

# AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY

## MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL

1:00 PM

Orlando, Florida

09 January 1996

### Abstract

The Council met at 1:00 PM on Tuesday, 09 January 1996 in the Grand Ballroom C, Clarion Hotel, Orlando, Florida.

Members present at some time during the meeting were: Georgia Benkart, Robert Daverman, Robert Fossum, William Fulton, Walter Gautschi, James Hyman, Irwin Kra, Steve Krantz, Andy Magid, Jerry Marsden, Hugh Montgomery, Cathleen Morawetz, Frank Morgan, Anil Nerode, Frank Peterson, Marc Rieffel, Cora Sadosky, Norberto Salinas, Peter Shalen, Alice Silverberg, Lance Small (voting Associate Secretary), B. A. Taylor, Sylvia Wiegand, and Susan Williams.

Others present during portions of the meeting: Salah Baouendi, Committee on the Profession Chair; Chandler Davis, CMS Representative; John Ewing, Executive Director; Marty Golubitsky, Editorial Boards Committee Chair; Arthur Jaffe, incoming President-elect; Krystyna Kuperberg, incoming Member-at-large; William James Lewis, Committee on Science Policy Chair; Claude Schochet, Committee on Professional Ethics Chair; Harold Stark, incoming Editorial Boards Committee Chair; and Kelly Young, Staff.

## Contents

<b>I</b>	<b>AGENDA</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS.</b>	<b>5</b>
0.1	Call to Order. . . . .	5
0.2	Retiring Members. . . . .	5
0.3	Introduction of Newly Elected Council Members. . . . .	6
0.4	Council Members. . . . .	6
<b>1</b>	<b>MINUTES.</b>	<b>6</b>
1.1	August 95 Council. . . . .	6
1.2	The 11/95 Executive Committee and Board of Trustees (ECBT) Meeting. . . . .	6
<b>2</b>	<b>CONSENT AGENDA.</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1	Association for Women in Mathematics. . . . .	6
<b>3</b>	<b>REPORTS OF BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES.</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1	Teller for the Election of 1995. . . . .	6
3.1.1	Teller for the Election of Officers. . . . .	7
3.1.2	Teller for Nominating and Editorial Boards Committees . . . . .	7
3.1.3	Teller for Amendments to the Bylaws. . . . .	7
3.2	Editorial Boards Committee (EBC). . . . .	7
3.2.1	Colloquium Editorial Committee. . . . .	8
3.2.2	Mathematics of Computation Editorial Committee. . . . .	8
3.2.3	Mathematical Reviews Editorial Committee. . . . .	8
3.2.4	Proceedings Editorial Committee. . . . .	8
3.2.5	Transactions and Memoirs Editorial Committee. . . . .	8
3.2.6	Bulletin Editorial Committee. . . . .	8
3.2.7	Electronic Journals. . . . .	8
3.2.8	Annual Report. . . . .	9
3.3	Executive Committee and Board of Trustees (ECBT). . . . .	9
3.3.1	Appointment of Officers. . . . .	9
3.3.2	Associate Secretary for the Southeastern Section. . . . .	9
3.3.3	Associate Secretary for the Eastern Section. . . . .	9
3.3.4	Associate Treasurer. . . . .	10
3.3.5	Treasurer. . . . .	10
3.3.6	Secretary. . . . .	10
3.3.7	Long Range Planning Committee. . . . .	10
3.3.8	ECBT Nominating Committee. . . . .	10
3.3.9	Review of Policy Committee Structure. . . . .	11
3.3.10	Business between meetings of the Council. . . . .	11
3.3.11	Council Membership. . . . .	12
3.3.12	Agenda and Minutes of the Council. . . . .	12
3.4	Committee on Education (COE). . . . .	12

3.5	Committee on Meetings and Conferences (COMC).	12
3.5.1	Summer Meetings.	12
3.6	Committee on the Profession (CPROF).	12
3.6.1	Rochester	13
3.6.2	Fulkerson Prize.	14
3.7	Committee on Publications (CPUB).	14
3.7.1	Resolution on "Simplicity".	14
3.7.2	Resolution on a member CD-ROM.	15
3.7.3	University Lecture Series.	15
3.8	Committee on Science Policy (CSP).	16
3.8.1	Revised Charges to the Committee on Science Policy.	16
3.9	Council Representative to the Joint Policy Board for Mathematics (JPBM).	16
3.10	CAFTES	16
3.11	Committee on Professional Ethics (COPE).	16
3.12	Library Committee.	16
3.13	Mathematical Reviews Editorial Committee.	16
3.14	Mathematical Surveys and Monographs Editorial Committee Report.	16
3.15	Joint Committee on Employment Opportunities	16
3.16	CRUME	17
3.17	Summer Research Conferences Committee	17
3.18	AMS-IMS-MAA Data Committee.	17
3.19	Joint Committee on Women	17
3.20	AMS-MAA Committee on Teaching Assistants and Part-time Instructors.	17
3.21	Commission on Professionals in Science and Technology	17
<b>4</b>	<b>REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES.</b>	<b>17</b>
4.1	Task Force on Participation Report.	17
4.1.1	Joint AMS-AAAS-MAA Committee on Opportunities in Mathematics for Underrepresented Minorities.	17
4.2	Committee on Procedures for the Committee on Professional Ethics.	18
4.2.1	Amendment 1	18
4.2.2	Amendment 2	18
4.2.3	Amendment 3	19
<b>6</b>	<b>NEW BUSINESS.</b>	<b>19</b>
6.1	AWM Affirmative Action Resolution	19
<b>7</b>	<b>ANNOUNCEMENTS, INFORMATION, AND RECORD.</b>	<b>20</b>
7.1	Budget.	20
7.2	Fulkerson Prize.	20
7.3	Subvention for travel and lodging.	21
7.4	Committee on Publications Actions.	21
7.5	Business between meetings of the Council.	21
7.6	Future Meetings	22
<b>8</b>	<b>ADJOURNMENT.</b>	<b>22</b>

<b>II ATTACHMENTS</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>A Council Membership.</b>	<b>23</b>
A.1 1995 Council . . . . .	23
A.2 1996 Council . . . . .	25
<b>B Procedures for COPE.</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>C Committee on Science Policy Charge.</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>D Future Meetings of the Society.</b>	<b>41</b>

## Part I

# AGENDA

## 0 CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS.

### 0.1 Call to Order.

The Secretary called the meeting to order at about 1:15 PM at the request of the President, who was in route to the meeting, having been delayed by the Blizzard of '96. The Secretary asked the Council to approve an Order of the Day as follows:

- Executive Committee member Marc Rieffel would assume the chair in lieu of the absence of a Vice-President. Until Rieffel arrived, the Secretary would remain in the chair.
- Routine Business would be conducted during the afternoon session.
- Executive Session business would be conducted after the dinner break, when the President would be available.

This Order was moved, seconded, and approved by the Council.

The Secretary then asked the members present to introduce themselves.

(Rieffel arrived soon after introductions were complete and assumed the chair. About an hour later Vice-president Nerode arrived. After some friendly discussion, Nerode and Rieffel agreed that Rieffel should continue to preside over the meeting. However Nerode assumed the chair when Rieffel was presenting reports from the Executive Committee.

President Morawetz did arrive for the evening session. The actions are reported seriatim according to their appearance in the agenda. Items were not considered in this order.)

### 0.2 Retiring Members.

The terms of Ronald Graham as Ex-President, Vice-President Anil Nerode, Bulletin Editorial Committee Chair Haynes Miller, Executive Committee member Joan Birman, and Members-at-Large Svetlana Katok, Steven George Krantz,<sup>1</sup> James Lepowsky, Peter Li, and Susan Gayle Williams end on 31 January 1996. This was their last meeting in their current positions. The Secretary received unanimous consent to send thanks on behalf of the Council to each of these individuals who are leaving the Council for sharing their wisdom with the Society and the Council and for their service to the mathematical community.

In addition, the President is in receipt of a letter from Member-at-large Robert Zimmer stating his desire to resign from the Council. The President has accepted his resignation effective on 01 Feb 1996. (According to the Bylaws, if a member resigns with less than a year left in the term, there is no replacement. If a member resigns with more than a year left in the term, the membership shall elect a replacement at the next Annual Meeting. Since the next Annual Meeting at which there is a Business Meeting will be in January 1997, it would be a moot point to hold an election to fill Zimmer's position, since his term expires on 31 January 1997.)

---

<sup>1</sup>Krantz remains on the Council as a member of the Executive Committee until a new member is elected in March 1999

### **0.3 Introduction of Newly Elected Council Members.**

The individuals elected to the Council in 1995 will take office on 01 February 1996. The Secretary recommended that these newly elected members who were present be granted privileges of the floor. The Council approved.

### **0.4 Council Members.**

The lists of Council members can be found in Attachment A.1, for the 95 Council, and Attachment A.2, for the 96 Council.

## **1 MINUTES.**

### **1.1 August 95 Council.**

The Minutes of the August 95 Council were distributed by mail. The Secretary requested approval of the minutes as distributed. They were approved as distributed.

### **1.2 The 11/95 Executive Committee and Board of Trustees (ECBT) Meeting.**

The ECBT met in Washington, DC, in November 1995. The minutes from this meeting will have been distributed and are considered a part of the minutes of the Council.

## **2 CONSENT AGENDA.**

### **2.1 Association for Women in Mathematics.**

The Association for Women in Mathematics (AWM) is celebrating its Twenty-Fifth Anniversary in 1996. The Council approved the resolution below.

**The Association for Women in Mathematics, founded in 1971, “to encourage women to study and to have active careers in the mathematical sciences” is celebrating the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of its founding at this meeting in Orlando.**

**The American Mathematical Society extends to AWM its warmest congratulations on this very happy occasion. The Society looks forward to continued cooperation with the AWM to encourage equal opportunity to all within the mathematical sciences.**

## **3 REPORTS OF BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES.**

### **3.1 Teller for the Election of 1995.**

The Council approved the reports of the Teller as described in the items below. The results of the election were attached to the Executive Session agenda.

