This is a compiled and confidential collection of comments from five LMSD educators who, for various reasons, including fear of retaliation, wanted to remain anonymous. To protect them as fully as possible, I am not sharing any identifying information, including schools, grade levels, roles, sex, or any other personal details. I am sharing only the substance of their concerns about the use of Chromebooks and school devices in LMSD.

• Students are using school email throughout the day in ways that function like texting, including constant back and forth with peers and sometimes with parents, and this is contributing to social conflict, cyberbullying, and major distraction from learning.

• Students are also using school devices to communicate socially during class in other ways, including opening video calls with friends in other classrooms, making faces at each other, and staying focused on peers instead of instruction.

• Personal device misuse affects everyone, including students who do not even have phones. One example raised was a student taking a photo of another student who did not have a phone and sharing it maliciously.

• Students are regularly getting around filters, blocks, and classroom monitoring systems that are supposed to restrict harmful or off task content. In practice, many students are ahead of the systems meant to contain them.

• Even when teachers are actively monitoring and have strong relationships with students, devices remain a major source of distraction and often overpower normal classroom management.

• Students are accessing inappropriate material on school devices, including social media, video games, violent websites, questionable gaming sites, music videos with violent or inappropriate content, and in some cases pornography, both at school and at home.

• Even students who are not misusing devices themselves can still be exposed in class to obscene, inappropriate, or disturbing material shown on nearby screens. A child can unintentionally see something they never chose to look at.

• The school environment is not experienced as a safe or controlled digital space. In some ways, it is seen as less supervised than home use.

• Many families who are strict about screens, YouTube, websites, and device access at home do not realize that school devices may give their children broader access with less supervision than they would ever allow in their own homes.

• The amount of real adult oversight over what students are doing on screens is seen as inadequate.

• Students often have devices open in homeroom, class, lunch, and around the building, and many are distracted before instruction even begins because games, videos, or other non academic content are already open on the screen from earlier use.

• In some classrooms, students are using devices for games or open internet time as early as homeroom, sometimes around 8:00 in the morning.

• Some students are already logged into their school devices at home before the school day starts, watching videos or playing games, and then continue that pattern when they arrive at school.

• Students use Chromebooks during free time for non academic content, including YouTube shorts, repetitive online games, and other distractions, even during the school day.

• Students are sometimes sending inappropriate material to large groups of classmates through school email, including spam style messages to the whole class or large student groups.

• Whether students get free browsing or game time often depends entirely on the teacher. Some teachers are strict, but there does not appear to be a clear blanket policy that is consistently enforced across classrooms.

• Screen use varies widely depending on the teacher, which means there is no meaningful consistency across classrooms. If device use is left to individual teachers, students are not getting the same standards, expectations, or limits.

• There should be clear districtwide policies and parameters for when laptops should and should not be used, rather than leaving major decisions to classroom by classroom discretion.

• Substitute teacher days are seen as a major weak point. Students know they can often get away with more when a substitute is present, and some actively try to exploit that.

• The issue is not only academic. Device misuse spreads conflict, distraction, inappropriate material, and harmful social dynamics across the student body.

• There is skepticism about district claims that certain digital learning platforms improve learning or build community, and a strong sense that these claims are not being clearly explained, justified, or supported by what educators actually see.

• Online assessments create easy openings for cheating, including opening other tabs during tests and using AI tools. Students can access AI summaries, search results, or other outside help instead of working independently.

• AI tools are becoming part of the problem. Once students know how to bypass blockers, they can use AI during class and often try to copy summaries rather than think and write in their own words.

• Children often have to actively reject AI help that is constantly presented to them rather than simply completing work independently.

• In some classrooms, when classwork is done, the reward or default becomes more laptop time. This is seen as an inappropriate and harmful use of school devices.

• The gamification of learning is a major concern. Many educational activities now look and feel like video games, which may engage students briefly but make it harder for them to tolerate slower, deeper, non gamified learning.

• Even when teachers use game style review activities, the emotional and behavioral fallout afterward can be so dysregulating that some teachers prefer to avoid them.

