

November 20, 2026

Re: <u>Follow-Up to Open Letter to School Districts, District Leadership, and School Boards</u>

Dear School Districts, School District Leaders, and School Boards (the "Districts"):

On October 5, 2026, thirteen leading organizations and experts on technology in schools wrote an Open Letter to the Districts, (i) informing the Districts of recent litigation developments and reporting concerning student use of YouTube, Gemini AI features, and the internet on school-issued devices; (ii) requesting that the Districts disable YouTube and Gemini AI features on school-issued devices, and (iii) requesting that the Districts investigate student internet use on school-issued devices, disclose the results to the public, and reform their policies to ensure student safety.[1]

[1] The Open Letter is available at: http://openlettertoschools.com.

Now, *nineteen* leading organizations and experts – the thirteen who joined the Open Letter, plus six more[2] – write the Districts to:

(1) Inform the Districts of additional reporting and litigation that reinforce the points made in the Open Letter and demonstrate the safety and legal risks of YouTube, Gemini AI, and student internet access on school-issued devices;

(2) Respond to a critique of the Open Letter from Lightspeed Systems, which apparently has done business with Google; and

(3) Urge the Districts to stand up to Google, which has recently sought to bully the Districts into forcing Gemini AI features onto students by threatening to take away Google Search functionality if the Districts refuse to do so.

I. Additional Reporting and Litigation Developments Related to YouTube, Gemini AI, and Student Internet Use on School-Issued Devices.

a. An NBC Report Reinforces the Dangers of YouTube and Supports the Open Letter's request that the Districts Turn Off Student Access to YouTube.

On October 20, 2026, NBC News reporter Tyler Kingkade issued a report, *Hooked on YouTube*, further demonstrating the shocking extent to which students in the Districts are drawn into inappropriate and non-educational YouTube videos on their school-issued devices—inside and outside of school hours.[3] This reporting aligns with comparable findings across multiple publications and reporters cited in the Open Letter.[4]

The Districts should review this NBC News Report, because it documents the safety hazards of student YouTube access on school-issued devices.

Among the findings of Mr. Kingkade and other NBC News reporters:

- NBC News reporters examined more than 17,000 videos viewed by students on school-issued devices and found that ***more than 95% of the videos, which include ads, were not educational***.

---

[2] The six additional organizations are: (1) The AI Psychological Research Coalition (AIPRC); (2) Buckets Over Bullying; (3) Center for Countering Digital Harm; (4) Four Norms; (5) the Institute for Family Studies; and (6) the Institute for Families & Technology. All six organizations also join in the October 5, 2026 Open Letter.

[3] NBC Report *available at*: https://www.nbcnews.com/specials/hooked-youtube-videos-schools-junk-infiltrating-classrooms-google/ (last accessed: Nov. 18, 2026).

[4] *See* Open Letter at pp. 10-11.

- Five of the students in the study viewed between 1,200 and 5,800 YouTube videos during school hours in one academic year, ***hundreds of which "contained profanity, sexually suggestive scenes or references to drugs and alcohol***"

- One eighth grader in the study viewed 4,784 videos during school hours, "clicking on NBA and NFL highlights before moving on to a mix of police chase footage, cats coughing up hairballs and AI-generated animations of a time-traveling skeleton visiting ancient Rome and the Titanic — in between ads for a local health clinic, Old Spice and CarMax."

- Interviews with students confirmed that they were addicted to YouTube's AI-generated slop videos—reinforcing many of the Districts' ***own allegations*** in their lawsuits against YouTube that YouTube is an addictive and dangerous platform and that "YouTube designed its algorithms to manipulate users and induce them to use YouTube excessively."[5]

- YouTube "does not give schools a way to disable addictive features like autoplay and TikTok-style YouTube Shorts unless they block the website entirely. That means millions of students have access to billions of videos, leaving some endlessly scrolling through targeted recommendations that have nothing to do with school."

