

AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY

MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING

14 August 1993

Vancouver, BC

May 29, 1997

Abstract

The Council of the American Mathematical Society met at 1:00 pm on Saturday, 14 August 1993, in Fort Camp Lounge, Walter Gage Complex on the University of British Columbia Campus, Vancouver, BC. Members in attendance were: Joan S. Birman, Carl C. Cowen, Jr., Chandler Davis, Robert M. Fossum, John M. Franks, Ronald L. Graham, Judy Green, Philip J. Hanlon, Arthur M. Jaffe, Linda Keen, Stephen George Krantz, James I. Lepowsky, Peter W. K. Li, Franklin P. Peterson, Murray H. Protter, Ruth J. Williams, Susan Gayle Williams, Wilfried Schmid, B. A. Taylor, Frank W. Warner III, and Steven H. Weintraub. Also present were Executive Director William H. Jaco and Executive Editor Donald Babbitt and other AMS staff members. President Graham presided.

Contents

0	Call to Order and Introductions.	4
0.1	Call to Order.	4
1	MINUTES	4
1.1	April 93 Council.	4
1.2	05/93 Meeting of the Executive Committee and Board of Trustees.	4
2	CONSENT AGENDA.	4
2.1	<i>What's Happening in the Mathematical Sciences.</i>	4
2.2	LIBRARY COMMITTEE CHARGE.	4
3	REPORTS OF BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES.	5
3.1	EBC	5
3.1.1	American Journal of Mathematics.	5
3.1.2	Transactions of the AMS.	5
3.1.3	Journal of the AMS.	5
3.1.4	Bulletin of the AMS.	5
3.2	EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES (ECBT).	5
3.2.1	LRPC Review of Role of Vice Presidents.	5
3.2.2	Prizes.	6
3.3	JOINT POLICY BOARD FOR MATHEMATICS (JPBM).	7
3.4	COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE POLICY.	7
3.4.1	National Science Foundation Grant Size.	7
3.5	COMMITTEE on EDUCATION.	9
3.6	COMMITTEE TO MONITOR PROBLEMS IN COMMUNICATION.	9
3.7	COMUM	9
4	REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES.	9
4.1	Committee to Review Member Publications (CRMP).	9
4.2	Guidelines for COPE	15
4.2.1	Membership	15
4.2.2	Procedures	16
5	UNFINISHED BUSINESS.	18
5.1	Copyright Policy.	18
5.2	Meetings in Cuba.	18
6	NEW BUSINESS	19
6.1	International Meetings.	19
6.2	United States National Committee on Mathematics.	19

7 ANNOUNCEMENTS, INFORMATION, AND RECORD.	20
7.1 Future Meetings	20
7.2 Co-sponsorship of Meetings	20
7.3 Expanding Role of AMS Publications.	21
7.4 Committee on Younger Mathematicians	21
7.5 Complimentary Copy Policy.	21
7.6 Bequest from the Estate of Israel Berstein	21
7.7 Special Donations to General Fund.	22
7.8 Department Chair's Newsletter.	22
7.9 Developing a Mathematics Policy Agenda.	22
7.10 Postdoctorate Fellowships.	23
7.11 Centennial Fellowships.	23
7.12 Presidential Decrees.	23
7.13 National Meetings Coordinating Committees.	24
7.14 Reviewer Credits for fSU, Eastern Europe, and PRC	24
7.15 AMS fSU Mathematical Literature Donation Plan.	25
7.16 Travel Expense Reimbursement of Volunteers.	25
7.17 Journal Pages.	26
7.17.1 SUGAKU Backlog.	26
7.18 Journal Prices	27
7.19 Davis–Markert–Nickerson Lecture on Academic and Intellectual Freedom.	27
7.20 Executive Director Resigns.	28
A Attachments: INTRODUCTIONS.	29
A.1 1993 Council.	29
B Attachments: REPORTS OF BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES.	30
B.1 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES.	30
B.1.2 Prizes	30
B.1.3 Minute from the ECBT Meeting.	34
C Attachments: REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES.	36
C.1 Committee to Review Member Publications	36
C.1.1 INTRODUCTION.	36
C.1.2 SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS.	37
C.1.3 DETAILED RECOMMENDATIONS.	38
C.1.4 ATTACHMENT 1: SOME IDEAS FOR eNAMS CONTENTS.	42
C.1.5 ATTACHMENT 2: CONTENTS OF iBAMS.	43
C.1.6 Special Committee to Review Member Publications: Membership.	46
D Attachments: ANNOUNCEMENTS.	48
D.1 Future Meetings.	48
D.2 Davis, Markert, Nickerson Lecture on Academic and Intellectual Freedom.	52

0 Call to Order and Introductions.

The meeting was called to order shortly after 1:00 PM local time.