**3.1.1 Teller for the Election of Officers.**

Newly elected persons in contested elections are as follows:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Institution</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Term</b>
Arthur M. Jaffe	Harvard	President-Elect	1996
Michael Aschbacher	Cal Tech	Vice-President	1998
Michael G. Crandall	University of California Santa Barbara	Trustee	2000
David M. Bressoud	Macalester College	Member-at-Large	1998
Gail A. Carpenter	Boston University	Member-at-Large	1998
John B. Conway	Univ. of Tennessee	Member-at-Large	1998
Krystyna Kuperberg	Auburn University	Member-at-Large	1998
Andrew Odlyzko	AT&T Bell Labs	Member-at-Large	1998

Lists of the 1995 and 1996 Council are attached (Attachments A.1 and A.2).

**3.1.2 Report from the Teller for the Nominating Committee and Editorial Boards Committee**

**Nominating Committee.** The following individuals were elected to the Nominating Committee.

<b>Name</b>	<b>Institution</b>	<b>Term</b>
Sylvain Cappell	New York University	1998
Eric M. Friedlander	Northwestern University	1998
Jane P. Gilman	Rutgers University	1998

**Editorial Boards Committee.** The following individuals were elected to the Editorial Boards Committee.

<b>Name</b>	<b>Institution</b>	<b>Term</b>
Sun-Yung Alice Chang	UCLA	1998
Andrew Granville	University of Georgia	1998

**3.1.3 Teller for Amendments to the Bylaws.**

The amendments to the Bylaws that were submitted to the membership for ratification were approved.

**3.2 Editorial Boards Committee (EBC).**

The Editorial Boards Committee recommended appointments of several editors. These appointments were considered in Executive Session.

**3.2.1 Colloquium Editorial Committee.**

The EBC recommended and the Council approved the appointment of SUSAN FRIEDLANDER to a three year term, JOAN BIRMAN to a two year term, and KEN BROWN to a one year term on the Colloquium Editorial Committee. The EBC also recommended the appointment of FRIEDLANDER as chair for 1996. The Council approved these recommendations.

**3.2.2 Mathematics of Computation Editorial Committee.**

The EBC recommended and the Council approved the appointment of G.W. STEWART and STANLEY OSHER to three year terms.

**3.2.3 Mathematical Reviews Editorial Committee.**

The EBC recommended and the Council approved the appointment of CLARENCE WILKERSON for a three year term as (Electronics) Editor. The EBC also recommended and the Council approved the reappointment of WENDELL FLEMING for a three year term retroactive to 01 February 1995.

**3.2.4 Proceedings Editorial Committee.**

The EBC recommended and the Council approved the appointment of CLIFFORD EARLE as Managing Editor of the Proceedings effective 01 February 1997.

**3.2.5 Transactions and Memoirs Editorial Committee.**

The EBC recommended and the Council approved the appointment of RODRIGO BANUELOS for a four year term.

**3.2.6 Bulletin Editorial Committee.**

The EBC recommended and the Council approved replacing Nolan Wallach by DAVID EISENBUD for the unexpired term of Wallach and appointing Eisenbud to a full term when that term expires.

**3.2.7 Electronic Journals.**

Based on a report of a special task force on electronic journals appointed by the President, it was proposed to create three new electronic journals. Based on the recommendations, the Council considered the resolution:

**the Council authorizes creation of three electronic journals:**

- 1. The Electronic Journal of Representation Theory.**
- 2. The Electronic Journal of Conformal Dynamics.**
- 3. The Electronic Journal of Geometric Methods in Differential Equations.**

A motion to table the resolution failed. It was moved, seconded, and passed to amend the resolution by inserting the word “**initial**” between the words “three” and “electronic” in the resolution. This amendment passed.

The Council then approved the amended resolution which reads:



**the Council authorizes creation of three initial electronic journals:**

- 1. The Electronic Journal of Representation Theory.**
- 2. The Electronic Journal of Conformal Dynamics.**
- 3. The Electronic Journal of Geometric Methods in Differential Equations.**

(It was stated and implicitly agreed that the managing editors and editorial boards would be appointed by the President based on recommendations from the Editorial Boards Committee. Terms would be the usual three years.)

### **3.2.8 Annual Report.**

The annual report of Editorial Boards Committee was attached to the main agenda. The report is filed in the AMS Committee Report Book for 1996, report no. 960131-01.

### **3.3 Executive Committee and Board of Trustees (ECBT).**

(Several of the following items were presented to the Council by Marc Rieffel, as a member of the Executive Committee. During the time Rieffel was reporting to the Council, Vice-president Nerode assumed the chair.)

#### **3.3.1 Appointment of Officers.**

(Nerode presiding.)

The Executive Committee and Board of Trustees recommended appointments of several officers of the Society. These appointments were considered in Executive Session. Marc Rieffel reported to the Council on the actions of the ECBT with regard to the recommendations below. (Rieffel is an EC member of the ECBT Nominating Committee.) (Daverman absented himself during discussion of Item 3.3.2. Taylor absented himself during discussion of Item 3.3.4. Fossum and Peterson absented themselves during the discussion of Items 3.3.5 and 3.3.6. During Fossum's absence Daverman served as Secretary. It is Daverman's record of the actions on Items 3.3.5 and 3.3.6 that appears below.)

#### **3.3.2 Associate Secretary for the Southeastern Section.**

The ECBT recommended and the Council approved the re-appointment of ROBERT DAVERMAN to a two year term as Associate Secretary for the Southeastern Section. His term begins on 01 February 1997.

#### **3.3.3 Associate Secretary for the Eastern Section.**

The ECBT recommended and the Council approved the re-appointment of LESLEY SIBNER to a two year term as Associate Secretary for the Eastern Section. Her term begins on 01 February 1997.

**3.3.4 Associate Treasurer.**

The ECBT recommended and the Council approved reappointment of B. A. TAYLOR as Associate Treasurer for another two year term beginning on 01 February 1997.

**3.3.5 Treasurer.**

The current term of FRANKLIN PETERSON as Treasurer expires on 31 January 1997. The ECBT recommended and the Council approved re-appointment of Peterson for a final term of two years beginning on 01 February 1997. It recommended and the Council approved that the Society thank Peterson for his many years of service to the Society as Treasurer. It further recommended that the Council authorize a nationwide search that would begin in the Fall of 1996, with a recommendation to the Council in 1997, the search committee to be appointed by the President. Further logistics with regard to the search will be handled by the ECBT, which will keep the Council fully informed of the progress. The Council authorized commencing the search.

**3.3.6 Secretary.**

The current term of ROBERT FOSSUM as Secretary expires on 31 January 1997. The Executive Committee and Board of Trustees recommended and the Council approved that Robert Fossum be re-appointed as Secretary of the Society for the term 01 February 1 1997 through 31 January 1999 and that, in accordance with his request, a successor be identified to assume the office of Secretary for the term starting February 1, 1999. It further recommended that the Council authorize a nationwide search that would begin in the Fall of 1996, with a recommendation to the Council in 1997, the search committee to be appointed by the President. Further logistics with regard to the search will be handled by the ECBT, which will keep the Council fully informed of the progress. The Council authorized the search as recommended.

**3.3.7 Long Range Planning Committee.**

(Nerode presiding) Marc Rieffel, incoming chair of the ECBT Long Range Planning Committee, gave an oral report on activities of the committee.

**3.3.8 ECBT Nominating Committee.**

(Nerode presiding) The ECBT Nominating Committee was established by the Council in August 1991. The Long Range Planning Committee recommended to the ECBT, the ECBT recommended to the Council, and the Council approved that the membership of the committee be changed by adding the second and third year trustee to the committee and removing the fifth year trustee. The third year trustee would be the chair of the committee.

The first paragraph of the charge now reads:

**The standing committee of the EC and BT, called the ECBT Nominating Committee, consists of the second and third year elected members of the BT, the fourth-year and second-year elected members of the EC, and the Chair of the Council's Nominating Committee. The chair is the senior trustee.**

### 3.3.9 Review of Policy Committee Structure.

When the Council established the five policy committees, it also requested that a review of their efficacy take place three years later. This review should thus be undertaken in 1996. The Long Range Planning Committee recommended to the ECBT, which in turn recommended to the Council, a blueprint for this review which was printed in the main agenda. Marc Rieffel, incoming chair of the Long Range Planning Committee and a member of the Executive Committee, presented, instead, a different plan proposed by President Morawetz. At the time of the presentation, the details of the Morawetz plan were not available.

The motion on the table (by the ECBT) was to conduct a review according to the draft outline:

#### DRAFT OUTLINE FOR REVIEW OF POLICY COMMITTEES

To make the review of the committee structure and the role played by policy committees more manageable, the ECBT suggests that it be divided into stages, as follows:

1. The first stage would examine the general “policy committees” structure and propose ways to improve it (including the possibility of eliminating it).
2. The second stage would examine the individual policy committees, and propose ways to increase their effectiveness. This would include suggesting adjustments to their charges, or, if the Council decides to eliminate one or more of them, the dispersal of their responsibilities to other committees.
3. The third stage would examine the general committee structure of the AMS, and propose ways to tighten this structure, within the framework of whatever has been decided about the policy committee structure in the previous stages.

We suggest that at this time a committee be appointed to carry out only the first stage, and that they be asked to submit their final report within one year, with preliminary reports at earlier times as appropriate. Then, on the basis of their report, the Council would decide how to proceed with the next stages of the review.

We suggest that the committee appointed to carry out the first stage be a subcommittee of the Long Range Planning Committee, consisting of 2 members of the LRPC (one of them an EC member and one of them a Trustee) together with 2 or 3 additional members chosen from the Council by the President.