Predictably, in its comments on this reporting, YouTube ***again blamed school districts*** for these problems—noting that "[o]ur tools allow administrators to block the platform entirely or restrict access to teacher-assigned videos only, with no ads, recommendations, or browsing."

There is no longer any excuse for the Districts to allow students to access YouTube on their school-issued devices. The Districts should turn off student YouTube access on school-issued devices ***immediately***. Public reporting, and allegations by over 1,000 of the Districts themselves, confirm that students are being harmed by YouTube. Students will continue being harmed by YouTube unless and until the Districts protect their students from YouTube by turning it off on school-issued devices.[6] Enough is enough.

---

[5] *See id.* at pp. 2-3 (detailing allegations against YouTube by over 1,000 school districts and quoting the School District Master Complaint at pp. 264-296 and ¶ 890).

[6] As noted in the Open Letter, to the extent that teachers wish to show particular YouTube videos to students for their unique educational value, it would be reasonable to allow teachers to show specific, preapproved educational videos to their classrooms. Even so, such videos must not contain advertisements, they must not be "Shorts," and they must not be algorithmically generated. Even if this limited use of YouTube by teachers is permitted, students should not be able to directly access YouTube on school-issued devices.

b. Senators Hawley and Blumenthal Push Back on Google, but Google Responds by Trying to Bully Schools into *Forcing* Gemini AI on Students.

The Open Letter cited a report from *The Wall Street Journal* in which reporters Shalini Ramachandran, Georgia Wells, and Molly Reinmann described Google's aggressive moves to force Gemini AI features onto schools, without first seeking permission from schools or parents.[7]

On October 21, 2026, Senators Josh Hawley and Richard Blumenthal wrote to Google's CEO, Sundar Pichai, citing that article and expressing "grave concern" that Google's "aggressive push of A.I. products to children in schools is threatening the academic success and overall wellbeing of an entire generation."[8] In their letter, Senators Blumenthal and Hawley wrote[9]:

- "93% of U.S. school districts planned to purchase Google's laptops, Chromebooks, in 2025"

- "Google has integrated its A.I. features in Chromebook devices, Google Classroom, and software partnerships, often without additional controls to turn them off. Google's A.I. Overview and A.I. Mode chatbot cannot be disabled and are the standard response to any search performed in the Chrome browser. Students, teachers, and parents who wish to avoid Google's A.I. are unable to do so, as other browsers are not natively available on Chromebooks."

- "Google is forcing their A.I. products into classrooms across America, and children are paying the price. We cannot repeat the mistakes of social media platforms where products are pushed onto children putting profit ahead of young peoples' best interest."

Senators Blumenthal and Hawley concluded their letter by demanding answers from Google to a series of pointed questions, by November 2, 2026. Google's answers to the Senators' questions are not public. On November 3, 2026, however, Google announced that, beginning in January 2027, Google would no longer opt in schools to Gemini AI or Google Search features by default.[10]

---

[7] *See* Open Letter at 11-12 (citing *Google Pushed AI Into Schools—and Even Students Say It's Gone Too Far*, Sept. 30, 2026, *available at* https://www.wsj.com/tech/ai/google-ai-gemini-education-schools-1ec0972a?msockid=2fff095d86306e5411471f7d87d46f4a).

[8] *See* Ramachandran, Shalini, *Senators Express 'Grave Concerns,' Launch Inquiry into Google's AI Push in Schools*, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL, *available at* https://www.wsj.com/tech/ai/senators-express-grave-concerns-launch-inquiry-into-googles-ai-push-in-schools-a198d5c1.

[9] The Senators' letter is available here: https://prod-i.a.dj.com/public/resources/documents/senators-letter-to-google-AI-10-21-2026.pdf.

[10] Goldstein, Dana and Singer, Natasha, *Google Will Turn Off Search for Schools That Reject A.I.*, THE NEW YORK TIMES, Nov. 3, 2026, *available at* https://www.nytimes.com/2026/11/03/us/google-search-schools-restrict-ai.html.

