



## Intelligent Design network, inc.

P.O. Box 14702, Shawnee Mission, Kansas 66285-4702  
(913) 268-0852; IDnet@att.net  
[www.IntelligentDesignnetwork.org](http://www.IntelligentDesignnetwork.org)

January 6, 2003

### **SUMMARY OF SUGGESTIONS AND IMPLEMENTING RECOMMENDATIONS**

for the West Virginia SCIENCE – POLICY 2520.3 Science  
Content Standards and Objectives for West Virginia Schools (the “Policy”)

(For detailed explanation of suggestions see our letter dated  
January 6, 2002 at <http://www.IntelligentDesignNetwork.org/wvletter.pdf>)

**1. Revise the policy to remove any implication that humans are “living objects.”**

*Implementing Recommendations.* To implement this suggestion the Policy could be revised to expand the concept of “*object*” with “*phenomena*,” “*entities*” and “*human beings*.” Thus, SC 1.4.1 could be revised to read as follows:

“SC.1.4.1 *classify objects, phenomena or entities as living or non-living.*”

**2. Revise the Standards to eliminate the naturalistic doctrine that natural objects and systems (natural phenomena, including life and its diversity), are not designed. Replace the doctrine with objectives that would encourage students to investigate and critically analyze the theories and evidence that supports both the design and naturalistic hypotheses.**

*Implementing Recommendations.* Replace objectives that teach that nature is not designed for teachings that seek to have students explore the scientific evidence on both sides of that issue in an objective and unbiased way. The following is a replacement objective that would accomplish that goal:

“SC 10.4.x.1 Understand the scientific evidence and arguments for and against the hypothesis that life and its diversity results only from unguided, natural processes.”

**3. Revise the Policy so that children are not introduced to origins science until they reach an age and maturity sufficient to fully comprehend the scientific bases for explanations and the philosophical implications of those explanations.**

*Implementing Recommendations.* Delete the following objectives in grades three through eight (together with any repetitions of those objectives during those grades): SC 3.43, SC 4.45, SC 5.46, SC 7.47, SC 7.48, and SC 8.48.

4. **Add explicit provisions that will encourage teachers to (a) discuss origins science objectively and without philosophic, naturalistic or religious bias or assumption and (b) help students think critically about evolutionary theory and understand the full range of scientific views that exist regarding origins of life and why origins science may generate controversy.**

**Implementing Recommendation.** An objective that would satisfy this end might be phrased like the following:

SC 10.4.x.2 Understand scientific criticisms of evolutionary theory and the full range of scientific views that exist regarding origins of life and why origins science may generate controversy.

5. **Add objectives that will require students to learn about the naturalistic assumption that is used in current origins science and the effect the assumption has on textbook explanations, particularly in light of the historical character of origins science.**

**Implementing Recommendations.** Objectives that could be incorporated into the standards to achieve this result are as follows:

“SC 10.4.x.3 Understand that many explanations regarding the origin of life and the origin of the diversity of life are based in part on a naturalistic assumption that phenomena result only from natural causes and not by design. Understand the effect of this bias or assumption on the choice of data considered, the interpretation of data that is considered and the credibility of explanations that are provided.

SC 10.4.x.4 Differentiate between historical sciences such as evolutionary biology and experimental sciences like physics and chemistry, understand methods used by scientists to test the credibility of historical hypotheses, understand the limitations of those methods to confirm historical explanations provided and understand how *bias* and the “*choice of what data to consider in the first place,*” may affect historical explanations.