
Public Comment to the Legislative Education Committee June 16, 2020

Good Morning, for the record my name is Brian Rippet. I am a high school physics and chemistry teacher from Douglas County currently serving as the President of the Nevada State Education Association. As you know, the NSEA has been the trusted voice of Nevada educators for over 100 years.

For the past 4 years I have also served as a member of the Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC). My experiences managing the NEPF as part of TLC and being evaluated with the NEPF tool have informed my belief that the intellectual and emotional costs of the NEPF system are at cross purposes to attracting and retaining high quality educators and will also be at cross purposes to safely reopening Nevada's schools. My beliefs were solidified at the Council's most recent meeting on 5/27/2020 when the findings of the NEVADA EDUCATOR PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK: IMPACT AND VALIDITY REPORT were presented. The report stemmed from SB 475 which required a study of the "impact and validity of the NEPF." It was prepared by the Center for Research, Evaluation and Assessment (CREA) at the UNLV College of Education and presented by lead author Bradley Marianno.

I'd like to share some "Key Takeaways" from the study and candid comments from the author. While much time and consternation has been expended over the weighting of domains over the past several legislative sessions. The study concludes:

"The Weighting of the NEPF Domains Do Not Measurably Impact Final Scores or Ratings." The study found: "in short, the weighting does not appear to matter much."

The NEPF is often held up as an instrument of growth and improvement. The study debunks this notion stating:

"We find that schools and districts grow very little in their NEPF scores over time. The mean year-to-year change in teacher and administrator NEPF scores is essentially zero." So much for "growth" model. The study did find that NEPF scores are associated with levels of achievement. However, there is no evidence of causality. The study concludes "...these relationships should not be interpreted as the NEPF causing higher achievement..." and **"When looking at the impact of NEPF growth on growth in reading and math achievement, we find no significant impact."**

An additional takeaway in the executive summary **"most teachers and administrators believe the NEPF is a valid measure of their performance"** on the surface seems to be a positive. Yet in the context of the full report, this takeaway is very disturbing. The NEPF has been exceptionally well marketed but does not stand up to its promises when actually put into use. Slick marketing does not change the facts that the NEPF is ineffective and exceptionally time consuming. I'm reminded of the old TV huckster Ron Popeil and "Ronco" who promoted 'game changing can't do without products.' What the buyer actually received in the mail did not do the intended job as described. Like Ronco, the NEPF is well marketed, but poorly constructed and ultimately not worth the costs.

In conclusion, it is time this committee listens to its own study. We need to focus our diminishing resources on a safe and effective school reopening and trust the professionals in the classrooms to teach and fairly assess our students without the burden of the NEPF.

Sincerely, Brian Rippet; NSEA President