There was a Catch 22 in Google's new policy: In order for schools to have access to basic Google Search features, schools would be ***required*** to enable Gemini AI features in Google Search, including AI Overview and AI Mode. These AI features often push students toward open-ended "chats" with Gemini AI, Google's AI chatbot, on their school-issued devices.

In other words, if schools refuse to force Gemini AI features on students through their school-issued devices, Google intends to take its ball and go home.

Further, as explained in the Open Letter, Google's consistent legal strategy is to force its products onto schools while trying to shift the legal liability for those products to school districts. Indeed, whenever students have allegedly been harmed by a Google product on a school-issued device—whether it's YouTube, or the Chrome internet browser on Chromebooks—Google always blames schools.[11] As set out in the Open Letter, Google even claimed that it could not be held legally responsible for an alleged injury to a student caused by their Chromebook, because the *school* issued the Chromebook to the student.[12]

By defaulting Gemini AI features and Google Search to "off," Google is teeing up the same legal strategy that it has employed for other Google products it forced onto schools: If and when children are harmed by those Gemini AI features, Google is likely to argue that *school districts* are responsible, on the theory that school districts *voluntarily chose* to turn those AI features back on.

In sum, Google's response to the "grave concern" of two United States Senators about Google's aggressive push of AI products into schools is to double down and become even more aggressive: Google's new policy seeks to bully schools into accepting Gemini AI features on school-issued devices. If schools refuse the Gemini AI features, they will lose basic Google Search functionality. At the same time, Google is trying to bulk up its legal defenses when students are inevitably harmed by those Gemini AI features—by setting up a legal defense that *schools* voluntarily enabled those dangerous AI features.

Finally, it bears noting that the concerns expressed by Senators Blumenthal and Hawley about AI in schools align with the views of parents, who broadly support slowing or eliminating AI in schools. For example, according to a recent poll by the Institute for Family Studies, 73% of parents say that AI will expose children to serious risks (e.g., self-harm, emotional dependence, or school shooting instructions), and 79% of parents say that AI will enable malicious behavior by students (e.g. cheating, AI-generated inappropriate pictures).[13] The same poll found that 75% of Republican parents and 72% of Democratic parents supported a pause on AI in schools.[14]

---

[11] *See* Open Letter at pp. 7-11 (describing how Google blames school districts for student YouTube use, and for student injuries alleged in lawsuits relating to Chromebooks).
[12] *See id.* at p. 9.
[13] *AI In The Classroom: New Report Highlights What Parents Want*, INSTITUTE FOR FAMILY STUDIES, Nov. 12, 2026, *available at*: https://ifstudies.org/blog/ai-in-the-classroom-new-report-highlights-what-parents-want.
[14] *Id.*

c. There are Strong Indications that Google is Attempting to Use its Near Monopoly in Schools to Solidify the Competitive Position of Gemini AI.

Google's aggression strongly reflects the behavior of a company putting its profits ahead of the interests of students and school districts. Google's conduct is not taking place in a vacuum. Rather, Google is apparently facing new competitive threats to its core Search business, and it appears to be trying to use its near monopoly in schools to fend off those threats. This is not OK.

It has been widely reported that on October 29, 2026, the quarterly earnings report of Google's parent company, Alphabet, revealed slowing advertising revenue from Google's Search business.[15] This sparked investor concerns that Google's Search business was being disrupted by AI chatbots, like ChatGPT.[16] The ensuing investor panic wiped out almost $500 billion from Alphabet's market capitalization—the second largest market value drop in the history of the American stock market.[17] Compounding this concern, on November 4, 2026, OpenAI announced that the volume of search-like queries in ChatGPT added up to 20% of the searches on Google Search, reflecting that AI chatbots were rapidly threatening Google's Search business.[18]

The business context of Google's new AI policies in schools is not complicated: Apparently concerned that other AI chatbots are disrupting its core Search business, Google has sought to advance the competitive position of its own AI chatbot by taking advantage of its near monopoly in public schools. The *business* case for this move is clear: With essentially unlimited access to Gemini AI chatbot features on their school-issued devices, millions of American students would become loyal to Gemini AI, rather than competing AI chatbots, those students would be become lifelong Gemini AI users, and Google would capture more AI chatbot "market share."