It was moved and seconded to substitute the motion by the following motion:

**The Council requests that the President establish a mechanism, including a charge based on the Council discussion of 09 Jan 96, to review the policy committees. This review should be conducted primarily by members of the council. This review should be reported to the Council in January 1997.**

The motion to substitute passed. The Council then approved the substitute motion.

### 3.3.10 Business between meetings of the Council.

This item generated no further discussion and is reported in the Section ANNOUNCEMENTS, INFORMATION, AND RECORD (7).

### 3.3.11 Council Membership.

(This item was the last to be discussed.) The proposal to change Council membership was tabled by the 8/95 Council. The ECBT recommends to the Council that the current arrangement be tried for one year and then discussed again by the 1/97 Council.

It was moved and seconded to place on the agenda a motion to the effect that:

**the Council accords to chairs of policy committees every right of Council membership except voting privileges, including the right to make motions and to attend executive sessions.**

The chair ruled that according to the rules of the Council, the motion to place on the agenda required a majority of those voting. A majority of the members voted to place this on the agenda. There was an appeal from the decision of the chair that this required a majority. Before a vote could be taken to sustain or overrule the decision, it was moved and seconded to adjourn. The motion passed by a vote of 11 in favor and 9 opposed.

### 3.3.12 Agenda and Minutes of the Council.

Member-at-Large Frank Morgan moved the following:

**That chairs of AMS committees, including joint committees, may, on request, receive free copies of the Council agenda and minutes.**

The motion was seconded and approved.

## 3.4 Committee on Education (COE).

The annual report of this committee was attached. The report is filed in the AMS Committee Report Book for 1996, report no. 960105-06.

## 3.5 Committee on Meetings and Conferences (COMC).

The annual report of this committee was attached. The report is filed in the AMS Committee Report Book for 1996, report no. 960105-07.

### 3.5.1 Summer Meetings.

The COMC recommends and the Executive Committee supports the recommendation that:

**There be no joint summer meeting in the present Mathfest format in the summers of 1997, 1998, and 1999.**

The Council approved this recommendation.

## 3.6 Committee on the Profession (CPROF).

The annual report of this committee was attached. The report is filed in the AMS Committee Report Book for 1996, report no. 960105-08.

### 3.6.1 Rochester

Most of the discussion on this item took place in Executive Session. The Committee on the Profession recommended the resolution below for approval by the Council:

**Committee on the Profession  
RECOMMENDED RESOLUTION:**

The Council of the American Mathematical Society is deeply concerned over the University of Rochester's announced intention to severely downgrade its strong mathematics program by eliminating Ph.D studies, shrinking the mathematics faculty "over time" by more than one half, and assigning the teaching of calculus to faculty in other departments and to nontenured adjuncts.

This plan displays a lack of understanding of the nature of mathematics, its role as a core discipline among the sciences, and its place in a well-rounded education.

The entire Rochester academic community is ill-served by such a strategy. Calculus students will be taught by instructors much less likely to have either the wideranging overview of mathematics or the involvement with the subject necessary for truly effective teaching. Nor will these instructors be likely to stay abreast of current evolution in the pedagogy and content of calculus.

The hiring of low-paid adjuncts with no long-term commitment to or from the institution will undermine educational quality. It could lead to an egregious violation of principles of non-exploitation enunciated in the January 1994 resolution adopted by the Council in the name of the Society, on "Supportive Practices and Ethics in the Employment of Young Mathematicians."

Advanced undergraduates in mathematics and graduate students in other scientific disciplines will be deprived of the support that a mathematics graduate program provides to their studies. Faculty in quantitative disciplines will miss opportunities to consult and collaborate with their colleagues in mathematics. In the absence of excellence in mathematics, the attractiveness of Rochester as a first-rate research center in physical science, engineering, and economics will diminish.

On intellectual, educational and practical grounds, Rochester's intended treatment of mathematics is incompatible with its aspirations to national distinction as a research university emphasizing quality undergraduate education.

The Council strongly urges the University of Rochester's administration to reconsider its proposed course of action with regard to mathematics.

It was moved and seconded to amend the resolution by removing paragraphs 2, 3, 4, and 5. This amendment failed.

The resolution was approved by the Council by a vote of 15 in favor, 1 opposed, and at least 1 abstention.

It was moved, seconded, and approved to put the following resolution on the agenda:

**The Council endorses the offers of assistance by the American Mathematical Society to the University of Rochester**

**(i) to achieve the financial and educational objectives of the University's overall restructuring of academic programs**

**(ii) while maintaining excellence at the University of Rochester in quality of education and research in mathematics.**

**The Council expresses its support of the steps taken by the President of the AMS to provide the assistance of the AMS to the University of Rochester.**

It was then moved and seconded to table this resolution. The Council agreed to the motion to table.

### **3.6.2 Fulkerson Prize.**

The Committee on the Profession and the Executive Committee recommended to the Council that the eligibility rule for the Fulkerson Prize be changed to

#### **ELIGIBILITY FOR FULKERSON PRIZE**

**Papers to be eligible should form the final publication of the main result(s) and should have been published in a recognized journal, or in a comparable, well-refereed volume intended to publish final publications only, during the six calendar years preceding the year of the Congress. Extended abstracts and prepublications, and articles published in journals, journal sections or proceedings that are intended to publish non-final papers, are not included.**

The Council approved.

### **3.7 Committee on Publications (CPUB).**

The annual report of this committee was attached. The report is filed in the AMS Committee Report Book for 1996, report no. 960105-09.

#### **3.7.1 Resolution on "Simplicity".**

The Committee on Publications submitted the resolution below for approval by the Council:

**Ease of access and use is one of the main attractions of electronic publications. For the AMS to gain a significant role in electronic information dissemination, and to provide service to all mathematicians, especially those with inadequate communication and computing facilities, it is important that AMS electronic products should strive, above all, to be as user friendly as possible. In particular, we urge that access by e-mail be provided, that**

**as many input and output formats be accepted as possible, and that these formats be made as simple and easy to use as possible.**

It was moved, seconded, and approved to table the resolution.

### **3.7.2 Resolution on a member CD-ROM.**

The Committee on Publications submitted the resolution below for approval by the Council:

**The Committee on Publications strongly supports the development of Members CD-ROM, because mathematicians in many parts of the world are limited in the amount of information they can obtain from the net, and would greatly benefit from the availability of information in CD ROM form.**

It was moved, seconded, and approved to table the resolution.

### **3.7.3 University Lecture Series.**

Approval is sought for the change in the charge to the Committee. The main change is an expansion of the interpretation of what constitutes a university lecture series. This change has been endorsed by the Committee on Publications and is being recommended to the Council by the Executive Committee.

The in the proposed charge contains the following subsection:

#### **Principal Activities**

- (a) The Committee is charged with evaluating manuscripts submitted for publication, using referees as appropriate. The Committee is responsible for the mathematical quality and, together with the AMS staff, for the economic viability of the series.**
- (b) The series consists of high level expository or survey books on topics of current interest but written to introduce non-experts to a special topic. In particular, these books might include notes from distinguished lecture series.**
- (c) While a book project may be solicited by the Committee, projects usually will be submitted by an AMS Acquisitions Editor, and AMS Consulting Editor, or directly by the author.**
- (d) The Committee is encouraged to consider recommendations from other book editorial committees of the AMS.**
- (e) The Committee should try to make timely decisions on every project it considers.**

It was moved, and seconded to revise (a) above by adding the following sentence:

**The Committee's primary responsibility is the mathematical quality of the series. The Committee is also responsible, together with the AMS staff, for the economic viability of the series.**

The amendment was approved. The amended charge was then approved by the Council.

### **3.8 Committee on Science Policy (CSP).**

The annual report of this committee was attached. The report is filed in the AMS Committee Report Book for 1996, report no. 960105-10.

#### **3.8.1 Revised Charges to the Committee on Science Policy.**

The Committee on Science Policy recommended that the Council approve the revised charges as found in Attachment C.

The Council approved the charges.

### **3.9 Council Representative to the Joint Policy Board for Mathematics (JPBM).**

Vice-President Jean Taylor is the current Council representative to the Joint Policy Board for Mathematics. Her report was attached. The report is filed in the AMS Committee Report Book for 1996, report no. 960105-11.

### **3.10 Committee on Academic Freedom, Tenure, and Employment Security.**

The annual report of this committee was attached. The report is filed in the AMS Committee Report Book for 1996, report no. 960105-12.

### **3.11 Committee on Professional Ethics (COPE).**

The annual report of this committee was attached. The report is filed in the AMS Committee Report Book for 1996, report no. 960105-13.

### **3.12 Library Committee.**

The annual report of this committee was attached. The report is filed in the AMS Committee Report Book for 1996, report no. 960105-14.

### **3.13 Mathematical Reviews Editorial Committee.**

The minutes of this meeting are attached to the 11/95 ECBT Minutes.

### **3.14 Mathematical Surveys and Monographs Editorial Committee Report.**

The annual report of this committee was attached. The report is filed in the AMS Committee Report Book for 1996, report no. 960105-01.

### **3.15 Joint Committee on Employment Opportunities**

The annual report of this committee was attached. The report is filed in the AMS Committee Report Book for 1996, report no. 960105-15.



### **3.16 AMS-MAA Committee on Research in Undergraduate Mathematics Education (CRUME).**

The annual report of this committee was attached. The report is filed in the AMS Committee Report Book for 1996, report no. 960105-05.

### **3.17 AMS-IMS-SIAM Committee on Joint Summer Research Conferences in the Mathematical Sciences (SRCC).**

The annual report of this committee was attached. The report is filed in the AMS Committee Report Book for 1996, report no. 960105-16.

### **3.18 AMS-IMS-MAA Data Committee.**

The annual report of this committee was attached. The report is filed in the AMS Committee Report Book for 1996, report no. 960105-02.

### **3.19 AMS-ASA-AWM-IMS-MAA-NCTM-SIAM Joint Committee on Women in the Mathematical Sciences**

The annual report of this committee was attached. The report is filed in the AMS Committee Report Book for 1996, report no. 960105-17.