• Device dependence is showing up behaviorally. Some students appear addicted to laptops, physically resist putting them away, tantrum when asked to stop, or even yank devices back from teachers.

• Teachers are having to spend time and energy policing laptop behavior, misuse, and emotional dependence, which pulls attention away from actual teaching.

• Students are more agitated, impulsive, demanding, and less patient than in the past. Educators are seeing much lower frustration tolerance and much more difficulty waiting even briefly for help or instruction.

• There is more impulsive physical behavior as well, including play hitting, slapping at each other or at devices, rough joking, and general poor impulse control. Teachers believe this has become noticeably worse in recent years, especially since COVID.

• Students sometimes sit and repeatedly hit keys or the spacebar while playing repetitive online games, creating a classroom environment that is loud, chaotic, and overstimulating.

• Screen heavy classrooms are described as overstimulating not only for students, but for teachers too. One comparison offered was that some classrooms now feel like casinos.

• Overstimulation is a word educators repeatedly use to describe the current classroom environment.

• Teachers are burned out, and part of that burnout is tied directly to nonstop stimulation, distraction, and the management burden created by screen based instruction.

• Some educators believe the current screen heavy model is exhausting enough to push teachers toward early retirement, and that this is part of a broader pattern of dissatisfaction in the profession.

• Teacher dissatisfaction is not only about student behavior in the abstract. It is tied directly to screen saturated classrooms, academic decline, overstimulation, and a feeling that the profession has changed in unhealthy ways.

• Traditional academic skills are being displaced. Concerns include the loss of spelling tests, less drilling of multiplication facts, weaker writing instruction, and less time spent on basic reading, writing, grammar, and arithmetic.

• There is a strong sense that pencil and paper education, direct instruction, and traditional classroom structure are being replaced by screen based systems long before children are developmentally ready.

• By middle school, the computer is seen not as a supplement, but as the center of the day. Some students are effectively managing their entire school life through the Chromebook.

• One example raised is that students may have to open their computer and sign in just to complete a bathroom related form, reinforcing the sense that school life has become over digitized.

• There are concerns that there are no real textbooks anymore, that materials feel scattered, and that learning is spread across worksheets and multiple platforms rather than grounded in a coherent traditional curriculum.

• Some teachers rely on screen based work because it is easier to assign and manage digitally than on paper, especially when paper supplies are limited or districts push digital platforms.

• Assignments are often posted through online classroom platforms instead of being handed out physically, partly for convenience and partly for cost reasons.

• Grammar and writing instruction are increasingly being done through clicking and selecting on screens instead of writing by hand. This raises concern that students are not truly learning how to write, punctuate, or edit in a durable way.

• Handwriting has deteriorated dramatically. Educators describe student handwriting as much more underdeveloped, less readable, and less practiced than in prior years.

• Writing itself is being weakened because students increasingly treat writing as searching, copying, and pasting rather than thinking and composing.

• Basic writing quality is perceived as declining badly, with concern that by later grades many students lack solid spelling, grammar, punctuation, and writing skills.

• Academic success is being harmed by this model. There is a sense that students can easily get lost in the shuffle, especially if parents are not closely monitoring every detail.

• Families who have time, knowledge, and resources can compensate more at home, while students without that level of support may fall behind further.

• A concrete concern raised is that students can struggle significantly, including failing subjects like math, without meaningful intervention, follow up, or a clear plan.

• The Chromebook issue is viewed not as a limited tool problem, but as something embedded in the curriculum itself. The concern is not about one app or one class, but about the overall educational model.

• If a family wants a more classical, traditional education centered on reading, writing, arithmetic, order, discipline, and teacher led learning, there is a belief that LMSD is moving away from that model rather than protecting it.

• Some educators believe the preferred model would be computer labs or shared carts used when genuinely needed, rather than each child having an individual device throughout the day.

• In the past, devices were a limited instructional tool that came from a cart for a short period and then went away. Now the computer is always with the student, all day, including lunch and downtime, which has fundamentally changed its role from occasional tool to constant distractor.

• Multiple educators believe parents should absolutely have the option to opt out of Chromebooks as a primary means of education and choose a more traditional model centered on paper, books, handwriting, direct instruction, and teacher led learning.