But public schools are not businesses. And Google does not own public schools. Google is a *technology vendor*. Public schools do not exist to provide a technology vendor a captive audience to grow its market share and enhance its profits. Public schools exist to educate children. In doing so, schools have a sacred duty to ensure the safety of the children entrusted to those schools by their parents.

When a technology vendor abuses the trust of public schools, or seeks to exploit public schools for its own gain, public schools must fundamentally reevaluate their relationship with that vendor. No matter what, *schools must always prioritize the safety of their students over the business challenges of a vendor*, no matter how big or powerful that vendor might be.

---

[15] *Alphabet shares record their worst day ever, shedding $500 billion in value*, NBC News, Oct. 29, 2026, *available at* https://www.nbcnews.com/business/markets/alphabet-google-stock-ai-advertising-rcna606322.
[16] *Id.*
[17] *Id.*
[18] Zainescu, Gabriel, *ChatGPT Search Hits 20% Of Google's Query Volume, OpenAI Says*, FORBES, Nov. 5, 2026, *available at* https://www.forbes.com/sites/gabrielalinzainescu/2026/11/05/chatgpt-search-hits-20-of-googles-query-volume-openai-says/.

d. The "AI Mode" Feature of Google Search on a School-Issued Device Allegedly Helps a Thirteen-Year Old Plan Her Own Suicide and Funeral.

Two days after Google attempted to strongarm schools into forcing Gemini AI features onto tens of millions of students across the country, a disturbing lawsuit was filed against Google by the parents of a thirteen-year-old girl who spent months discussing suicidal thoughts with the Gemini AI chatbot on her school-issued Chromebook.[19]

Importantly, the student allegedly began "chatting" with Gemini AI through Google Search's *AI Mode* – one of the Gemini features that Google will require schools to retain in order to use Google Search at the beginning of 2027.

This lawsuit is publicly available, and the Districts should review it in full, because it sets out the dangers to students from Gemini AI features, including AI Overview and AI Mode in Google Search.[20]

In her report on the lawsuit, Bloomberg reporter Julia Love wrote: "AI has become infused in Google Search, which answers many queries with AI-generated summaries and features a dedicated AI Mode tab, which is difficult to avoid even if schools block chatbots."[21]

The lawsuit alleges, among other things:[22]

- The thirteen-year-old-girl, referred to under her pseudonym, "Emma," started the 2025 school year as a healthy, joyful, and high-performing student with no history of mental health issues.[23]

- On her school-issued Chromebook, Emma performed a traditional Google web search but was routed to AI Mode, where she began chatting with Gemini about her schoolwork.[24]

- Over time, however, her Gemini chats veered into darker content—including her anxiety, depression, and even methods of committing suicide.[25] She ultimately exchanged thousands of messages a month with Gemini through AI Mode.

---

[19] Love, Julia, *Google AI in School Triggered Teen's Mental Health Crisis, Lawsuit Says*, BLOOMBERG, Nov. 5, 2026, *available at* https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2026-11-05/google-ai-in-school-triggered-teen-s-mental-health-crisis-lawsuit-says.
[20] Complaint *available at* https://edtech.law/wp-content/uploads/2026/11/2026.11.04-Dkt-001-1-Emma-v-Google-Complaint_2.pdf.
[21] *Supra note* 19.
[22] *Id.* (Bloomberg article summarizing the complaint).
[23] *See* Complaint, *supra* note 20, at ¶¶ 302-304.
[24] *Id.* at ¶ 318.
[25] *Id.* at ¶¶ 343-345 (Emma allegedly asking about suicide methods such as hanging, suffocation, and overdosing on medication and toxic household items).