0.1 Call to Order.

A complete list of the 1993 Council is attached (Att. A.1).

1 MINUTES

1.1 April 93 Council.

The Minutes of the April 93 Council were mailed to members and submitted for approval. They were approved as submitted. [It should be noted in those minutes that Daniel M. Burns, Jr., was attending the Council meeting as an official representative of the Nominating Committee. The Secretary failed to request amendment of the minutes to reflect this. It has also been pointed out that corrections must be made in the Report of the Special Committee on Ethical Conduct. These corrections will be requested at the January 1994 Meeting of the Council.]

1.2 05/93 Meeting of the Executive Committee and Board of Trustees.

The Executive Committee and Board of Trustees met in the period 21-23 May 1993. The minutes of these meetings have been distributed to the members of the Council and are considered to be part of the record of the Council.

2 CONSENT AGENDA.

The following items were approved by consent of the Council.

2.1 *What's Happening in the Mathematical Sciences.*

The Advisory Boards for *What's Happening in the Mathematical Sciences* will be appointed by the President upon consultation with and by recommendations from the Editorial Boards Committee.

2.2 LIBRARY COMMITTEE CHARGE.

The charge to the Library Committee was amended to include the following statement:

Periodically collect and maintain authoritative data on mathematics libraries. Study and articulate the needs of mathematicians with respect to use of print and electronic information. Monitor problems in libraries, and foster dialog between mathematicians and librarians on issues that concern the dissemination and preservation of research. Support librarians in their efforts to build and maintain better mathematics libraries and to provide access to information.

3 REPORTS OF BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES.

3.1 EDITORIAL BOARDS COMMITTEE (EBC).

The Editorial Boards Committee recommended appointments of several editors, appointments that were considered in executive session. The Council approved the following appointments:

3.1.1 American Journal of Mathematics.

HENRI GILLET to a regular term as representative from the Society to the Editorial Committee of the American Journal of Mathematics. (This appointment has been approved by the Editor in Chief of the Editorial Committee of the American Journal of Mathematics.)

3.1.2 Transactions of the AMS.

ROBERT STANTON, **E. ZELMANOV**, and **DANIEL RUDOLPH** for full terms on the Transactions and Memoirs Editorial Committee and **PETER SHALEN** as Managing Editor.

3.1.3 Journal of the AMS.

BENEDICT H. GROSS for a full term on the Journal of the AMS Editorial Committee.

3.1.4 Bulletin of the AMS.

HAYNES R. MILLER to a full term as Editor of Research Reports on the Bulletin of the AMS Editorial Committee.

3.2 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES (ECBT).

3.2.1 LRPC Review of Role of Vice Presidents.

Acting on the advice of the Executive Committee, the Council adopted the following policy regarding the role of Vice-presidents in the governance and activities of the Society.

Vice-presidents

1. Under the bylaws, a vice-president may become president in the event that the president die or resign when no president-elect is in office. In that case, the Council, with the approval of the Board of Trustees, shall designate one vice-president to serve the remainder of the term of the president.
2. At the discretion of the president, a vice-president (as well as a president-elect, an ex-president or other officer) can represent the Society when the president cannot attend.
3. Vice-presidents should not be elected with a portfolio.
4. When nominating vice-presidents, the Nominating Committee should take into account that former vice-presidents are considered in the pool of candidates to be nominated as president.

5. The nominating committee should be instructed about the above roles of the vice-presidents.
6. The president should be encouraged to use the vice-presidents in active roles within the Society.

3.2.2 Prizes.

This report was placed on the executive session consent agenda when first considered at the January 1993 Council meeting. It was taken off that consent agenda but consideration was deferred until the April 1993 Council meeting. The report was not considered at that meeting either. It was considered at this meeting.

The President appointed an ad hoc Committee on Prizes that was requested to report to the ECBT. Following the actions taken by the EC and/or BT, the following proposals were put to the Council. The Council approved them all. (The numbering is not serial since several items in the report received no ECBT action. See the 11/92 ECBT Minutes and the attachment.):

1. Number of Prizes.

Resolution: The Society welcomes the creation of new prizes as a result of gifts when the following conditions are met:

1. The gift should be sufficient to fully endow a substantial prize and
2. any conditions attached to the gift should be acceptable to the Society.

