



CTAG

Certification & Training Assessment Group — National Partnerships for Safe and Effective Pesticide Management through Education, Training and Competency Assessment

Funding Strategies for Certification and Pesticide Safety Education Programs

July 2007

Obtaining adequate funding to conduct an effective certification (C&T) or pesticide safety education program (PSEP) is a constant challenge. Therefore, it is essential that those who are engaged in this vocation take funding matters, as best we can, into our own hands. CTAG developed this resource guide to present novel approaches to funding both certification and pesticide safety education programs. There are many different tactics that can be utilized to augment base program funding. In addition, C&T and PSEP coordinators can benefit from developing allies and supporters to help accomplish their goals.

CTAG knows the suggestions presented herein are not comprehensive or universally adaptable. Plus, many may require changes in policy, rules, regulations or statutes. They are presented to stimulate consideration of new strategies for C&T and PSEP programs that are not currently using some of these conventional and unconventional funding sources.

Finally, in preparing this fact sheet, it became apparent than there are many ways to fund programs, but there are no “silver bullets.” If you have additional suggestions or strategies you are willing to share with others, contact the CTAG Board so they may be added to the next printing of this paper.

Conventional Funding

Historically, C&T and PSEP programs have been funded by EPA-USDA pass-through dollars; EPA state, tribe assistance grant (STAG) dollars; institutional/agency funding; and state lead agency (SLA) memoranda of understanding. It is usually necessary to supplement this base funding with fees for services or materials. For example, programs often charge fees for training manuals, training, on-line programs, shipping and handling, examinations, licensing, certification and even charging for little items such as printing a new certification card.

When pricing training and exam fees, consider the benefits of early versus regular registration fees (make them significantly different). Also consider forfeiture for nonattendance and exam retake fees.

Educational Material and Book Sales

Program dollars for personnel and operational expenses needed to produce and revise educational materials may be fully or partially recouped by 1) printing outside the institution and selling to institutions with overhead included, 2) charging full price of development, production and distribution or 3) charging a surcharge on each sale. Many different types of resources can be sold. Programs must include in the sales price, all development costs, revision costs, printing costs and distribution costs. Sustainable pricing is very important.

Saleable resources include hard- and digital-copy educational materials.

- Printed study or resource manuals
- Digital resource material
- Manuals
- Video tapes, DVD and CD-ROMs
- Streaming video files
- Downloadable video files
- PowerPoint presentations
- On-line training modules or tutorials

In addition, if a state has spent significant resources developing training resources that other states/private businesses request to resale or modify for their own distribution, recognize your original resource is copyright-protected and you can request payment for use of your materials.

Nontraditional Funding Sources

Both C&T and PSEP programs can assess the ability to recoup expenses in various program areas. This includes:

- Exam fees (in addition to certification fee) for entities that work with SLAs to administer exams
- Special charges or fees for issuing reciprocity credentials or continuing education units (credits) from other states, provinces or private firms
- Charging an application fee for recertification session approval
- Sponsoring and/or handling fees for meetings and conferences
- Charging for certified crop adviser accreditation
- Charging for Web hosting, streaming video services and handling secure on-line credit card transactions

Third-party Sponsorship/ Partnership of Publications, Events and Training Modules

Many land-grant and provincial institutions work directly with associations, commodity groups, trade organizations and private firms to partially or fully cover actual expenses associated with developing/delivering educational programs, events or training resources. In exchange for this, the sponsoring group receives some recognition. Historically, state agencies and Cooperative Extension have been concerned about conflicts of interest, but with education being the interest, many entities have changed their view of partnerships and sponsorships. Examples of these statements are listed below:

- “The cost of printing for this publication was paid for in part ... ”
- “Roofing supplies for this structural pest training facility were donated by ... ”
- “Training event was sponsored by ... ”
- “Development of this exam was financially supported by ... ”

This also could lead to advertisements. For example, advertisements or partnerships can be imbedded subtly within a document, or they can be prominently displayed with a company logo on the cover of the document or at the beginning or end of a video clip. These, in essence, would be sold, just like an advertisement.

