

ternational studies. The argument holds that more high school students should study calculus because students who take calculus do better on the international mathematics tests, which include calculus problems. My point is that an analysis of such a proposal should be based on the merits—Are students who take calculus for the first time in college at a disadvantage? What courses would high school calculus displace? Who would teach it?—and not on the basis of the lower scores of students who have never taken the subject (3).

Finally, research on school expenditures showing, for example, the value of lower class size cannot help us design better test-based accountability systems. The reason is that the results of the former type of research do not have publicized negative consequences for teachers and students. As long as test score comparisons are used for accountability purposes, there will be an incentive to find a way to modify the test-taking population or "teach to the test" to achieve favorable results. Methodological and statistical analysis will not solve that real-world problem.

**Iris C. Rotberg**

7211 Brickyard Road,  
Potomac, MD 20854, USA

#### References

1. M. A. Millsap et al., *The Chapter 1 Implementation Study, Interim Report* (U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC, 1992).
2. G. F. Madaus, M. West, M. C. Harmon, R. G. Lomax, K. A. Viator, *The Influence of Testing on Teaching Math and Science in Grades 4–12* (Center for the Study of Testing, Evaluation and Education Policy, Boston, MA, 1992).
3. I. C. Rotberg, *Phi Delta Kappan* **72**, 4 (1990).

#### HHMI Awards

The announcement that the Howard Hughes Medical Institute (HHMI) is awarding its Research Resources Grants to 30 U.S. medical schools (Jocelyn Kaiser, "Med schools receive Hughes windfall," *News & Comment*, 12 Jan., p. 138; correction, 2 Feb., p. 583) is applauded, but something is left out of the analysis. The 30 schools who have received funding are, almost without exception, the most successful and well-endowed schools in the country.

Why should HHMI have chosen to lavish its affections on schools such as Stanford University; the University of California, San Francisco; the University of California, San Diego; the University of California, Los Angeles; Harvard University; and Johns Hopkins University, when the stated intent of the opportunity was encouraging to smaller schools with emerging excellence ("The scientific reputation of the medical school will not be the primary criterion for awarding funds")?

If HHMI had wanted to have an impact on the research enterprise, it might have spent more of its funds on schools with an excellent, if small, research enterprise. Schools like the University of Nevada School of Medicine (which, ironically, was started by a financial contribution from the late Howard Hughes to the Nevada legislature in 1969) would have been able to improve all aspects of their operation with awards the size of those announced by HHMI, while schools the size of those receiving the largest of the HHMI awards will be able to improve only one or two programs and add a few faculty at best.

Could it be that it is time for HHMI to broaden its perspective?

**Iain L. O. Buxton**

Dean for Research,  
University of Nevada School of Medicine,  
Reno, NV 89557-0046, USA

#### Corrections and Clarifications

In the news article by Jon Cohen "AIDS trials take on peer review" (*News & Comment*, 5 Jan., p. 20), the table on page 21 should have listed the University of Miami instead of Miami University. The University of Southern California, omitted from the table, ranked 11th, with a score of 153. The University of California, San Francisco, had a score of 156.

"The Bell Curve: A statement" (*Letters*, 5 Jan., p. 13) was an edited version of a statement by the federal advisory group listed in the address at the end of the letter, the National Institutes of Health–Department of Energy Joint Working Group on the Ethical, Legal, and Social Implications of Human Genome Research (ELSI Working Group). The names of two members of that group appeared at the end of the letter for the purpose of correspondence. They were not the sole authors.

In the 24 Nov. Perspective "Ensemble activity and behavior: What's the code?" by S. A. Deadwyler and R. E. Hampson (p. 1316), the citation at the end of the figure legend (p. 1317) incorrectly stated that the data were taken from reference (5). That citation should have read "[Data taken from (24)]." Reference 24 is S. A. Deadwyler, T. Bunn, R. E. Hampson, *J. Neurosci.* **16**, 354 (1996).

#### Letters to the Editor

Letters may be submitted by e-mail (at [science\\_letters@aaas.org](mailto:science_letters@aaas.org)), fax (202-289-7562), or regular mail (*Science*, 1333 H Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005, USA). Letters are not routinely acknowledged. Full addresses, signatures, and daytime phone numbers should be included. Letters should be brief (300 words or less) and may be edited for reasons of clarity or space. Letter writers are not consulted before publication.

# Precipitate Nucleic Acids.

## IN COLOR!

### Pellet Paint™ Co-Precipitant

A highly visible, inert carrier for routine DNA or RNA precipitation.\*

#### EFFICIENT PRECIPITATION OF DNA AND RNA

- Quantitative recovery of nucleic acids
- Five minute procedure
- No low temperature incubations
- Suitable for precipitation of dilute samples (<2ng/ml)

#### NO MORE LOST SAMPLES!

- Vivid pink pellets are easily located
- Consistent precipitation ends uncertainty
- Precipitation and resuspension steps are easily confirmed

#### COMPATIBLE WITH MANY APPLICATIONS

- Pellet Paint contains no DNA, RNA or nucleases
- No inhibition of downstream reactions
- Qualified for:
  - manual and Cy5\*\* sequencing
  - PCR\* amplification
  - cDNA synthesis
  - random priming
  - transformation
  - ligation
  - restriction digestion
  - kinase reactions
  - *in vitro* transcription
  - *in vitro* translation
  - gel electrophoresis

\*Patent pending

\*\*Cy5 is a trademark of Biological Detection Systems, Inc.

\*The PCR process is covered by patents owned by Hoffmann-La Roche.



## Novagen

Novagen, Inc.  
597 Science Dr.  
Madison, WI 53711  
e-mail: [novatech@novagen.com](mailto:novatech@novagen.com)  
URL: <http://www.novagen.com>

800-526-7319

Fax: 608-238-1388

Circle No. 47 on Readers' Service Card