### **3.20 AMS-MAA Committee on Teaching Assistants and Part-time Instructors.**

The annual report of this committee was attached. The report is filed in the AMS Committee Report Book for 1996, report no. 960105-18.

### **3.21 AMS Delegate to the AAAS Commission on Professionals in Science and Technology.**

The report from the AMS Delegate to the AAAS Commission on Professionals in Science and Technology report is filed in the AMS Committee Report Book for 1996, report no. 960131-02.

## **4 REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES.**

### **4.1 Task Force on Participation Report.**

The preliminary report from this committee appeared in the agenda. It should be noted that the ECBT agreed to proceed cautiously on the recommendations, in particular with the recommendation that the Society establish an Office of Minority Affairs in its Washington, DC., office.

#### **4.1.1 Joint AMS-AAAS-MAA Committee on Opportunities in Mathematics for Underrepresented Minorities.**

Since the Task Force recommended that an advisory committee be appointed to “oversee” the operations of this office, it went on to recommend (and the ECBT concurred) that:

**The Society withdraws its participation in the Committee on Opportunities for Underrepresented Minorities and thanks the AMS appointees for their service to the committee.**

The Council approved this recommendation.

## **4.2 Committee on Procedures for the Committee on Professional Ethics.**

The special Committee on Procedures for the Committee on Professional Ethics presented its final report for approval by the Council. The Executive Committee and Board of Trustees, at its meeting in November 95, had the opportunity to review a version of this report. Based on this review the Secretary moved, on behalf of the Executive Committee and Board of Trustees, several minor amendments to the procedures. The amendments were approved by the Council. The Council then adopted the procedures for the Committee on Professional Ethics. (The individual amendments are listed below. The final version of the procedures, with the approved amendments, is found in Attachment B.) The report of is filed in the AMS Committee Report Book for 1996, report no. 960131-03.

### **4.2.1 Amendment 1**

The language in the report is indented:

COPE and any special committee COPE establishes to investigate any case shall have access to AMS legal counsel for advice.

The amendment changes this to:

**Access to AMS legal counsel shall be through the Secretary or the Executive Director and not, in the first instance, directly with Society counsel.**

and add the boldface parenthetical expression in the statement below:

3. COPE shall review the report of the Special Committee, advice of AMS legal counsel (see note concerning consultation with legal counsel above), and all other relevant information presented to it and shall make a final decision regarding the disposition of the case. It shall take supplemental action as it deems appropriate (cf. Appendix A for examples) and shall communicate its decision and actions to the parties and to the Council.

### **4.2.2 Amendment 2**

The statement concerning expenses is amended to read:

**5. All expenses incurred by members of COPE, COPE subcommittees, and individuals consulted by COPE in connection with the exercise of these formal procedures shall be paid by the AMS. Prior approval from the President, Secretary, or Treasurer is required before unusual expenses, such as travel, are incurred.**

### 4.2.3 Amendment 3

The question of indemnification came up at the ECBT meeting in November. The Trustees believed it was not necessary to extend indemnification beyond the statement in the bylaws. However the insurance vendor was consulted. There is a letter on record from the vendor that states that members of all committees and subcommittees are protected by the Society's liability and other insurance while engaged in Society activities. This extends to legal liability while performing service for the Society.

The indemnification statement of the procedures is amended to read:

#### 7. Insurance

**By virtue of the vote of the Society's Board of Trustees approving these Procedures, the Board of Trustees has agreed to provide liability insurance for members of COPE and COPE subcommittees against claims arising out of actions taken by them in their capacities as members of the Committee.**

## 6 NEW BUSINESS.

### 6.1 Association for Women in Mathematics Resolution on Affirmative Action.

It was moved and seconded to pass the following resolution:

**The Council of the AMS regrets the recent action by the Regents of the University of California to end its affirmative action programs. Twenty years ago there were many fewer women and underrepresented minorities among students, faculty, and administrators in the University of California system. Affirmative action has played an important role in increasing the representation of these groups, and in making the higher education community at large aware of the discrimination, blatant or subtle, against underrepresented groups. At the same time, bringing people from these groups has strengthened the universities while maintaining the high quality of faculties and student bodies.**

**In particular the dramatic change in the representation of women in the mathematical sciences in the past decades would have not have been possible without the changes that affirmative action has brought. Less than 30 years ago the highest ranked mathematics graduate program in the U.S. did not even allow applications from potential women students. Many of the leading colleges and universities either accepted only men or kept the ratio of women students intentionally small. Even among public high schools, some of those most successful in scientific and mathematical training were closed to girls. Some men who received their scientific training in the sixties and earlier, and who are now holding positions with responsibility and power, came to accept the official discrimination against girls and women as the normal status quo.**

It was then moved and seconded to substitute for this motion the motion:

The Council of the AMS endorses the following AWM resolution on affirmative action.

The Association for Women in Mathematics (AWM) regrets the recent action by the Regents of the University of California to end its affirmative action programs. Twenty years ago there were many fewer women and underrepresented minorities among students, faculty, and administrators in the University of California system. Affirmative action has played an important role in increasing the representation of these groups, and in making the higher education community at large aware of the discrimination, blatant or subtle, against underrepresented groups. At the same time, bringing people from these groups has strengthened the universities while maintaining the high quality of faculties and student bodies.

In particular the dramatic change in the representation of women in the mathematical sciences in the past decades would have not have been possible without the changes that affirmative action has brought. Less than 30 years ago the highest ranked mathematics graduate program in the U.S. did not even allow applications from potential women students. Many of the leading colleges and universities either accepted only men or kept the ratio of women students intentionally small. Even among public high schools, some of those most successful in scientific and mathematical training were closed to girls. Some men who received their scientific training in the sixties and earlier, and who are now holding positions with responsibility and power, came to accept the official discrimination against girls and women as the normal status quo.

The motion to substitute passed. The substitute motion then passed.

## 7 ANNOUNCEMENTS, INFORMATION, AND RECORD.

### 7.1 Budget.

The Board of Trustees adopted the budget for 1996 as presented at the meeting of the BT on 18 November 1995.

### 7.2 Fulkerson Prize.

[From 11/95 ECBT Item 3.10] Continued Funding for the Fulkerson Prize. The monies for the Fulkerson prize having been exhausted by awards, the BT approved the following motion: The AMS is willing to fund the Fulkerson Prize for one more time, if and only if the Mathematical Programming Society will commit to raising endowment funds of the amount (approximately \$20,000) required to sustain the Prize in perpetuity.

### **7.3 Subvention for travel and lodging.**

The ECBT has adopted the policy that members will NOT be put on hotel master accounts during any committee meetings or other meetings. Members who can be reimbursed for travel, lodging, or meals will be asked to pay for these items personally and request reimbursement on travel vouchers. This applies to all volunteers and most all staff.

### **7.4 Committee on Publications Actions.**

In addition to the report of the Committee which has been filed, the Committee on Publications wishes to inform the Council of its actions, some of which include:

1. The author of a submission to the electronic preprint server should specify how long the preprint should stand before it is removed from the server. For purely clerical reasons, it is useful to put an absolute upper bound of five years.
2. It is agreed, both for legal and for practical reasons, that we should not screen submissions to the EPS.
3. We have reached no consensus on whether CPUB\_D and CPUB\_G can completely absorb the activities of the former EMS.
4. Everyone agrees that we should recommend to the AMS that it strive for simplicity. An explicit expression of this sentiment is formalized in a resolution that will be considered.
5. The issue of standardization of output is enormous, and is still up in the air.
6. It is agreed that we should compensate referees for AMS book series, who submit their reports in a timely fashion, with their choice of any AMS book.
7. It is agreed that we should expand the scope of the University Lecture Series as previously described.
8. It is agreed that the AMS should do regular, archival backups of startup electronic journals.

Details can be found in the report of the Committee on Publications.

### **7.5 Business between meetings of the Council.**

The 8/95 Council asked the EC “to suggest for action at the 1/96 Council meeting a procedure for dealing with pressing matters which come up between Council meetings”.

The Secretary recommended and the EC agreed to report to the Council that it believes the procedures as outlined in the Bylaws are adequate, but in the future every effort will be made to give the Council at least four weeks to respond to mail ballots.

(In case this much time cannot be given, then the reason why should be so stated clearly when the ballot is sent out. Normally the Secretary asks for mail ballots to be returned about four weeks after a business by mail is sent out. The Bylaws allow for postponement of an issue until the next Council meeting if five or more members so request. It is the policy of the Secretary to provide a fifth request if four or more members make such a request. This clause certainly provides members

of the Council with a means to insure that matters of importance are not passed without due deliberation by the Council. In the future, the Secretary will make every effort to insure that this clause is mentioned when business by mail is sent to the membership.)

The portion of the Bylaws that concern this read as follows:

Sect 6. Between meetings of the Council, business may be transacted by a mail vote. Votes shall be counted as specified in Section 4 of this Article, "members present" being replaced by "members voting." An affirmative vote by mail on any proposal shall be declared if, and only if, (a) more than half of the total number of possible votes is received by the time announced for the closing of the polls, and (b) at least three-quarters of the votes received by then are affirmative. If five or more members request postponement at the time of voting, action on the matter at issue shall be postponed until the next meeting of the Council, unless either (1) at the discretion of the secretary, the question is made the subject of a second vote by mail, in connection with which brief statements of reason, for and against, are circulated; or (2) the Council places the matter at issue before the Executive Committee for action.

Sect 7. The Council may delegate to the Executive Committee certain of its duties and powers. Between meetings of the Council, the Executive Committee shall act for the Council on such matters and in such ways as the Council may specify. Nothing herein contained shall be construed as empowering the Council to divest itself of responsibility for formulating and administering the scientific policies of the Society.

[With regard to the appointment of the Executive Director, the Bylaws state that "the Executive Director shall be appointed by the Board of Trustees with the consent of the Council". The EC conveys to the Council its concern that Council members were apparently not fully informed about the recent search and that every effort will be made in the future to continue to keep the Council members fully informed on such matters.]

