

Laurance Lee full response

Yes. I support LAUSD's limits: no routine screen time through first grade and no more than 30 minutes a day through fifth grade, with exceptions for assistive technology and accommodations. This is about how children learn.

I volunteer weekly in a Bayview kindergarten and see how quickly a screen becomes a game. The educator I work with says it plainly: no AI for elementary students. It is unproven and cannot replace working with a person.

SFUSD should use this winter to hear from students, families and educators, as LAUSD did, and adopt clear rules this spring.

Parents and educators speaking at Board meetings have a point. LAUSD developed its limits after hearing from thousands of students, families, educators and school leaders. It also included exceptions for disabilities, assessments and courses that require technology. SFUSD should do the same work instead of leaving every school to make its own rules. Some schools already have useful practices around privacy and requiring students to explain how they used AI.

Amira AI software is already raising these questions in SFUSD. Schools need more adults to give students individual reading help. I understand why a program promising that help at scale is attractive. But independent research has found smaller gains than the company advertises, and SFUSD cannot yet say Amira caused its reported early-grade gains. Before expanding it, the district should share the evidence with educators, protect student privacy and listen to what teachers and principals are seeing.

The full SFUSD AI policy should set age-based screen limits, prohibit student-facing generative AI in elementary schools, and give older students and teachers clear rules. Technology and evidence will keep changing, so the Board should review the policy regularly.