• A better model raised by educators is not one to one Chromebooks in students' hands all day, but limited access to shared computer labs or carts for specific purposes, such as typing, research, or targeted technology instruction, while keeping core learning off screens as much as possible.

• Educators describe the current direction as unsustainable. They see growing burnout, more teachers considering early retirement, and a broader sense that this model cannot continue indefinitely. There is also a belief that national momentum is building toward a significant shift away from heavy educational technology use and back toward far less screen based learning.

• In some classes, students are given a choice between paper and digital versions of the same assignment. Most students choose digital because it is easier, faster, or allows them to pull images and material from the internet, but some educators see the paper option as important and worth preserving.

• Many parents are frustrated that they cannot place their own parental restrictions on school devices and cannot realistically monitor every minute of use. They feel powerless when the school controls the device but does not provide meaningful safeguards.

• The current idea that students are primarily responsible for managing their own device use is seen as wrong and harmful, because children are being expected to self regulate access to something highly distracting and highly addictive.

• There is concern that social life is increasingly organized around screens and gaming, and that children who are not allowed to spend hours gaming can feel excluded from peer culture.

• Educators see a broader cultural problem in which many children have been raised to see constant screen use as normal and no longer experience it as strange to spend large parts of the day looking at a device instead of speaking to people around them.

• Attention spans have clearly declined compared with 10 or 20 years ago. Educators see much less patience, much more difficulty sustaining attention, and a general worsening of regulation.

• The problem is not seen as just school based or just home based. It is the combined effect of school screens, home screens, short form video culture, online gaming, social media, and adults using devices constantly around children.

• There is concern that academic outcomes nationally have fallen sharply during the same era that school screen use has exploded, and that this may reflect a combination of school devices, home devices, and reduced real world engagement.

• Devices break regularly. They are dropped, keys come off, screens crack, and replacements and repairs appear to create a significant ongoing cost.

• There is concern that districts are spending large amounts on devices, filtering tools, software subscriptions, and related programs while also making staffing cuts. This raises the question of whether some technology spending should be reduced before staff positions are reduced.

• A great deal of money appears to be wasted on breakage, replacement, maintenance, and related software, all of which comes from public funds one way or another.

• There is concern that vendors and educational technology companies may influence district decisions through bundled offers, extra materials, discounts, or other perks that make programs more attractive financially even if they are not educationally better.

• In financially stressed districts, there is concern that decisions about software and screen based curriculum may be shaped more by price, incentives, or what stretches a dollar further than by what is developmentally or educationally best for children.

• The district's framing of equity around educational technology is seen by some educators as backward. The concern is not only access to devices, but unequal exposure to harm.

• If device policies remain weak, families with more privilege, time, and resources will be better able to shield their own children from overuse, misuse, unsafe content, and negative academic effects, while more vulnerable students will be left more exposed.

• In that sense, the current approach may create a different kind of digital divide, where the students most in need of protection are the least protected.

• Some educators note that other school systems and states are already reconsidering the individual device model, in part because of cost and in part because the educational return does not justify the expense.

• At least one example was cited of a public middle school moving away from one to one student devices and back to shared carts because the cost of maintaining individual devices had become too high.

• One educator had not found a district that broadly allows full parental opt out from school devices for everyone, but had seen cases where screen use was scaled down significantly for students whose parents had more formal legal leverage through special education related protections or similar school based protections.

• There is a belief that legal pressure matters. Families with stronger formal protections, documentation, and willingness to push hard can sometimes get schools to scale device use back for their child.

• In one example shared, sustained parent pressure, documentation of inappropriate school device use, and a formal educational designation led a district to become much more careful about a child's screen exposure.

• Once a parent is known to be highly informed, highly persistent, and willing to escalate, schools may become much more willing to offer paper alternatives or sharply reduce device use for that child.

• There is an urgent need to rebuild paper based curriculum and direct instruction.

• There is also a need to retrain younger teachers in how to teach effectively without centering instruction around screens, because many entered the profession after digital systems were already dominant and may have little experience with strong paper based classrooms.

• There has been an increase in concerns that children are not developing enough core strength, hand strength, and fine motor skills, and that this may be contributing to more referrals for occupational therapy.