### **7.6 Future meetings of the Council, Agenda and Budget Committee (ABC), and Executive Committee and Board of Trustees (ECBT).**

Deadlines for receipt of material for the Council agenda are approximately five (5) weeks before the date of the meeting. Agenda items should be submitted to the Secretary, preferably in electronic form.

The list appears in Attachment D.

## **8 ADJOURNMENT.**

See Item 3.3.11. The Council adjourned at 10:35 PM.

Robert Fossum  
Champaign, Illinois  
01 February 1996

## Part II

# ATTACHMENTS

### A Council Membership.

#### A.1 1995 Council

AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY  
effective 950601

#### OFFICERS

President	Cathleen S. Morawetz	NYU-Courant	1996
Ex-President	Ronald L. Graham	AT&T Bell Labs	1995
Vice Presidents	Anil Nerode	Cornell University	1995
	Gian-Carlo Rota	MIT	1997
	Jean E. Taylor	Rutgers University	1996
Secretary	Robert M. Fossum	University of Illinois	1996
Associate Secretaries	Robert Daverman	University of Tennessee	1996
	Andy Roy Magid	University of Oklahoma	1995
	Lesley Sibner	Polytechnic University	1996
	Lance W. Small	U California, San Diego	1995
Treasurer	F. P. Peterson	MIT	1996
Associate Treasurer	B. A. Taylor	University of Michigan	1996

#### REPRESENTATIVES OF COMMITTEES

Bulletin Editorial Comm	Haynes Miller	MIT	1995
Colloquium Editorial Comm	William Browder	Princeton University	1995
Journal of the AMS	William Fulton	University of Chicago	1995
Math. Reviews Edit Comm	Hugh Montgomery	University of Michigan	1995
Math. Surveys Edit Comm	Georgia Benkart	U Wisconsin Madison	1997
Math. of Comp Comm	Walter Gautschi	Purdue University	1995
Proceedings Editorial Comm	Irwin Kra	SUNY Stony Brook	1995
Transactions & Memoirs	Peter B. Shalen	U Illinois at Chicago	1995
Executive Committee	Joan Birman	Columbia University	1995
Executive Committee	John M. Franks	Northwestern University	1996
Executive Committee	Marc Rieffel	U California, Berkeley	1997

## MEMBERS-AT-LARGE

David B.A. Epstein	University of Warwick	1997
James M. Hyman	Los Alamos Nat'l Lab	1997
Svetlana R. Katok	Penn State University	1995
Steven Krantz	Washington Univ., St Louis	1995
Robert Lazarsfeld	UCLA	1996
James I. Lepowsky	Rutgers University	1995
Peter Li	U California, Irvine	1995
Jerrold E. Marsden	U California, Berkeley	1997
Frank Morgan	Williams College	1996
Cora Sadosky	Howard University	1997
Norberto Salinas	University of Kansas	1996
Alice Silverberg	Ohio State University	1997
Sylvia M. Wiegand	University of Nebraska	1996
Susan Gayle Williams	University South Alabama	1995
Robert Zimmer	University of Chicago	1996

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Joan Birman	Columbia University	1995
Robert M. Fossum	University of Illinois	1996
John M. Franks	Northwestern University	1996
Ronald Graham	AT&T Bell Labs	1995
Cathleen S. Morawetz	NYU-Courant	1997
Marc Rieffel	U California, Berkeley	1997
Steven Krantz	Washington University	1998

## TRUSTEES

Roy Adler	IBM Watson Lab	1997
Hyman Bass	Columbia University	1998
Maria M. Klawe	U British Columbia	1996
Donald E. McClure	Brown University	1999
M. Susan Montgomery	U Southern California	1995
Cathleen S. Morawetz	NYU-Courant	1996
F. P. Peterson	MIT	1996
B. A. Taylor	University of Michigan	1996



## A.2 1996 Council

AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY  
effective 960201

OFFICERS

President	Cathleen S. Morawetz	NYU-Courant	1996
President-Elect	Arthur M. Jaffe	Harvard University	1996
Vice Presidents	Michael Aschbacher	Cal Tech	1998
	Gian-Carlo Rota	MIT	1997
	Jean E. Taylor	Rutgers University	1996
	Robert M. Fossum	University of Illinois	1996
Secretary	Robert Daverman	University of Tennessee	1996
Associate Secretaries	Susan Friedlander	University of Illinois, Chicago	1997
	William Harris	Univ. Southern California	1997
	Lesley Sibner	Polytechnic University	1996
	F. P. Peterson	MIT	1996
Treasurer	B. A. Taylor	University of Michigan	1996
Associate Treasurer			

REPRESENTATIVES OF COMMITTEES

Bulletin Editorial Comm	Murray Protter	UC Berkeley	1996
Colloquium Editorial Comm	Susan Friedlander	University of Illinois Chicago	1996
Journal of the AMS	William Fulton	University of Chicago	1996
Math. Reviews Edit Comm	Hugh Montgomery	University of Michigan	1996
Math. Surveys Edit Comm	Georgia Benkart	U Wisconsin Madison	1997
Math. of Comp Comm	Lars B. Wahlbin	Cornell University	1996
Proceedings Editorial Comm	Irwin Kra	SUNY Stony Brook	1996
Transactions & Memoirs	Peter B. Shalen	U Illinois at Chicago	1996
Executive Committee	John M. Franks	Northwestern University	1996
Executive Committee	Steven G. Krantz	Washington Univ St. Louis	1998
Executive Committee	Marc Rieffel	U California, Berkeley	1997

## MEMBERS-AT-LARGE

David M. Bressoud	Macalester College	1998
Gail A. Carpenter	Boston University	1998
John B. Conway	U Tennessee	1998
David B.A. Epstein	University of Warwick	1997
James M. Hyman	Los Alamos Nat'l Lab	1997
Krystyna Kuperberg	Auburn University	1998
Robert Lazarsfeld	UCLA	1996
Jerrold E. Marsden	U California, Berkeley	1997
Frank Morgan	Williams College	1996
Andrew Odlyzko	AT&T Bell Labs	1998
Cora Sadosky	Howard University	1997
Norberto Salinas	University of Kansas	1996
Alice Silverberg	Ohio State University	1997
Sylvia M. Wiegand	University of Nebraska	1996

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

To be elected		1999
Robert M. Fossum	University of Illinois	1996
John M. Franks	Northwestern University	1996
Arthur Jaffe	Harvard	1999
Cathleen S. Morawetz	NYU-Courant	1997
Marc Rieffel	U California, Berkeley	1997
Steven Krantz	Washington University	1998

## TRUSTEES

Roy Adler	IBM Watson Lab	1997
Hyman Bass	Columbia University	1998
Michael Crandall	UC Santa Barbara	2000
Maria M. Klawe	U British Columbia	1996
Donald E. McClure	Brown University	1999
Cathleen S. Morawetz	NYU-Courant	1996
F. P. Peterson	MIT	1996
B. A. Taylor	University of Michigan	1996

## B Special Committee on Procedures for the Committee on Professional Ethics.

The following document is the final version of the Procedures manual for the Committee on Professional Ethics as adopted by the Council.

Procedures Manual  
Committee on Professional Ethics (COPE)  
Draft August 28, 1995

**1. Charge to COPE** COPE was established by action of the Council of the American Mathematical Society in 1983. It functions under the authority delegated to it by the Council and as set forth in the Ethical Guidelines adopted by the January 1995 Council. These guidelines appear in the Notices of the AMS Volume 42 and on the AMS Secretary's Home Page. Here is an excerpt from the introduction to the Ethical Guidelines:

*To assist in its chartered goal, "...the furtherance of the interests of mathematical scholarship and research ...," and to help in the preservation of that atmosphere of mutual trust and ethical behavior required for science to prosper, the American Mathematical Society, through its Council, sets forth the following guidelines. While it speaks only for itself, these guidelines reflect its expectations of behavior both for its members and for all members of the wider mathematical community including institutions engaged in the education or employment of mathematicians or in the publication of mathematics.*

*It is not intended that something not mentioned here is necessarily outside the scope of AMS interest. These guidelines are not a complete expression of the principles that underlie them but will, it is expected, be modified and amplified by events and experience. These are guidelines, not a collection of rigid rules.*

*The American Mathematical Society, through its Committee on Professional Ethics (COPE) may provide an avenue of redress for individual members injured in their capacity as mathematicians by violations of its ethical principles. COPE, in accordance with its procedures, will, in each case, determine the appropriate ways in which it can be helpful (including making recommendations to the Council of the Society). However, the AMS cannot enforce these guidelines and it cannot substitute for individual responsibility or for the responsibility of the mathematical community at large.*

COPE shares responsibility with the AMS Committee on Academic Freedom, Tenure, and Salary (CAFTES) for the implementation of these guidelines. COPE normally is a reactive committee, entering a dispute by request of a disputant. However, from time to time it should consider ethical matters that go beyond interpersonal conflict and to make appropriate recommendations to the AMS Council. Such considerations may be initiated by others or by COPE itself.

Outlined below are procedures for conflict resolution. The Committee may deviate from these procedures as cases warrant and parties agree, but COPE is encouraged to follow standardized procedures. It is of great importance to the AMS that COPE act impartially— both in fact and in appearance. Modification of these procedures is expected to occur as experience is gained. It is expected that the vast bulk of the cases brought to COPE will be resolved by the Standard

Procedure described below and that the Formal Procedure described in Appendix B will be very rarely invoked. The Council has delegated responsibility to COPE and has full confidence in COPE and its procedures. It is anticipated that the Council will consider appeals from COPE decisions only rarely.

**2. Membership** COPE shall be a committee of six members representing a broad spectrum of membership of the Society. They shall be appointed by the President acting on the advice of the Committee on Committees and shall have three year staggered terms. Each year one of the continuing members is appointed by the President to be Chair for that year.