- Emma asked Gemini to count calories, listen to her vent about her family and share the symptoms of various mental illnesses that she suspected she might have.

- Emma's mental health deteriorated as she used Gemini more and more, and she began cutting herself. "Gemini coached Emma on how to conceal her despair and self-harm from her parents, siblings, and friends," the complaint states.

- Emma chatted with Gemini about planning her own funeral and suicide, and even explored a plan with Gemini to jump off of a cliff on an upcoming family trip to Yellowstone. She chatted about what songs would be played at her funeral, and she used Gemini to draft her own eulogy.[26]

- While consumers can view their full search history, including conversations with AI Mode, Google does not provide such data on student accounts, so the full chat history is unavailable to the family.

- The complaint notes a query in which Emma asked about heaven and said she would soon be going there soon and was scared. "It is clear that Gemini was not redirecting Emma to real-world resources or refusing to respond," the complaint says. "Instead, the chatbot was readily engaging in these topics, often for hours at a time."

- Thankfully, Emma's mother finally received an alert from a third-party monitoring service, logged into her Google account, and ***saw her writing her suicide note in real time***—allowing her father to intervene and save Emma.[27]

This lawsuit illustrates the immense safety and legal risks of Gemini AI features on school-issued devices. While this family has not sued the school district, and Google has not yet responded to the complaint, the legal risks of this type of lawsuit to the Districts and their taxpayers are obvious: Per her mandatory public school education, Emma was forced to use a school-issued Chromebook, enabled with an allegedly dangerous AI chatbot, which allegedly coached her in planning her own suicide and funeral.

---

[26] *Id.* at ¶¶ 347-353.
[27] *See Emma v. Google* Press Release, Nov. 4, 2026, *available at* https://edtech.law/cases/emma-v-google/.

Under the law, schools cannot give students access to obviously dangerous things and then face zero accountability when those dangerous things harm students. Emma was not issued a gun or a knife by her school. But she *was* issued a device by her school that allegedly caused a mental health crisis, helped her plan her own suicide and funeral, and almost ended her life.

The Districts are now unambiguously aware of the dangers of Gemini AI features, including AI Mode and AI Overview.[28] To protect their students, those Gemini AI features must be immediately disabled on school-issued devices.

II. Lightspeed System's Response to the Open Letter Misses the Point and Misleads the Districts on the Safety Risks of Student YouTube Use.

Google has not responded to the Open Letter. Therefore, Google has *not denied* the following points made in the Open Letter:

- ***Google intends to hide behind Section 230*** of the Communications Decency Act and the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution when students are allegedly harmed by Google products on school-issued devices.

- Google intends to ***blame school districts*** when students are allegedly harmed by Google products on school-issued devices.

- Google intends to ***shift the legal liabilities to school districts*** when students are allegedly harmed by Google products on school-issued devices.

One company, however, has issued a response to the Open Letter: a company called Lightspeed Systems, which sells device and internet monitoring software to school districts and has contracts with 28 of the 50 largest U.S. school districts, according to its website.[29]

Lightspeed has apparently done business with Google,[30] and it also touts a "seamless integration" between Lightspeed and Google Workspace for Education.[31]

---

[28] *See also* Open Letter at pp. 11-12 (Common Sense Media rating both AI Overview and AI Mode with the worst possible rating and concluding they "*pose unacceptable risks to children*").
[29] *See* https://www.lightspeedsystems.com/ (last accessed: November 18, 2026).
[30] Global Newswire, *Lightspeed Systems Partners with Google for Education to Provide Distance Learning Resources*, May 19, 2020, *available at* https://www.globenewswire.com/fr/news-release/2020/05/19/2035796/0/en/lightspeed-systems-partners-with-google-for-education-to-provide-distance-learning-resources.html ("Education technology solutions provider Lightspeed Systems … has partnered with Google for Education as a technology resource for schools transitioning to distance learning.").
[31] *See* Lightspeed website, *available a*t https://www.lightspeedsystems.com/solutions/security-compliance/lightspeed-systems-google-chrome/

