainers/educators to Workgroup #2 Co-Chairs, and
- C Draft for the Workgroup #2 Co-Chairs a set of performance measures to improve training quality and make recommendations which can be incorporated into grant requirements, perhaps by channeling more grant funds to programs that are pro-active in this area and less funds to those that are not.

The Subgroup has developed some minimum standards for pesticide safety educators and proposed methods whereby prospective trainers may meet these minimum standards. Pat Hipkins, co-Chair of the subgroup, has asked for AAPSE input early in the process specifically because this effort will impact AAPSE members and the team would greatly prefer to incorporate AAPSE's suggestions, if deemed appropriate, into the documents they are preparing, rather than having to go back to the drawing board later. The AAPSE Executive Committee has invited Pat Hipkins and Al Muench to attend the AAPSE Board of Directors meeting in Hawaii on August 10 to lead a discussion of this issue with Board members. The actual process of developing such standards is expected to take place over a long time period. If AAPSE is in accordance with the overall plan, the Subgroup wishes to work out the details together, to be sure that they are sustainable for AAPSE but not burdensome for the trainers seeking/maintaining accreditation.

Request to the AAPSE Board of Directors

To prepare Board members for the discussion, Pat Hipkins has composed the following list of questions. All Board members should read the questions and give some thought to them before arriving for the meeting in Hawaii. In addition, please read the background document supplied by the Subgroup. The background document is attached in a separate file and provides helpful insight into the Subgroup's deliberations.

1. Will/can AAPSE support the concept of competency standards for pesticide safety educators?
2. Will/can AAPSE support a requirement that only those people who meet these standards be allowed to train occupational pesticide users? (This includes both initial pre-certification training and recertification/continuing education.)
3. What does AAPSE think about EPA adding a federal category for certified trainers as a means to demonstrate competency?
4. Will/can AAPSE support the idea of requiring that all pesticide safety training be conducted by properly accredited trainers (e.g., CES/University personnel), and having an accrediting body to review trainer credentials and assess competency?
5. Would AAPSE consider becoming the accrediting body for pesticide safety educators? (We envision a process that is self-sustaining because fees will be involved...so AAPSE could hire the staff needed to handle this function.)
6. What does AAPSE think of using the model in place for public school system educators for accrediting pesticide safety trainers? (In short, most prospective teachers meet prerequisites by taking required courses in an approved program of study, take an exam that demonstrates competency in the basic curriculum, and spend time in the classroom with an experienced "master" teacher demonstrating that they have the necessary heuristic skills. This model assesses both competency in technical content and skill in educational methods, and involves peer mentoring and review.)
7. Is AAPSE (EC or BOD) interested in providing input directly to this subgroup by appointing a liaison, or is the organization OK with that input coming from AAPSE members on the subgroup (Pat Hipkins, Ron Gardner, Monte Johnson) and within CTAG (lots!) Some of the things this group is working on include:
 - What credentials (prerequisites) should a pesticide safety educator have?
 - How can a prospective certified trainer demonstrate competency -- by passing a competency test, by peer-review, through a mentoring program, other?
 - What sort of continuing education requirements should accredited trainers have, and how can they meet these requirements?

Background Information on CTAG Workgroup Effort

Submitted by: Al Muench, co-Chair, CTAG
June 24, 2003

The Methods to Improve Trainer Skills Subgroup, which is composed almost entirely of current AAPSE members, feels that pesticide safety educators are a vital part of an overall pesticide program. The role of pesticide safety educators is respected and appreciated and needed. The body of knowledge of pesticide safety educators gives them a professionalism that is important and needs to be protected.

The Subgroup examined the following basic questions in pesticide safety education:

Is it important that pesticide safety educators be competent in the knowledge, skills and abilities for which they are doing the training? We looked at the range of people who provide pesticide training, from the farmer to the ranch foreman to the Americorps volunteer to the labor contractor, to the workers compensation insurance carrier representative to the pesticide safety educator (essentially anyone who does pesticide training), and we concluded that it is, indeed, important.

Is it important that trainers understand the real world circumstances in which this knowledge is used by licensees? We felt that sufficient knowledge and an understanding of the real world circumstances surrounding good pesticide application is critical to sound pesticide training.

Is it important that trainers understand the licensing process? Again, we felt this to be important.

Is there a body of knowledge that applicators and trainers should share to properly do their jobs? The answer is clearly "Yes".