**3. Scope of Activities** COPE serves primarily as an agency for conciliation, as a mediating body seeking for its standards “reasonable behavior expected of a active member in good standing of the mathematical community”. This includes the expectation that normal professional standards are respected in interaction with students and colleagues and in regard for the intellectual work of others. Most of the cases COPE receives are colored in shades of grey. For such cases, COPE attempts to facilitate an equitable resolution by drawing on the collective experience, judgment, and wisdom of its membership and the AMS.

In general, COPE does not take on disputes unless at least one of the parties is based in a U.S. or Canadian institution. This is because the AMS has considerable resources in U.S. and Canadian institutions that can be drawn upon to help establish the facts and assist in resolution of the matter but lacks these resources elsewhere in the world.

COPE has neither staff, legal expertise, nor budget. Therefore COPE does not have the resources to participate in judicial proceedings. Its only role can be as a committee of professional peers.

COPE has little direct power beyond the moral force of the collective judgment of its membership. COPE may bring a serious transgression to the attention of appropriate university and/or institutional officials. COPE may also bring a matter to the attention of its parent AMS Council. On occasion, if conciliation is not possible, a public statement might be issued in the form of an announcement in the AMS Notices.

It is understood that the conflict resolution procedures described below are not legally binding upon parties bringing conflicts to COPE. However COPE offers its services in the belief that members of the profession are best suited to resolve disputes involving professional ethics. Parties understand that the AMS will not take legal action to support the claims of any parties which are the subject of proceedings under these procedures. All parties are urged to find mutually satisfactory settlements to their conflicts. At any time, if a settlement is agreed to between the parties, then the proceedings will cease. COPE will simply report to the Council that a case was handled and resolved. It is expected that almost all cases will be handled by the Standard Procedure described below. In rare cases (explained below) the Formal Procedure described in Appendix B will be invoked.

Attention is also drawn to the AMS committee CAFTES: The Committee on Academic Freedom, Tenure, and Salary. A complainant should submit his case to the committee that he feels is most appropriate to handle it; if the Committee receiving it feels otherwise, it will recommend transfer of the case.

Access to AMS legal counsel shall be through the Secretary or the Executive Director and not, in the first instance, directly with Society counsel.

**4. Standard Procedure** Inquiries, complaints, and documentation are sent to the Chair, who sends copies to all members. (For this reason, eight copies of all materials will speed processing.) Members having a substantial personal interest in the case are recused. Members study and discuss the material. All parties to a dispute are informed that a complaint has been registered with COPE and their input is sought. If appropriate, COPE may consult with others who may have knowledge which is relevant.

COPE uses its resources and best judgment to mediate between disputing parties, tracing out the middle grounds or alternate approaches to divergent views. It is only when these efforts fail, and a judgment and/or action is required to proceed with a case or to close the case, that COPE renders decisions. COPE communicates these decisions to the parties and takes supplementary action (various examples are given in Appendix A) as appropriate.

Formal proceedings (as described in Appendix B) may be invoked for a particular case by COPE if COPE decides (at the beginning or in the midst of the Standard Procedure) that this is wise.

**5. Appeals in the Standard Procedure** The Council has full confidence in COPE and expects to intervene in COPE matters very rarely, if ever. Nevertheless, there is always the possibility of error, and these appeals processes are thus included in COPE procedures.

**A. APPEALS OF COPE DECISION TO USE STANDARD PROCEDURE:** If a party in a case being handled by COPE under the Standard Procedure wishes to invoke the Formal Procedure then the party has the right to request this of COPE (the request should be in writing to the Chair of COPE) and COPE has the right to grant or to deny this request. If COPE denies the request then the party has the right to appeal this decision to the Council. (Such appeal must be filed within 30 days with the Secretary of the AMS and the Chair of COPE). The Council will decide whether to consider this appeal. If the Council decides to consider the appeal then a COPE representative will be present at the Council meeting where the matter is discussed. The Council will either sustain COPE's decision or else will direct COPE to invoke the Formal Procedure.

**B. APPEALS OF COPE RESOLUTION OF A CASE:** If a party in a case wishes to appeal the disposition of a case handled by COPE, then such appeal shall be made to the Council. The grounds for appeal must be serious and weighty, such as egregious procedural errors or very substantial new facts. The fact that a party in a case is unhappy with the resolution of the case is not, in itself, grounds for appeal. Written notice of intent to appeal shall be made within three months of COPE's action to the Secretary of the Society. The Council shall act in a timely manner on any appeal. The Council will take advice from COPE and then will decide whether or not to consider the appeal. If the Council decides to consider the appeal then normally, the Council will appoint a subcommittee to investigate the case, report back to the Council, and recommend action. The Chair of COPE shall have the right to nominate one member of COPE to serve on this subcommittee; the Council need not accept COPE's nomination. At any time that the Council or such subcommittee discusses the case, members of the Council with substantial personal interest in the case shall be recused.

Whenever an appeal is discussed by the Council a representative of COPE shall attend the Council meeting with travel expenses paid by the AMS. Upon resolution of this appeal, the Council will provide the Chair of COPE with written records of subcommittee and the Council action for the COPE files.

**6. Records** COPE usually conducts business via email, mail, and conference calls. Each year a summary report of all COPE business will be presented to the Council (normally at the Annual Winter Meeting.)

In addition, the Chair of COPE is charged with keeping detailed records of each case and archiving one copy of these records with the Chair's successor and one copy with the Archives of the AMS. It is understood that the records of closed cases are to be held confidentially by the AMS and that access to these records will be limited to future COPE committees, to CAFTES and to the Council in case other proceedings warrant access. The AMS will endeavor to keep these records private to the extent possible by law.

**7. Insurance** By virtue of the vote of the Society's Board of Trustees approving these Procedures, the Board of Trustees has agreed to provide liability insurance for members of COPE and COPE subcommittees against claims arising out of actions taken by them in their capacities as members of the Committee.

**Appendix A: Examples** Here are some examples that may give some guidance as to what COPE can and cannot do. They are fictional but are based on past cases and other situations in which COPE may be helpful.

Example 1. A complaint that a proof of the Riemann hypothesis has been rejected by the Editor of XXX because, “the referee could not follow the proof presented and deemed it unlikely the methods used could be successful”. The complainant felt that the referee’s criticisms were not valid. His letter of complaint to the Editor decried the “superficial” examination of the submitted paper as indicated by the lack of detailed comments. The Editor responded that he had tried but had not succeeded in finding another referee for the paper, but that the referee was “an authority in the field”.

In such a situation, COPE’s response can only be to confirm that the established procedures for submitted manuscripts to XXX were reasonable and were followed. Acceptance or rejection of a paper is the prerogative of the Editor (or Editorial Board), based on their evaluation of the manuscript and interpretation of any referee’s reports. COPE has no standing to intervene when the Editor exercises his best judgment, so long as the appropriate procedures are followed.

In the end, it is the responsibility of the person claiming the proof to present it in such a way that other qualified readers can understand. We recognize that history holds examples where the originality and depth of penetration of the writer was not recognized by reviewing editors, who instead may have been unduly focused on the form of the presentation. Nevertheless, the only recourse for an author is to try different journals.

Example 2. A complaint that the ideas propounded in an NSF proposal were appropriated and subsequently applied by an alleged reviewer for his own purposes without attribution.

In such a situation, unless there is some concrete evidence that this has happened in this way, COPE has no basis to intervene. Proposals are supposed to be confidential. If the alleged event actually happened it would certainly be unethical. On the other hand, it is often difficult or impossible to nail down the source of an idea. Usually, ideas are “in the air” and are generated by the open nature of mathematical activity and discussion. Thus, it is not unusual that a number of people in a field arrive at similar ideas in the same time frame. It is also true that successful implementation of an idea can be of far greater import and challenge than the idea itself.

Example 3. A similar complaint was received claiming that the alleged referee of a paper ran with the idea and beat the author to improving the results. The complainant was also concerned lest his paper be rejected by the referee in favor of his own improvements. The facts were much easier to establish in this case. COPE confirmed through the journal editor that the author was correct in his designation of referee. The author had not distributed preprints so it was only in the capacity as referee that details of the complainant’s result were known. After researching the situation and establishing the validity of the complaint, COPE wrote a very strong letter to the referee with copies to the journal editor and author severely chastising him for his actions.

Seeing improvements is a rather common experience for a referee. COPE pointed out that the referee should either point out the improvement anonymously, leaving the credit for himself as the unnamed referee, or write directly to the author. Usually the choice is made according to the magnitude of the mathematical improvement. In the latter case the outcome is often a joint paper but may be an independent paper if the contents so warrant. If so, the referee will often wait until prior publication.

Certainly an outright rejection of the original paper by the referee with the intent of publishing his own work instead would be regarded with scepticism as to its ethical grounds. By accepting the role, a referee responding to the work he is examining is not in the same position as one without any direct responsibility for the paper.

Example 4. A complainant said that a result attributed in Y's paper to the Fields medalist Z was actually proved first by the complainant (reference provided).

There is a human tendency in scientific papers to establish or confirm authority by citing famous authors, but this is not an excuse for not making the correct attributions. The complainant should make sure he informs the offending author. Depending on the judgments of the significance of the oversight, a correction can be sent to the journal. If the response is not satisfactory then a formal complaint can be made to COPE and it will be examined.

However we are all aware that it is often much easier and much faster when confronted with a particular question to simply work out the answer without a literature search. If the result is buried as a lemma in the middle of a paper, it is even unlikely that a simple search will find it. This is why those who are most vociferous in publicizing their work are more likely to be so credited. Still, it is clearly unethical to knowingly omit a relevant reference even on the grounds that the result quoted is trivial (although there may be lower bounds on this score).