On October 11, 2026, Lightspeed's Chief of Staff issued a public blog post responding to the Open Letter.[32] In this blog post, Lightspeed argued that, according to its data, only 35% of students use YouTube, and the average YouTube watch time for those students was "less than seven minutes a day at school and less than three minutes a day outside of school." This led Lightspeed to claim: "This is not what an unresolved problem with YouTube looks like."

Having decided to speak on this topic, Lightspeed has an obligation to speak candidly. By citing only an *average* YouTube watch time statistic, Lightspeed failed to do so. Lightspeed's critique should be dismissed, for the following reasons, among others:

- The use of an *average* statistic across a large population is an obviously faulty method to assess safety and legal risks. Lightspeed's choice to only disclose a purported "average" YouTube watch time insults the District leaders' intelligence. To illustrate:

    - The *average* Ford Pinto did not explode. Ford sold over 3 million Pintos, and they led to under 1,000 deaths.[33] Did the *average* Ford Pinto kill someone? No. But many did. So, it was recalled.

    - More than twenty million people took a painkiller called Vioxx from 1999 to 2004.[34] A study led by an FDA scientist estimated that up to 140,000 cases of serious heart disease resulted from Vioxx.[35] The *average* Vioxx user did not suffer from heart disease. But many did. So, Vioxx was removed from the market, and Merck paid a $4.85 billion settlement.[36]

- Any responsible disclosure of YouTube watch time would include statistics showing the *distribution* of student watch times, not just the average. Lightspeed did not release statistics on the distribution of watch times. In contrast, Tyler Kingkade's NBC News report cited a report from another filtering software company, called Securly. Securly's data on 610,000 pre-K-12 students showed:

---

[32] *See* Lightspeed Systems, *Should schools block YouTube and Gemini? What is correct in an open letter addressed to 150 school districts and what I would oppose.*, *available at* https://www.lightspeedsystems.com/cs/blog/blog-should-schools-block-youtube-and-gemini-open-letter-150-districts/.
[33] *Pinto Madness*, MOTHER JONES, Sept. 1977, https://www.motherjones.com/politics/1977/09/pinto-madness/.
[34] *A Painful Mistake*, TIME, Oct. 11, 2004, https://time.com/archive/6739603/a-painful-mistake/.
[35] *Study Blames Vioxx for Up to 140,000 Cases of Heart Disease*, HEALTHDAY NEWS (Jan. 24, 2005), *available at* https://www.healthday.com/health-news/cardiovascular-diseases/study-blames-vioxx-for-up-to-140-000-cases-of-heart-disease-523599.html.
[36] *Merck to Ante Up $4.85B for Vioxx Settlements*, Nov. 9, 2007, NPR, *available at* https://www.vpm.org/npr-news/2007-11-09/merck-to-ante-up-4-85b-for-vioxx-settlements/.

- 10% of students average more than 26 minutes of YouTube per day
- More than 2,800 middle and high schoolers average at least 2.5 hours per day
- 911 elementary school students viewed ***over five hours*** of videos each day

- Even if a misleading average YouTube watch time were a fair metric to use to evaluate the situation, *and it is not*, Lightspeed's average watch time is not credible or reliable because Lightspeed does not disclose basic information about this statistic, like: (i) which school grades were captured, (ii) whether Lightspeed captures students who watch YouTube in embedded links or who evade firewalls (many do); and (iii) how it calculates the watch time and the averages.

