



The Kansas Board of Education “‘dumbed down’ our minimum requirements, but they can’t dictate what is taught in the classroom,” writes a Kansas resident. The salary situation for biomedical postdocs is discussed, and advice is offered to both faculty and postdocs. A News article about a postdoc’s decision to leave science draws comment from a former lab member. It is pointed out that false-positive results by polygraphs are harmful. And a question raised in a previous letter about validation of evolutionary theory is addressed.

Keeping Calm About Kansas

Although the Kansas Board of Education (BOE) decision has made a mockery of science standards, it will probably have a net positive impact in most Kansas classrooms. Good science teachers will take this as an opportunity to explore the difference between science and nonscience. But from this whole episode, I question the response of some toward Kansas (Herbert Lin, *Letters*, *Science’s Compass*, 17 Sept., p. 1849). Disallowing credits from Kansas high school science classes would be purely political and symbolic because the BOE decision is unlikely to have a significant impact on the average quality of Kansas high school biology courses. The proposal to give biology credit on the basis of standard tests is fine, but only if applied to all students, not just those from Kansas.

An extremist minority has temporarily taken control of an elected political body in our state. They have “dumbed down” our minimum requirements, but they can’t dictate what is taught in the classroom. Our governor has strongly opposed their decision, and their tenure will undoubtedly be vigorously challenged at the next election. In the meantime, it would help to remain cool-headed. One doesn’t want to look too much like the church defending the doctrine. Lin’s proposal sounds ominously similar to excommunication.

Robert L. Bowden

Department of Plant Pathology, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66506–5502, USA. E-mail: rbowden@plantpath.ksu.edu

The proposal by Lin for colleges to refuse to count as an academic subject any high school biology course taught in Kansas is provocative but may not be necessary. The Kansas Board of Education dropped the teaching of evolution and the origin of the universe from mandated state science curriculum standards, but did not ban them. It is up to each of the state’s 304 school districts to decide what to teach and how to present it. Among the many efforts by scientists, the Kansas Geological Survey, with assistance from the National Academy of

Sciences, is providing resource materials and offers of assistance to help school district officials make informed decisions about their curricula. A number of school districts have announced their intent to continue to teach evolution and cosmology. We are hopeful that others will as well.

M. Lee Allison

State Geologist and Director, Kansas Geological Survey, Lawrence, KS 66047, USA. E-mail: lallison@kgs.ukans.edu

Postdoc Advice

My fellow postdocs and I read the special section “Postdocs working for respect” (3 Sept., p. 1513) with great interest. Of the many issues facing the biomedical postdoc, here we focus on one: money. We appreciated the recent increase in the de facto national salary levels [the National Research Service Award (NRSA) stipends], yet we believe that those holding the reins are still abdicating responsibility. In Jeffrey Mervis’s *News* article (p. 1519), Wendy Baldwin of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) is quoted as saying that institutions may supplement NRSA levels; but ask a supervisor and you’re likely to hear that his or her hands are tied because of the NIH. We ask the faculty to stand up for what is right—actively and consistently. The salary levels in effect until the recent increase were nothing if not shameful. We hope that future postdoc salaries will be determined on the basis of merit and humanity, rather than budgetary whims and windfalls.

Another issue is cost-of-living (COL) increases. The NIH’s technical excuse for avoiding COL increases is that postdocs are not employees because they are in training (p. 1520). As has been said, postdocs are the most dollar-efficient part of the research machine: When do we have time for all this training? The similarity of

postdoctoral positions to ordinary jobs, where some start-up training is always necessary, is too often overlooked.

But postdocs must get their heads out of the sand and stand up for their financial self-interest. The first step is to negotiate salary before beginning a postdoctoral job. During employment, postdocs should ask for and expect significant raises and keep the larger picture in mind: What are the chances of landing a faculty position? Would it be enjoyable working for a pharmaceutical or consulting firm? What are lifestyle and family needs? Postdocs should seek advice from scientists ahead of them in both academic and nonacademic career tracks, as is most efficiently organized by a postdoctoral association or career office. Faculty must be sensitive to the tight academic job market. They should encourage the development of a range of skills and seek out nonacademic career opportunities for their postdocs. These are the competitive tonics postdocs so desperately need.

Daniel M. Zuckerman

President, The Johns Hopkins Postdoctoral Association. E-mail: www.med.jhu.edu/jhpda/

Dan Ferber’s article “Irreconcilable differences” (3 Sept., p. 1516) highlighted the inherent problems of the unequal struggle between trainees and mentors to resolve severe differences. This serious issue was reduced to personal mudslinging by the use of two case reports. I was a postdoc at

the time in one of those labs mentioned, and I witnessed how

two intelligent people—

who had started out their scientific relationship with high mutual expectations and great enthusiasm—found it difficult to handle the situation when the project didn’t work out. In my experience,

the supervisor, Ann Hubbard, is not shy about

speaking out openly about

what she thinks is right or wrong, a trait that in this case seems to

have contributed to a trainee’s decision to leave science. Similar situations have no doubt occurred elsewhere. Currently, the main option for disaffected postdocs is a formal grievance procedure. Perhaps a more effective way to avoid these situations is to implement advisory committees that evaluate the work of each postdoc on an annual basis and share the responsibility of guiding postdocs toward becoming independent researchers. To my knowledge, only Johns Hopkins University has

