**Discontinue the Current 1:1 iPad Program for Grades K-5**

Parents, teachers, pediatricians, librarians, art therapists, poets, doctors, and taxpayers of [PLACE or DISTRICT] are asking that **[SCHOOL or DISTRICT] discontinue immediately the current 1:1 iPad program within [SCHOOL or DISTRICT] elementary schools for grades K-5**.

The [1:1/Digital Learning/Personalized] program(s), which put personal iPads in the hands of elementary school children over the past [#] years, has not only cost millions for devices, staffing, and infrastructure, but it has put children into a social experiment that is likely to harm their physical and social-emotional wellbeing. Recent studies have led other school systems to greatly reduce device exposure or ban them entirely.

**We urge [DISTRICT] to address the following:**

1. Eliminate the current 1:1 model for grades 2-5 and classroom iPad use in grades K-1.
2. Have an established, equitable and proven curriculum that demonstrates how the use of these devices furthers children’s academic success and actually teaches “technology,” i.e., coding, robotics.
3. Ensure [DISTRICT] has procedures for [DISTRICT] parents to opt out of iPad use and out of the devices being sent home.
4. Set restrictions on the number of hours per day children spend on digital devices (including expected homework time with the device).
5. Have [DISTRICT] send a waiver to explicitly list the potential risks of iPad usage, including, but not limited to, attention issues, screen addiction, blue light effects on eyesight, insomnia, and effects on reading acquisition.
6. Ensure [DISTRICT] has a consistent and sensible technology policy that applies to our youngest learners – no iPads during indoor recess or open-ended iPad usage (YouTube, gaming, etc.). Reading should be from real books until further evidence that reading from electronic devices does not stunt reading acquisition.

**Considerations:**

These devices are being used as testing devices in the name of “personalized learning.” This program has been implemented via trial and error for [#] years, using our children as the guinea pigs. We know what positively influences our children’s development: having wonderful teachers who are able to spark their love of learning; exposure to and connection with the outdoors; developing social skills and relationships with peers; freedom to solve problems creatively; engagement with their surroundings in a way that involves the senses and the whole body.

[A global report by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) suggests](https://www.wsj.com/articles/technology-in-classrooms-doesnt-always-boost-education-results-oecd-says-1442343420) iPads work against all of these elements, and are therefore not a constructive medium with which to be occupying so much of our youngest students’ time.

What parents are seeing within [DISTRICT] is significantly inconsistent from school to school – some schools allow the devices to go home; some small groups of kids learn to code robots; some classrooms barely use the devices outside of state-mandated testing. When devices are required to be used at home, we also see conflict arising from unwanted additional screen time.

Exposure to technology has its place and can be incorporated through shared carts of iPads or a wired computer lab for special technology sessions (i.e., coding, keyboarding, internet safety, or use as a research source).

**Budget Concerns for [DISTRICT] & [COUNTY]:**

We have to prioritize funds. The costs of infrastructure and personnel to maintain individual devices for students in grades 2-5 is significant and will continue to increase as our school population grows. (Costs increase even more if the schools also provided the filters and peripheral devices necessary to avoid the development of eye and musculoskeletal problems in students.) This is not a good use of our tax dollars – especially for a program that has not proven its benefit since it began.

The opportunity cost and unintended consequences of 1:1 programs are of grave concern. We strongly suggest halting further implementation and pulling back when it comes to our youngest learners.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter,