

To: Marguerite.Lamotte@lausd.net, verline.moore@lausd.net, Monica.Garcia@lausd.net, jenny.aguas@lausd.net, Tamar.Galatzan@lausd.net, hilary.macgregor@lausd.net, Steve.Zimmer@lausd.net, celia.lopez@lausd.net, BoardDistrict5@lausd.net, cynthia.ronquillo@lausd.net, Nury.Martinez@lausd.net, rosemary.duff@lausd.net, Richard.Vladovic@lausd.net, chris.torres@lausd.net  
Sent: 2/11/2013 1:19:46 P.M. Pacific Standard Time  
Subj: Letter to LAUSD Board re: Agenda Item 12 for Feb. 12-2013 Bd Mtg

Re: Agenda Item #12 - Project Definition and Funding Strategy for Phase 1A of the Common Core Technology Project Plan

Dear LAUSD Board Members,

I commend you for taking the precautionary approach in 2000 and again repeatedly in 2009 when taking a public stand against cell towers (and a T-Mobile project) on or next to your schools, and I hope and ask you to do the right thing this time in taking the same precautionary approach and turning down the wireless aspects of the proposed wireless technology program as described in Item #12 in the Agenda for your upcoming Feb. 12th Board Meeting.

Attached are letters that I and Gail Nicol submitted to the Bond Oversight Committee on January 23, 2013 for its meeting to consider the supporting the wireless technology proposal.

I will re-attach it here for your review and consideration of Item #12 on your Agenda for your Feb. 12, 2013, Board Meeting.

I request that the LAUSD Board Members do not approve the schoolwide Wi-Fi and wireless tablet proposal and instead use wired technologies to advance student learning and test scores. WiFi networks and wireless tablets are not a requirement to participate and succeed in the Common Core curriculum.

You could use that bond money instead to fund wired networks and technologies that are faster, more efficient, cleaner, more secure, truly state of the art, and will also be more cost efficient (and a smarter investment) as they will not be obsolete within 6 months or 1 year.

In addition, please keep in mind that the FCC that sets the current RF public safety guidelines has a major conflict of interest because it is in the billion dollar business of selling and auctioning wireless spectrum, and promoting the growth of the telecom and wireless industries.

Sincerely,

Ms Kiku Lani Iwata  
Burbank Action Founding Member

Enc: Letters from Kiku Iwata and Gail Nicole to LAUSD BOC, dated Jan. 23, 2013

Date: January 23, 2013

To: BOC Chair Stephen English and the BOC Committee Members

Re: Proposed allocation of funds for LAUSD WiFi Infrastructure and wireless devices/notebooks/ipads/laptops

The following e-Public Comments were e-mailed to Mr. Daniel Hwang, BOC Staff Member and BOC contact person according to the BOC website, to forward or copy to you for today's BOC meeting. The first one is from me, below. The second one was sent from fellow Los Angeles resident Gail Nicol, who sent me a copy of her e-mail to Mr. Hwang also for your receipt. Thank you for your review and consideration.

Appreciatively yours,



Ms. Kiku Lani Iwata  
Los Angeles County resident  
School Parent

=====

To: [daniel.hwang@lausd.net](mailto:daniel.hwang@lausd.net)

Sent: 1/22/2013 6:03:04 P.M. Pacific Standard Time

Subj: Public Comment for 1-23 BOC Mtg re: Wireless - Pls forward to Chair & Committee

Dear Mr. Hwang,

Please forward or copy this e-Public Comment to Mr. Stephen English and the other BOC Committee members in time for the BOC Jan. 23rd Meeting, regarding what I was told would be the first item on the Agenda: Whether to support the proposal of implementing district wide WiFi infrastructure and wireless device/ipad/laptops for LAUSD students and schools.

As a resident of Los Angeles County and concerned school parent, and due to my concern for my friends who are LAUSD school parents and their children who are enrolled in the LAUSD school system, I ask that the BOC do not support the approval of the allocation of bond/taxpayer money to fund the proposed Wi-Fi/wireless device/ipad/laptop program.