Plan to seek sponsorships and partnerships upfront and recognize the expectation of all parties. If you build these relationships well, other opportunities will develop.

Direct Fundraising Appeals

Some pesticide safety programs are making very limited direct solicitations for support in the forms of gifts and/or endowments. This is not new as many educational institutions do this to raise money to build sports complexes, pay for scholarships or to support faculty salaries with an endowed chair. However, to date, only a few pesticide safety education programs have placed any significant effort in doing this type of fundraising. An example is the termite and structural pest training facilities at Washington State University. A considerable portion of the resources for this facility was obtained by conducting a fundraising or capital campaign.

Obtaining Grants

Grants for pesticide education programs typically have come from EPA and USDA. But little attention has been focused on:

- National Resource Conservation Service or the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
- Conservation groups (e.g., The Nature Conservancy or Ducks Unlimited),
- Philanthropic organizations (e.g., the Lilly Foundation or the W.K. Kellogg Foundation)
- Private companies (e.g., 3M, Dow and Monsanto)

Public to Private Enterprise

A few pesticide safety programs have used their expertise to develop private companies to fill niches in certain industries. An example of this is WRK of Arkansas and Oklahoma. Essentially, agricultural engineers working with aerial applicators determined that there was no infrastructure for developing and servicing hardware and software to properly tune or calibrate aerial application equipment. So they started WRK to supply this need. Some of the funds generated from these enterprises are used for personal and professional purposes, but overall, they still support the work of pesticide safety education.

Consulting and Charging for Specialized Trainings

Some pesticide safety education programs have begun charging for services that historically would have been covered as “part of their normal duties and travel expenses.” But with reduced base support, programs are charging for:

- Consulting or speaking honorariums
- Worker Protection Standard, applicator or train-the-trainer programs
- Sprayer tune-up and pattern testing clinics
- Pesticide safety auditing and consulting
- Master applicator schools
- Lecture fees for speaking at community or technical college courses
- Closed trainings for associations or private companies

Enforcement Fines and Negotiated Settlements

Most states or provinces direct that fines for enforcement actions go into their respective general funds. But, in states such as Indiana and North Dakota, these fines go directly

to support pesticide education efforts. In other states, such as Massachusetts, plea agreements are entered into that direct a pesticide violator to make financial gifts to pesticide education programs in lieu of paying fines to the state. Either way, the violator pays a price for noncompliance and, at the same time, assists pesticide education programs by supporting their work.

Work with your state lead agencies for pesticide regulation and health to assess the plausibility of having these dollars directed at intervention, prevention and risk mitigation.

Federal and State Registration Fee Percentage

EPA, the U.S. Farm Bill and state legislatures set into rule how product registration fees will be allocated. Work with commodity groups, associations and the state lead agency to have a small portion of those fees dedicated to pesticide training and continuing education for stewardship. In order to accomplish this task, you must have your game plan detailed a year or two in advance and market your ideas to the stakeholders.

Where to Get More Resources?

CTAG appreciates the original team effort by Andrew A. Thostenson, pesticide program specialist, North Dakota State University, Fargo, N.D.; Vivianne Servant, pesticide certification specialist, Alberta Environment, Grand Prairie, Alberta, Canada; and Jack Peterson, Arizona Department of Agriculture, who initiated the work on this document. In addition, CTAG is grateful to CTAG partners who reviewed this fact sheet.

Andrew and Vivianne presented much of this information at the 2005 North American Pesticide Certification and Safety Education Workshop. Their presentation can be viewed as a PowerPoint download at

<http://ndsupesticide.cws.ndsu.nodak.edu/Funding2005.ppt>

or as a Windows Media video at

<http://ndsupesticide.cws.ndsu.nodak.edu/Funding2005.wmv>