• A major concern is that children are increasingly doing academic tasks by moving shapes or objects around on a screen instead of doing physical, hands on work that develops the body and brain together.

• Students are doing less of the activities that used to build foundational motor development, including squeezing Play Doh, gripping pencils, painting while standing at an easel, and practicing movements that cross the midline. These are not minor details, they are basic developmental activities that support writing, regulation, and learning.

• There has been a major increase in emotional dysregulation, especially after screen use. Students can become highly upset, reactive, and unable to regulate when devices are removed or denied.

• Children as young as about eight years old have been seen having crying tantrums when told they cannot use a device during things like indoor recess or a brain break.

• There has been a major increase in impulsivity and a visible decline in self control.

• There has also been a major increase in oppositional behavior. This includes both students who have a formal oppositional diagnosis and students who are simply far more oppositional, defiant, and resistant than teachers used to see.

• A major classroom problem is that students keep devices open and tune the teacher out while doing other things in the background. They may look like they are following instruction, but they are actually on another tab gaming, chatting, messaging friends, or engaging in cyberbullying.

• Teachers are facing students who are splitting their attention across multiple tabs and conversations while appearing to be in class.

• There has been an increase in attention problems and hyperactivity, along with a reduced ability to stay with a lesson.

• Students have far less stamina for attending to instruction, persisting through difficulty, and sustaining focus. Their attention is increasingly shaped by scrolling, fast switching, and short form content.

• The teacher described children coming to school already exhausted from staying up very late on devices, including watching videos or scrolling online at night. This then affects the next school day, because the teacher is receiving tired, depleted students who are less able to focus, regulate, or learn.

• One concern tied to equity is that when every child is given a take home Chromebook, children who otherwise might not have had much screen access now have a highly tempting device at home that can become a tool for gaming, videos, and late night use.

• A school issued device can quickly become like candy to a child, something they want to be on constantly, including for non academic purposes.

• Even if a district says devices should not be used as rewards, they are often functioning that way in practice.

• During intervention or enrichment periods, if students are not actively working on homework, many are allowed to sit on their Chromebooks and play games.

• Even after school activities can become screen based in ways that defeat the whole purpose of the activity. A club that should involve real interaction, strategy, or hands on engagement can

turn into students sitting on Chromebooks playing online games or playing the activity digitally instead of doing it in person.

• There appears to be an increase in the number of students needing one to one behavioral aides, meaning an adult shadowing them because of behavior issues. The teacher described this as something that used to be rare and is now much more common.

• Some of the overuse of technology happens even in literacy instruction. Instead of reading a paper book aloud to children in an engaged and interactive way, some teachers are simply playing a prerecorded read aloud from the internet.

• That matters because a real interactive read aloud includes eye contact, pausing, asking questions, pointing to pictures, responding to children, and shaping their attention in the moment. A video read aloud does not provide the same human connection or instructional value.

• The teacher expressed concern that this kind of detached, screen based instruction has become normalized enough that it may even happen when parents are present in the room.

• Student behavior overall feels different from previous years. The teacher described children as having less grit, less capacity to tolerate frustration, less ability to be held accountable, and more difficulty sitting, listening, taking in directions, and functioning in a grade appropriate way.

• It is becoming harder not only to engage students, but to make sure they are communicating, participating, and behaving in age appropriate ways.

• Students are also struggling more with real world communication, both with teachers and with peers.

• In free time, quiet time, transitions, and similar parts of the day, time that could be used for play, imagination, drawing, conversation, or creativity is often being handed over to devices instead.

• For difficult or dysregulated children, the device can become a pacifier. It may make classroom management easier in the moment, but the concern is that it is not what is best for the child.

• Screen use is affecting children outside of formal lesson time as well, including breaks, transitions, and social interactions.

• Schools are increasingly dealing with social and disciplinary fallout from videos, posts, and online conflicts that happen outside school but spill directly into school relationships and classroom dynamics.

• Even when online harm does not happen physically in school, teachers and administrators are left dealing with the consequences in school.