Since the answers to all of these questions were affirmative, that brought The Subgroup to the question of how to have both applicators and trainers demonstrate that they have that knowledge. The answer for applicators is easy since every state has an applicator certification program. Some type of certification program seems to flow naturally from these concepts and it seems to The Subgroup that a logical approach would be a certification program for trainers.

One concern that The Subgroup is wrestling with is that some current educators may feel they are not qualified to become certified trainers. We are looking at people with backgrounds and responsibilities such as the Pat O,Connor-Marers and Carol Ramsays of the pesticide safety education world; people that we are bringing on board to be trainers (people whose main job is to train others) and who are not necessarily master pesticide safety educators like the Pats or Carols. This latter group can include the farmer, the ranch foreman, the labor contractor, a workers compensation insurance carrier representative, Americorps

volunteers, essentially anyone who does pesticide training. The efforts of The Subgroup will be aimed at this group, not at the Pats and Carols of the world who are more program managers and are likely qualified in other ways. We are trying to focus on the much larger population of people who are really trainers.

How do we handle the Pats and the Carols if the people that work for them have to demonstrate competency? If the Pats and Carols have to demonstrate competency, is it a different kind of demonstration of competency from trainers or applicators? How do we define that field or scope? The Subgroup is still struggling with these issues and the resolution will be a long-term, rather than a short-term, process. This does, however, logically point to a process in the future where we will be certifying trainers and their bosses, county agents who do training, farmers and anyone else who does pesticide safety training. It does not seem to be supportable to exclude university appointed pesticide safety educators from demonstrating competency when there are no such exclusions on the SLA side.

The Subgroup is trying to build the logical case for the position that there are ways to improve pesticide safety education through a number of elements: the competency of the trainer, the quality of the presentation skills, the quality of the curriculum, and the frequency and amount of training that should be required. We will be focusing on each of these elements, not just the competency of the trainer.

What are we trying to accomplish? We currently have situations such as those with Americorps where, literally, teenagers are providing pesticide training across the country. We also have many “for profit” trainers and others, but no minimum qualifications or minimum standards for the training they provide. Certainly people who train others about pesticides ought to know something about pesticides themselves before training others. A trainer who picks up a manual and simply follows an outline is not providing good training. Some practical experience is required. For example the WPS pilot train-the-trainer program for field workers requires that the people who are going to be the master trainers have some experience with pesticides and have some real world pesticide knowledge, even though they are not actually training the field workers.

Ultimately, trainers should have to demonstrate competency, but this is a long term issue. The Subgroup is working toward ensuring that, in addition to knowledge, trainers will have to have skills as a trainer and knowledge in teaching adult students. Most university hiring decisions for trainers do not now appear to place a great emphasis on making sure that their new employees are excellent teachers of students in their target populations. This has a negative impact on the important pesticide safety education goal of effectively communicating vital knowledge. The Subgroup clearly needs to build consensus around these and other ideas.

The Subgroup is trying to identify the types of training that would prepare a prospective trainer for certification in the first place, as well as those courses and programs that could provide continuing education for people who become certified trainers. This is a new concept and extensive development in this area may be needed.

Some may argue that certification for trainers is unnecessary. In a perfect world, every pesticide applicator would be adequately trained, follow all of the rules and not make any misapplications. Our world is not perfect in these areas. Good training - and good trainer certification - will help to make our world better.

Why is some sort of trainer certification so important? If, as with Americorps, any 18 year old can go into a state and provide “acceptable” training, why would any state want to pay a PhD to train? We don’t feel training should be open to anyone who walks in off the street. We feel pesticide training should be raised to the level of an important profession. We think AAPSE will agree that certification of professional trainers is so vital and so important that AAPSE needs to move to protect what AAPSE members do, since it is in the best interest of the public and the workers and the profession they represent. Logically, this may eventually lead AAPSE to want to be a certifying agency and, for example, review a state,s pesticide training program to determine if it meets all of the standards AAPSE has laid out for a good program and whether it merits AAPSE”s seal of approval or if it needs improvement in specific areas.

A good trainer certification program would need to have different levels of certification for the pesticide safety education coordinator, for the pesticide safety educator, for the WPS handler trainer and for the worker trainer, and any other appropriate level of trainer. They would not all be held to the same standards. There is probably a need for an exam developed by educators which tests what educators ought to be able to do. The exam could be as simple as a series of course work with some demonstration of mastery of the issues learned.