One, the 24/7 WiFi exposure is like having a cell tower on the school ground. This wireless exposure is like second-hand smoke, and the World Health Organization has categorized it as a Class 2B Possible Carcinogen, on par with DDT and lead. I am almost certain that the BOC or LAUSD would not approve spending funds to expose our children to DDT or lead on a non-stop basis. Wired (versus wireless) technology like DSL via fiberoptics is faster and more efficient and healthier.

Two, I read in the Los Angeles Daily News/Huffington Post story, "LAUSD Tablet Program Nixed: Superintendent John Deasy's Request For \$17.5 Million Nixed" (on-line link: [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/11/15/lausd-tablet-program\\_n\\_2137270.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/11/15/lausd-tablet-program_n_2137270.html) ), and at the end of the story, a reader commented about how school districts do not need wireless laptops and WiFi to participate in the Common Core program. If this is so, then LAUSD's BOC would indeed be smarter to support spending or allocating funds to other much needed LAUSD budget items instead, especially given today's tough economy.

Three, I also read the Nov. 9, 2012, letter that Mr. English wrote to the LAUSD Supt. that posed several important questions. What will be the costs to ensure that every student that is given a wireless laptop (or wireless device) has WiFi at home? What about homes that do not have WiFi or do not have or cannot afford WiFi service at home? Do the households who do not have or use WiFi systems at home then get "left behind"?

The point about equity is also so important -- will ALL students have the wifi computer? Or only certain ones? Who determines which students if not all? Do the students who do not have WiFi devices then get "left behind"?

Also, what is the future cost for upgraded wireless technology as it always seems to advance and obsolete within 6 months to 1 year? What about the costs of insuring this equipment? Who picks up that cost when a portable wireless laptop or device gets broken at home or on the playground or lost? (The glass screens are very expensive.) What if a family cannot afford this insurance cost or the costs associated with repairing one?

Four, as other teachers and readers have pointed out -- schools don't need to supply our students with \$5 calculators, and they certainly don't need to equip them with portable wireless laptops or devices that quickly become obsolete and cost hundreds of dollars more to buy, maintain, replace and insure.

High-tech wireless laptops and devices do not ensure that our children will succeed with academics, test scores, graduation, or life. (In fact, giving a student a low-tech musical instrument may be a better investment, according to studies on how playing an instrument improves a child's academic achievement!) Please read two very important articles about technology and education, if you have not already:

1. NY Times, "Grading the Digital School: In Classroom of Future, Stagnant Scores," on-line link:

[http://www.nytimes.com/2011/09/04/technology/technology-in-schools-faces-questions-on-value.html?pagewanted=all&\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2011/09/04/technology/technology-in-schools-faces-questions-on-value.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0)

2. NY Times, "Grading the Digital School: A Silicon Valley School That Doesn't Compute," on-line link:  
<http://www.nytimes.com/2011/10/23/technology/at-waldorf-school-in-silicon-valley-technology-can-wait.html?pagewanted=all>

Thank you for your consideration and please make the decision not to approve or not so support the proposal to allocate bond/taxpayer funds to the WiFi/wireless device item described in your agenda.

Sincerely,

Ms. Kiku Lani Iwata  
Los Angeles County resident  
School Parent

=====

To: daniel.hwang@lausd.net  
Sent: 1/22/2013 3:38:00 P.M. Pacific Standard Time  
Subj: Wireless Laptops

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I am a former Los Angeles City teacher, and as such, have kept up with various policy changes over the years.

It is sad to think that education is coming to a point where the superintendent of LA Schools believes that children cannot succeed unless they have wireless laptops. While I do agree that computer instruction is important, I strongly disagree with a laptop for every student, especially while teachers are being let go and class size is increasing.

Also, there is the issue of the expense for tech support and how often will damaged laptops be replaced? As technology changes, where will the funds come from to keep up with new laptops for all the students?

I do not believe that a good teacher needs a classroom full of laptops in order to help children succeed. If the main reason for laptops is to help children succeed with the standardized testing, then education becomes "teaching to testing", and fails to succeed in the areas of creative thinking, and one-on-one, face-to-face instruction.

Sincerely,

Gail Nicol