• Students in elementary grades are already using messaging tools and other digital communication platforms in ways that create drama, conflict, and social problems that then come into the classroom.

• This is changing the way children socialize with one another. Their social interactions are increasingly shaped by digital communication, conflict, and poor online etiquette.

• There is deep concern that students are being handed powerful devices without a real digital citizenship curriculum.

• Children are being given access to an enormous online world at very young ages, but are not being systematically taught how to be safe online, what information not to share, what makes a source trustworthy or untrustworthy, how to handle contact from others, or how to navigate the risks.

• If a district is going to be aggressive about putting technology in children's hands, then it should also be aggressive about teaching safety, judgment, boundaries, and digital responsibility. The concern here is that the technology is being pushed far more than the protection.

• The district appears to be relying too much on band aids, filters, blockers, and technical fixes, even though students keep finding ways around them.

• Spending more money on more filters is not seen as a real solution, because children often find another workaround anyway.

• Another concern is that people higher up in educational leadership can become overly focused on budgets, systems, rankings, and the business side of education, and lose sight of the fact that the central issue is children.

• Financial considerations appear to play a major role in technology decisions. Programs may be chosen not because they are best for children, but because they are cheaper, come with perks, or are easier to justify institutionally.

• There is concern that large sums of money are being spent on software and digital intervention systems when that same money could have gone toward highly trained human beings.

• A major question raised is how many interventionists, classroom aides, or support staff could be hired for the amount of money being spent on certain digital programs.

• Elementary classrooms often do not have enough human help. Many teachers do not have aides unless a particular child has a plan that requires one, even though an aide could support the entire classroom.

• Part of why devices are used so much is that it is easier for one overwhelmed teacher to manage digitally than to run several small groups alone without enough adult support.

• In that sense, technology is not just supplementing instruction, it is replacing human beings.

• Diagnostic and intervention software is increasingly doing work that might once have been done by trained adults in small groups or direct support settings.

• There is strong concern that technology based intervention is replacing more meaningful, human, relational intervention.

• A major point raised about the PSSA is that some digital academic programs appear to be built to mirror the format, structure, and answer entry methods of the state test.

• The concern is that these programs are not simply teaching content, they are training children to operate within the interface of the PSSA.

• For example, students may have to learn the exact digital way to enter answers, such as fractions, using specific on screen buttons. If they do not know the interface, they can get an answer marked wrong even when they understand the math.

• This means part of what is being taught is not knowledge itself, but how to navigate a digital testing environment.

• The teacher's concern is that this can make students better at taking that specific kind of test without necessarily making them more thoughtful, more mathematically sound, or more deeply educated.

• It is similar to test prep culture, where the goal becomes mastering the format and mechanics of the exam rather than mastering the underlying subject in a rich and durable way.

• There is concern that this pressure is tied to school ratings, teacher ratings, and district rankings, which can distort educational priorities.

• The teacher believes that state testing pressures are likely one reason districts keep pushing technology, because digital instructional programs can be marketed as helping students perform better on digital standardized tests like the PSSA.

• Students also experience significant anxiety around this whole testing environment.

• Overall, the combined concern is that the current LMSD device environment is affecting nearly every dimension of student life and school functioning. Educators describe a system that is contributing to distraction, cyberbullying, exposure to obscene, inappropriate, and violent content, inconsistent classroom standards, AI assisted cheating, compulsive and addictive device behavior, overstimulation, reduced parent control, unnecessary financial cost, and greater inequity for the students least able to protect themselves. At the same time, they believe it is weakening academic foundations, including reading, writing, handwriting, grammar, math fluency, stamina, persistence, and the ability to think, compose, and solve problems independently. Beyond academics, they describe effects on physical development, including weaker fine motor skills, less hand strength, less core strength, and fewer opportunities for the kinds of real world activities that build coordination and readiness to learn. They also describe serious effects on emotional regulation, attention, impulsivity, oppositional behavior, classroom conduct, peer relationships, communication, discipline, sleep, and overall social development. The broader picture they paint is not simply that devices are overused, but that they are reshaping childhood, classroom culture, and the daily experience of teaching and learning in ways that feel less human, less relational, less developmentally appropriate, and less protective of children.