- Lightspeed's conclusions cannot be reconciled with many of the Districts' *own lawsuits* against YouTube, which allege that "YouTube's platform features are engineered to induce excessive use and to addict adolescents and children to the platform" and that "Google also failed to warn [School District] Plaintiffs about the dangerous, addictive nature of its platform [and] the resulting harms that occur from use of its platforms…"[37]

- A focus on watch times, rather than *content* viewed, or *how* students are viewing YouTube, conceals the true safety risks to students from YouTube. Students could be watching YouTube Shorts, AI slop, and other inappropriate and harmful content generated by algorithmic feeds. Confirming the points made in the Open Letter, NBC News found that 95% of the content watched by students was non-educational, and included "profanity, sexually suggestive scenes or references to drugs and alcohol."

Further, Lightspeed's blog post is careful to shift the legal risks of the YouTube issue to the Districts, noting: "*I do not evaluate the legal or private law claims from the letter and none of this is legal advice. For that, your legal representative is the right place*."[38]

In short, it would violate the Districts' duties to their students and taxpayers to rely on Lightspeed's blog post to justify enabling YouTube on school-issued devices. Lightspeed's blog post is misleading. If the Districts still have any doubt about the severity of their YouTube problem, they should directly request comprehensive YouTube watch history from Google for the top 5% most active student users in their Districts. The results will speak for themselves.

All of the credible public reporting aligns with the core allegation of over 1,000 of the Districts in their lawsuits against YouTube: YouTube is a dangerous product that is harming and addicting children. Therefore, it has no place on school-issued devices.

---

[37] Open Letter at p. 2.
[38] *See supra* Note 24.

III. The Districts Must Stand Up to Google to Protect Their Students and Taxpayers.

Google's recent attempt to bully the Districts into forcing Gemini AI features onto tens of millions of American public school students crossed many lines. Google has made its intentions clear: It intends to make money. Google's conduct makes clear it is not prioritizing student safety. And when push comes to shove, and students are harmed by Google products on school-issued devices, Google has signaled that it will blame schools and try to shift the legal liability to the Districts and their taxpayers.

The time has come for the Districts to stand up to Google. If Google refuses to allow students to use Google Search features without forcing them to use AI features that *allegedly helped a thirteen-year old girl plan her own suicide and funeral on her school-issued device*, then the Districts should find another internet search vendor.

There are a variety of internet search vendors who have not been accused of actively helping children commit suicide and plan their own funeral on their school computer. If a school lunch vendor behaved like Google is behaving, the Districts would not put up with it. The Districts should not put up with it from Google, either.

In this country, we have a storied history of standing up to bullies. It's a core American value. History teaches us that standing up to bullies is the only thing bullies understand.

Unfortunately, children are not in a position to stand up to this bully. Only *you* are. The Districts are the gatekeepers. You lead the Districts. If you fail to stand up to this bully, students will be harmed, Google will point the finger at you, and your taxpayers will be left footing the bill. Don't let that happen.

Conclusion

The public reporting and litigation developments that have played out since the Open Letter was sent to the Districts on October 5 only reinforce the central requests in the Open Letter.

The below-signed organizations therefore again urge the Districts to:

- Disable student access to YouTube on school-issued devices;

- Disable *all* Gemini AI features, including AI Overview and AI Mode, on school-issued devices – even if that means the Districts must find an alternative internet search vendor; and

- Perform a systematic review of student internet use on school-issued devices, disclose the results to the public, and adjust their policies to ensure student safety.

We greatly appreciate the Districts' attention to these matters.

The AI Psychological Research Coalition (AIPRC)

Buckets Over Bullying

Becca Schmill Foundation

Center for Countering Digital Harm

The Center for Responsible Technology

Child First Policy Center

The Digital Childhood Institute

Distraction-Free Schools Policy Project

DMV Unplugged

Fairplay

Four Norms

Institute for Family Studies

Institute for Families & Technology

Protect Young Eyes

Schools Beyond Screens

Scrolling 2 Death

Smartphone Free Childhood U.S.

Dr. Jared C. Horvath and LME Global

Emily Cherkin,
The Screentime Consultant