

Regular Board Meeting - Public Comment (Online Submissions)

Date: September 3, 2026

	First Name (Optional)	Last Name (Optional)	Is this comment related to an item on the agenda?	Agenda Item
1	Marisol	Diaz	N/A	N/A
Please write your comment: My daughter has been lost at Mountain View Elementary School Three times. This last time was the final straw. There is no accountability. None of my emails about timelines or whereabouts of my daughter have been answered by anyone in the district including the principal, superintendents office, or the teacher. I am prepared to speak on the lack of safety and accountability with extensive communication and emails that I feel have been ignored and minimized				

	First Name (Optional)	Last Name (Optional)	Is this comment related to an item on the agenda?	Agenda Item
2	Alicia	Brady	N/A	N/A
Please write your comment: I want to start by thanking the Board and the District Technology Leadership Team for the changes announced on August 20, limiting TK-1 devices to shared classroom technology centers, blocking YouTube by default, and creating a Parent/Staff Technology Advisory Group. These are real, positive steps, and I recognize they happened faster than typical district timelines. Thank you. That said, I believe there's still meaningful work ahead, and I want to be a constructive partner in getting there. First, on process: the DTLT currently appears to be making decisions affecting thousands of students without a formal vote or consensus process from this elected Board. I'd ask for clearer public accountability, including how Parent Advisory Committee members will be selected, how the District will ensure that group is broadly representative, and a stronger commitment to research-based evidence over anecdotal experience in decision-making. The August survey was a good start, but several questions lacked the context needed for the results to be interpreted with confidence. Second, on devices: 49% of survey respondents said regular individual device use shouldn't begin before 7th grade. I support the District's commitment to equity, but equity doesn't require identical device use for every student; it means targeted accommodations for students who need them, not 1:1 devices as the default for all. Third, on i-Ready: 47% of parents said it wasn't beneficial or had little impact on their child's learning, with only 7% calling it an important support. I'd ask the Board to revisit that investment. Finally, on AI: I understand a separate presentation is coming, and I want to raise concerns now, before policy is set, specifically around student data privacy, mandatory human oversight of any AI-assisted instruction or grading, age-appropriate limits, and transparent parent notification before any classroom AI tool is adopted. I'd also ask the Board to consider one more piece as that policy takes shape. This district has always taken real pride in supporting the arts, and I share a concern that AI-generated art raises serious questions the broader field hasn't resolved yet, particularly around whether the original artists whose work trained these tools were ever recognized or compensated. Given how much this community values the arts and the students creating in them, I'd ask that AI-generated art be kept out of use by staff, faculty, students, and PFAs districtwide, and that this be part of the AI policy discussion going forward. Thank you for your time and for the progress so far. I look forward to continuing this partnership.				

Continued on next page...

Regular Board Meeting - Public Comment (Online Submissions)

Date: September 3, 2026

First Name (Optional)	Last Name (Optional)	Is this comment related to an agenda?	Agenda Item
3 CUSD Parent	Undisclosed	N/A	N/A
Please write your comment:			
Thank you to the District and Board for listening to families and making meaningful changes, especially reducing device access in TK-1 classrooms, blocking YouTube by default, and creating opportunities for parent involvement. These are positive steps, and I appreciate the work that has gone into them. However, I believe there is still significant room for improvement. Technology decisions affecting thousands of students should have clear Board oversight, transparency, and accountability. As the District moves forward with a parent advisory group, many families would like to understand how members will be selected, how diverse viewpoints will be represented, and how research, rather than anecdotal experiences, will guide decision-making. I also hope the District takes a closer look at its own survey results. Forty-nine percent of respondents indicated that regular individual device use should begin in 7th grade or later, suggesting significant community support for limiting 1:1 device use in elementary school. While equity is important, equity does not require identical technology use for every student. Students with special needs or socioeconomic circumstances can be supported through targeted accommodations without making 1:1 devices the default for all children. The survey also showed that 47% of parents felt i-Ready was not beneficial or had little impact on their child's learning, while only 7% viewed it as an important support for learning. These results warrant a serious re-evaluation of the program's role in our classrooms. Finally, I was happy to see that both New York City and LAUSD, have adopted a moratorium on student AI use. I hope that CUSD will also follow suit and make sure that AI impacts on education are evaluated based on research and shared with the community before making any decisions. Thank you for your time.			

Continued on next page...

Regular Board Meeting - Public Comment (Online Submissions)

Date: September 3, 2026

First Name (Optional)	Last Name (Optional)	Is this comment related to an agenda?	Agenda Item
4 CUSD Parent	Undisclosed	N/A	N/A
Please write your comment:			
Equitable Access and Purposeful Technology Use I'd like to begin by thanking the Board, Dr. Elsasser, Kara and the DTLT for the time they have given to the technology review. I'm also grateful for the changes these conversations have brought about for students – particularly our youngest learners in TK–1. For many parents, how things progress from here matters, so I appreciate this opportunity to keep the conversation going. Up until now, my previous concerns have centered around elementary education, but following the discussion about equitable access at the last Board meeting, I'd like to consider what that means for students in middle and high school. At that meeting, Alex McDonald shared that because of dyslexia, he didn't read until seventh grade, and reflected that a device capable of reading to him could have opened up a world of literature as early as second grade. This anecdote illustrated an important part of equitable access. The Board also highlighted how providing 1:1 devices can help ensure access for all, regardless of family income. This was another important point. Alongside this aspect of equitable access, research also shows that reliable internet and support at home can shape how students access learning. So equity has many dimensions. When we look specifically at learning, there's another important dimension to consider. At the last meeting, the DTLT highlighted examples of "purposeful" technology use — including a kindergarten seed project, a student-created story and a TED Talk — reflecting the district's focus on creating rather than simply consuming through technology. But it's important to remember that secondary students regularly use their iPads to access textbooks, longer readings, learning materials and Canvas. In those moments, technology isn't simply supporting an activity — it's becoming the medium through which students receive and work with their curriculum. And that medium matters. Research tells us that reading on a screen can affect comprehension, with some students more affected than others. Learning through a device can also bring additional demands — navigating platforms, moving between reading and note-taking, and managing distractions. So a device that removes a barrier for one student may introduce disadvantages for another. Equitable access doesn't have to mean identical use. The access may be equal but the learning benefit may not be. When every student is expected to access materials through a device, we need to consider whether those additional demands are serving a purpose. New York City's new screen-time policy goes further, requiring technology to be "mission-critical to learning." So, if a student could simply open a physical textbook, put a notebook beside it and begin, we need to ask: What is the device adding to the learning? Understanding daily device time would also be very helpful. The district's technology survey showed that 75% of staff responses placed typical daily use between 15 and 60 minutes. But what does that mean for a secondary student moving from class to class? Does that amount reflect screen time during one period, or total use across the school day? The presentation doesn't communicate that, so aggregate data from the district's iPad device-management system should be analyzed. It would provide a clear picture of the screen time that can accumulate across a school day for each grade level. I hope the Board requests this. So, equal access is only part of the picture. We also need to ask whether the medium supports learning, what the device is adding, and how much of the school day students are spending on it. Thank you for considering these points as the technology review continues.			

END