Example 5. A complainant said that a principal result proved by Y and then distributed as a preprint failed to give credit properly reflecting the magnitude of the complainant's prior contribution toward the result. The complainant enclosed a polite letter he had written to Y and Y's response denying any wrong. COPE wrote to Y registering the fact of the formal complaint and asked for a response. COPE also became aware of the fact that the paper was being refereed for an AMS journal and sent a copy of the complaint to the relevant editor for consideration. Subsequently, the referee and editor suggested modification in the wording, which was carried out and the paper was published. However the complainant was not satisfied and asked for formal censure of Y for the transgression. After discussion, COPE did not agree that the situation warranted a public rebuke of Y and closed the case.

Example 6. The complainant based in a US institution discovered that his published lemma and its rather lengthy proof was reproduced verbatim in a journal without any attribution to him. He brought this to the attention of COPE. After confirmation of the situation, COPE wrote to the author and the editor of the Journal asking for explanation of the apparent overt plagiarism. No re-



sponse was received. A further notice was sent stating that COPE would publish an announcement in the Notices calling attention to the plagiarism unless a satisfactory explanation was forthcoming. COPE published the announcement. If the article had arisen from a thesis, university officials would have been notified as well.

Example 7. A graduate student wrote in confidence to complain of the actions of his thesis advisor, a well known mathematician. According to the student he had discovered a wonderful formula without substantial help from his advisor. Yet his advisor insisted that the announcement of the result be made jointly. According to the student, the advisor even went around giving talks about the formula, always mentioning the student, not always by name, but implying that the student had played a secondary role in the discovery. The student asked COPE for advice.

COPE asked the student to supply as much documentation as he could for his claims. COPE also asked permission to write to his advisor, without mentioning the student's name but stating that a complaint had been brought questioning whether the formula was truly a joint discovery. Permission was given. The advisor responded that he had suggested the topic area to the student and he had witnessed the progress of the discovery, freely giving suggestions about its proof. He acknowledged that the core insight was the student's but as the senior figure ultimately responsible for the correctness of the proof, as "director of the lab", he felt it was his prerogative to claim joint authorship.

COPE carefully studied the record and consulted a leading expert in the field. Although COPE felt the advisor's actions were not without some justification, on balance it concluded that the magnitude of the student's insight outweighed the proprietary claims of the advisor. It wrote its report to the advisor, who accepted it after blasting COPE and terminating his relationship with the student.

A year later, the same student wrote back to say that he was told that his former advisor had written a negative, damaging letter as part of his application package for junior positions. Again he asked for assistance.

After confirming that this had occurred with at least one school, and that the matter was directly related to the experience with the formula, COPE wrote a very strong letter to the Dean and the Chairman of the Department. A copy of the finding about joint authorship was enclosed. COPE recommended that all of the schools receiving the former advisor's recommendation should be contacted and copies of the letters from COPE should be sent for insertion in the applicant's file. COPE in addition wrote a report on the case to the Council for further consideration, possibly for publication of the record in the Notices.

Example 8. Professor X, who had been on the faculty of his large urban university for 20 years, came to COPE with the following complaint. Individuals had been critical of the current teaching of calculus. They came out with a new curriculum which was embraced by the department's committee on calculus. But after independently studying the new curriculum, Professor X concluded that it was seriously flawed and wrote a long critique to that end. He then declared that to follow such a syllabus would compromise his integrity as a mathematician and announced his refusal to use it in any classes. His department head and dean were equally adamant that as an employee he had to

follow their directions and refused to entertain his objections, especially as they had to demonstrate success to the funding agency.

COPE felt this case was potentially significant. Although ethics played a substantial role in this case, COPE felt that the academic freedom issue dominated. The case was referred to CAFTES.

Example 9. Professor Y had for some years written a newsletter for his department. It was written in an informal, personal style, not unlike the Parks newsletter for physics. In particular it highlighted stupidities wherever Professor Y saw them. The newsletter was greatly appreciated by the alumni, faculty, and students. It was credited with a significant role in recruiting new students and faculty and more generally, new friends, to the department because of its very human qualities and the fact that it highlighted the most interesting work done in the department. Because of its success, it received modest support from the Dean's office to cover expenses.

However it transpired that Professor Y felt called upon to address certain points relating to the Dean's latest initiative to get faculty members into factories, where they would gain "real life" experience to bring back to their students. He found that another school had tried and then quickly dropped this idea, and he reported their troubles in detail. In particular he reported on the quality of mathematics that was brought into the classroom and into the scholarly literature as a result of their experiment.

When he saw the piece, the Dean felt it disloyal in that it threatened his relations with industry and his attempts to raise substantial funds. With the cooperation of the department chair he ordered a restructuring of the newsletter production. Professor Y would be replaced by a committee which would pay a graduate student to follow their direction.

Professor Y brought his case to COPE. He wanted its support in addressing what he believed was an unethical action by his department and the Dean in silencing his voice for truth in commenting on mathematical issues.

After a vigorous debate, which took account of input from the Dean and department chair, COPE unanimously supported Professor Y's position. A strongly worded letter spelling out the reasons for declaring the action unethical was sent to the department Chair and to the Dean, Provost, and President. In addition, an account of the case was given to the Council.

**Appendix B: Formal Procedure** The Formal Procedure is followed when COPE decides that it is appropriate or when COPE is directed to do so by the Council. It is rarely used. The following describes this procedure:

1. The Chair of COPE, on the advice of the Committee, and after consultation with the President of the Society, shall appoint a three member Special Committee for the case. At this time any member of COPE with a significant personal interest in the case shall be recused for the duration of the case. Any party to the case may submit to the Chair of COPE a written list of Society members whom they wish not to serve on the Special Committee and reason for the objection. Any party may request certain peer representation on the Special Committee, e.g., a non-tenured member if a party is also non-tenured. The Chair of COPE shall take these suggestions under advisement and may, but is not required to, act upon them. The members of the Special Committee shall generally be knowledgeable of the area of conflict. A time limit for the special investigation will be agreed to by all parties, with the Chair of COPE making the final determination of reasonable time limit in case of non-agreement of the principal parties. Any party may ask for an extension of the time limit from COPE as the case proceeds and the Chair will grant the extension if the request is justified.
2. The Special Committee shall gather facts and statements from all interested parties. Committee members conducting interviews will make written summations of any interviews. After completing what it determines to be a full investigation, and after all parties have been asked to comment on the accuracy and completeness of the record, the Special Committee shall present a written report to COPE. In case parties disagree on statements of facts in the report, their written disagreement shall constitute a part of the report. As part of its report, the Special Committee shall recommend to COPE action that it deems appropriate for the case. All parties to the dispute shall be given copies of the Special Committee report. AMS legal staff shall review the final report of any Special Committee and any final determination and recommendation of any case that goes through a Special Committee procedure.
3. COPE shall review the report of the Special Committee, advice of AMS legal counsel (see note concerning consultation with legal counsel above), and all other relevant information presented to it and shall make a final decision regarding the disposition of the case. It shall take supplemental action as it deems appropriate (cf. Appendix A for examples) and shall communicate its decision and actions to the parties and to the Council.
4. If a party in a case wishes to appeal a case handled by Formal Procedure then such appeal shall be made to the Council. The grounds for appeal must be serious and weighty, such as egregious procedural errors or very substantial new facts. The fact that a party in a case is unhappy with the resolution of the case is not, in itself, grounds for appeal. Written notice of intent to appeal shall be made within three months of COPE's action to the Secretary of the Society. The Council shall act in a timely manner on any appeal. The Council will take advice from COPE and then will decide whether to consider the appeal. If the Council decides to consider the appeal then normally, the Council will appoint a Subcommittee to investigate the case, report back to the Council, and recommend action. The Chair of COPE shall nominate one member of COPE to serve on this

Subcommittee; the Council need not accept COPE's nomination. In addition, COPE shall review the request for appeal and give a written opinion to the Council as to whether the appeal is valid. The Council will decide on the validity of the appeal based upon the information presented to it by the parties, its Subcommittee, and on the COPE opinion. At any time that the Council discusses the case, members of the Council with substantial personal interest in the case shall be recused. Whenever an appeal is discussed at a Council meeting a representative of COPE shall attend the Council meeting with travel expenses paid by the AMS. Upon resolution of this appeal, Council will provide the Chair of COPE with written records of subcommittee and Council action for the COPE files.

5. All expenses incurred by members of COPE, COPE subcommittees, and individuals consulted by COPE in connection with the exercise of these formal procedures shall be paid by the AMS. Prior approval from the President, Secretary, or Treasurer is required before unusual expenses, such as travel, are incurred.

## C Committee on Science Policy Charge.

### Committee on Science Policy

#### General Description

**Committee** is Standing.

**Number** of members is fourteen to sixteen.

**Term** is three years effective February 1.

The Committee consists of 3 Council members (chosen from the Vice-Presidents and Members-at-Large), a member of the Board of Trustees, the President, the President-Elect/Past President, the Council representative to the JPBM, the chair of COE (Committee on Education), the Executive Director, and 4-6 at-large members. The Secretary will serve as a non-voting member.

The Chair of the Committee on Science Policy shall sit *ex officio* on the Committee on Education.

**Principal Activities** The Committee on Science Policy is created by the Council and is charged with the responsibility to provide advice to the leadership of the Society and to make recommendations as to Society policy. The general area of responsibility of the Committee are those matters that fall into the broad area of science policy. In discharging their duties, the Committee is responsible for taking a long-range view in science policy. The Council charge to the Committee shall include the following responsibilities:

1. To discuss and act on questions of policy as it affects the discipline.
2. As a Committee and individually upon request, to represent the Society and the mathematical community in discussions with Federal agencies and policy makers.
3. To be responsible for the selection of those elements of AMS meeting programs, such as lectures and panel discussions, which bear directly on such policy questions as are within the purview of the Committee.
4. To conduct an annual high-level review of activities and structure within the realm of science policy and evaluate progress toward Society goals in this area. As a part of this responsibility, the Committee shall carry out at least every six years reviews and appraisals of Society activities in the following areas and report the results of these reviews to the Executive Committee and to the Council.
  - National Policy Agenda
  - JPBM and the Washington Office
  - International Activities
  - Policy forums and public relations
  - Relations with other scientific organizations
  - All other activities of the Committee

5. To prepare an annual report on the Committee's activities and goals for possible publication in the NOTICES.
6. To prepare an annual summary of federal funding in mathematics over the preceding year.
7. To prepare an annual summary of the discussions within the mathematical community over policy issues with which the Committee has come into contact.
8. To report annually to the Council and more often when appropriate.

The 11 January 1994 Council approved the following resolution:

The Council charges the committees on Education, Meetings and Conferences, Profession, Publication, and Science Policy to carry out at least every six years reviews and appraisals of Society activities in the areas of their charges and to report the results of these reviews to the Executive Committee and to the Council.

**Other Activities** In order to effectively discharge the responsibilities listed under Principal Activities above, the Committee is given the following additional charge.

1. To coordinate their discussions with the Board of Mathematical Sciences (BMS) of the NRC, the Joint Policy Board for Mathematics (JPBM), the science policy committees of other mathematical and scientific societies and the policy committees of the AMS.
2. To report regularly to the membership, both in writing, by use of e-Math and by presentations at meetings.
3. To maintain communication with the membership and awareness of their views.

**Miscellaneous Information** The Committee does its work by mail, telephone and usually 2 face-to-face meetings a year.

Members are reimbursed for travel and incidental expenses that are not covered from some other source.

An explanation of travel expense reimbursement of volunteers for this committee is attached. This committee has been designated at **LEVEL B**.

**Notes to the Chair** Committee chairs should be informed, at the beginning of each fiscal period, the budget of their committees and cautioned to remain within the budget. Such items as travel reimbursement to, accommodations for, and meals for guests of any kind fall within these budgets. Work done by committees on recurring problems may have value as precedent or work done may have historical interest. Because of this, the Council has requested that a central file system be maintained for the Society by the Secretary. Committees are reminded that a copy of every sheet of paper should be deposited (say once a year) in this central file. Confidential material should be noted, so that it can be handled in a confidential manner.

The 11 January 1994 Council adopted procedures for Committees as follows:

Committee Procedures

1. The Society should have a “Manual on Committees.” It should be included in the “Manual of Information for the Board of Trustees, Council, and Executive Committee of the Council.” We refer to “this manual.”

#### Rules for inclusion in the Manual

2. Definitions concerning committees, charge to committees and rules of procedures for committees will be published in this manual. Items for inclusion, or modifications to the manual, require approval by the body to which the committee reports.
3. The following statement should appear in this manual: “Procedures for committees will in general follow A. Sturgis’ ‘Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure, revised.’ In case definitions, rules, or procedures in this manual differ from those in Sturgis, then this manual takes precedence.”
4. Each committee must have a designated chair (or a procedure to choose a chair) and a designated body to which the committee reports. In the absence of specification of such a body, that body will be assumed to be the body which formed the committee.
5. The meeting of a committee may be presided over by a substitute chair appointed by the chair of the committee.
6. Responsibility during a meeting for the interpretation of the Rules for Committees lies with the chair of the meeting in question.
7. A guest at a committee meeting can only be invited by the chair of that committee.
8. The chair of a committee must follow instructions implied by votes of that committee.
9. Committees may have non-voting members. (For example, the secretary and Executive Director are non-voting members of certain policy committees.)
10. A committee has the right to appoint subcommittees which are directly responsible to it. Normally the chair of a subcommittee would be a member of the parent committee but members of subcommittees need not, in general, be members of the parent committee. While subcommittees can exchange information with other committees, they report only to the committee that created them.

**Authorization** Council minutes of 25 October 1974, p.4  
 ECBT minutes of 20-22 November 1981, item 5.1  
 Council minutes of 6 January 1986, item 4.10  
 Council minutes of 12 January 1993, item 4.5  
 Council minutes of 11 January 1994.  
 Council minutes of 07 January 1995.  
 CSP minutes of 11-12 September 1994.  
 CSP minutes of 28-29 April 1995

updated 02/22/93

updated 08/24/94

updated 04/27/95

updated 10/30/95 RES

updated 01/05/96 RMF



## D Future Meetings of the Society.

The following lists all known future meetings of committees and other organizations related to the Society. Note the deadlines for Council agenda items to be submitted to the Secretary.

### 1996

DATE	MEETING	SITE
February 29, 1996	DEADLINE FOR APRIL 96 COUNCIL ITEMS	
March 16, 1996	ABC Meeting	Providence, RI
March 22-23, 1996	AMS Sectional Meeting at Univ. of Iowa	Iowa City, IA
April 4, 1996	Passover	
April 5, 1996	Good Friday	
April 7, 1996	Easter	
April 13, 1996	AMS Council Dinner 5:30, Meeting 7:00 PM	New York, NY
April 13-14, 1996	AMS Section Meeting, NYU Courant Institute	New York, NY
April 17-19, 1996	AAAS Colloquium LECTURE	Washington, DC
April 19-21, 1996	AMS Sectional Meeting, Louisiana State Univ	Baton Rouge, LA
April 20, 1996	CPUB Meeting	Washington, DC
May 3-4, 1996	CSP Meeting	Washington, DC
May 5, 1996	COE Meeting	Washington, DC
May 12, 1996	Mother's Day	
May 17-19, 1996	ECBT Meeting	Ann Arbor, MI?
May 22-24, 1996	Joint AMS/BENELUX Meeting	Antwerp, Belgium
May 27, 1996	Holiday - Memorial Day	
June 8-13, 1996	SLA Annual Conference	Boston, MA
June 16, 1996	Father's Day	
June 21, 1996	DEADLINE FOR AUGUST 96 COUNCIL ITEMS	
July 4, 1996	Holiday - Independence Day	
July 9-12, 1996	CESSE '96 Annual Meeting	Providence, RI
August 9, 1996	AMS Council	Seattle, WA
August 10-12, 1996	Mathfest	Seattle, WA
August 12, 1996	Holiday - Victory Day	RI
September 2, 1996	Holiday - Labor Day	
September 14, 1996	Rosh Hashanah	
September 23, 1996	Yom Kippur	
September 27-28, 1996	COE Meeting	Washington, DC
September 28-29, 1996	CSP Meeting	Washington, DC
October 5-6, 1996	AMS Sectional Meeting, Rider University	Lawrenceville, NJ

October 11-12, 1996	AMS Sectional Meeting, Univ Tennessee	Chattanooga, TN
October 12, 1996	ABC Meeting	Providence, RI
October 14, 1996	Holiday - Columbus Day	
October 19, 1996	COMC Meeting (TENT)	Chicago, IL
November 1-2, 1996	AMS Sectional Meeting Univ. of Missouri	Columbia, MS
November 5, 1996	Election Day	
November 11, 1996	Holiday - Veterans Day	
November 22-24, 1996	ECBT Meeting	Ann Arbor, MI
November 28, 1996	Holiday - Thanksgiving	
November 29, 1996	Holiday - Thanksgiving	AMS Offices
December 2, 1996	DEADLINE FOR JANUARY 97 COUNCIL ITEMS	
December 6, 1996	Hanukkah	
December 25, 1996	Holiday - Christmas	

**1997**

DATE	MEETING	SITE
January 1, 1997	Holiday - New Year's Day	
January 7, 1997	AMS Council	San Diego, CA
January 8-11, 1997	AMS-MAA Annual Meeting	San Diego, CA
January 20, 1997	Holiday - Martin Luther King, Jr. Day	Note: NOT a holiday for AMS offices in RI
March 15-16, 1997 TENT	ABC Meeting	Providence, RI
March 21-22, 1997	AMS Sectional Meeting at University of Memphis	Memphis, TN
March 28, 1997	Good Friday	
March 30, 1997	Easter	
April 12-13, 1997 TENT	AMS Sectional Meeting at Univ. of Maryland	College Park, MD
April 22, 1997	Passover	
May 2-4, 1994	AMS Sectional Meeting, Wayne State University	Detroit, MI
May 11, 1997	Mother's Day	
May 16-18, 1997 TENT	ECBT Meeting	Washington, DC?
May 26, 1997	Holiday - Memorial Day	
June 7-12, 1997	SLA Annual Conference	Seattle, WA
June 15, 1997	Father's Day	
July 1, 1997	DEADLINE FOR AUGUST COUNCIL ITEMS	
July 4, 1997	Holiday - Independence Day	

August, 1997	Council Meeting (date and location to be determined)	
August 11, 1997	Holiday - Victory Day	RI
September 1, 1997	Holiday - Labor Day	
September 26-28, 1997	AMS Sectional Meeting	Montreal, Quebec
October 2, 1997	Rosh Hashanah	
October 11, 1997	Yom Kippur	
October 4 or 18, 1997	ABC Meeting (TENT)	Providence, RI
October 13, 1997	Holiday - Columbus Day	
October 24-26, 1997	AMS Sectional Meeting	Milwaukee, WI
TENT	at Univ. of Wisconsin	
November 4, 1997	Election Day	
November 11, 1997	Holiday - Veterans Day	
November 21-23, 1997		
TENT	ECBT Meeting	Providence, RI
November 27, 1997	Holiday - Thanksgiving	
November 28, 1997	Holiday - Thanksgiving	AMS Offices
December 1, 1997	DEADLINE FOR JANUARY 98 COUNCIL ITEMS	
December 24, 1997	Hanukkah	
December 25, 1997	Holiday - Christmas	

**1998/1999**

DATE	MEETING	SITE
January 1, 1998	Holiday - New Year's Day	
January 6, 1998	AMS Council	Baltimore, MD
January 7-10, 1998	AMS-MAA Annual Meeting	Baltimore, MD
March 27-28, 1998	AMS Sectional Meeting at Kansas State Univ.	Manhattan, KS
December 1, 1998	DEADLINE FOR JANUARY 99 COUNCIL ITEMS	
January 12, 1999	AMS Council	San Antonio, TX
January 13-16, 1999	AMS-MAA Annual Meeting	San Antonio, TX