2. Committee on National Awards.

Resolution: The Committee on National Awards and Public Representation be reconstituted to be a working committee with more members who are not ex-officio.

5. Qualifications for prizes and awards.

Resolution: The Society hereby removes any citizenship, residency or AMS membership requirements for AMS awards.

7. Steele Prizes.

Resolution: The Steele prizes will carry the following three names:

- a) The Leroy P. Steele Prize for Seminal Contribution to Research;
- b) The Leroy P. Steele Prize for Lifetime Achievement;
- c) The Leroy P. Steele Prize for Mathematical Exposition.

8. Contributions to other prizes.

Resolution: The AMS will not contribute funding to awards given by other organizations. It will, however, at the discretion of its governing bodies, consider contributions to awards made jointly by the AMS and another society provided the contributions are equal and the behavior being rewarded is considered sufficiently in line with the mission of the AMS.

15. Prize amounts. The BT agreed that all AMS prizes should be a minimum of \$4,000, and that the Satter Prize should be raised to \$4,000. In the future, new prizes will not be accepted unless they meet the minimum set by the BT. The BT expects that a concerted effort will be made to raise money to fund AMS prizes, and that the ED will attempt to see if other prizes the AMS co-sponsors can be raised to the minimum of \$4,000.

For information.

3.3 JOINT POLICY BOARD FOR MATHEMATICS (JPBM).

The Council was informed of the location, in the ECBT minutes mentioned in 1.2, of draft copies of the minutes of the 11/92 JPBM Meeting and the 3/93 JPBM Directors Meeting.

3.4 COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE POLICY.

The Council was informed of the location, in the ECBT minutes mentioned in 1.2, of the 9/92 CSP meeting minutes.

3.4.1 National Science Foundation Grant Size.

At its meeting in San Antonio in January, 1993, the Council passed the following directive:

The Council directs the CSP to prepare a satisfactory procedure for determining sizes of National Science Foundation (NSF) grants and to report this procedure to the Council and the Council, following approval, propose this procedure to NSF.

The CSP interpreted the Council directive to be a request for a satisfactory procedure for determining sizes of NSF grants in the current funding climate. The Council adopted the following resolution and requested that it be forwarded to all individuals concerned.

PREAMBLE.

The quality of mathematics research in the United States is being adversely affected by erosion in the support by the NSF for basic disciplinary mathematical sciences research. Recent levels of constant or reduced funding from NSF have had a direct, uncushioned impact on several fundamental areas of mathematics research for which there is little alternative funding. The overall funding in mathematics has become so tightly stretched that much outstanding research is now either unsupported or inadequately supported. Even more worrying for the health of the discipline is that this situation is unlikely to improve in the near future. This present state of

funding threatens our ability to maintain US world leadership in science research and technological vitality.

RECOMMENDATIONS.

The only completely satisfactory procedure is to provide the full funding necessary to maintain the pre-eminence of mathematical sciences research in the United States. Unfortunately, this ideal is impossible with the current DMS budget because there are far more excellent research activities than can be fully supported.

The operational DMS strategy today, described next, is intended to minimize the damage caused by the present funding constraints.

First, within each program, 10-15% of the number of awards may be made (if appropriate) to support research considered as "high impact." Such proposals are funded adequately, meaning that reasonable requested support will be fully provided. The support awarded for such research may include up to two months of time in the summer for the investigator(s), postdocs and graduate students, travel, visitors, and publication costs.

Approximately 25% of the number of awards are made to support research proposed by young investigators (up to seven or eight years after the Ph.D.) considered outstanding relative to this group. These proposals are also to be funded adequately, with a somewhat more restricted definition. The support awarded for such research may include up to two months of time in the summer for the investigator(s), and modest funds for travel, visitors and publications. Graduate student support is rare, and postdocs are not provided.

The remaining awards are made at the discretion of the program directors, based on the quality of the proposed science and the availability of funds. Typically the full amount needed to support each project adequately cannot be provided.

The CSP recommends that the award policy for this latter group be based on the following guidelines. If time during the summer is required to perform the research and if support is requested for one month or more, then support for at least one full month for each investigator should be provided to ensure a minimal period of time for sustained attention to the research. Because of the central importance to mathematical research of professional interactions and communication of new results, these awards should also include (when requested) modest amounts for travel, visitors and publications. Further, differential rates of benefits and overhead should not affect the support awarded directly to a research project. Calculations of benefits and overhead should be made separately once the levels of salary, travel, visitor and publication support are set.

With the above implementation, the CSP would support current DMS policy as a reasonable interim funding strategy.

We emphasize again that the budgetary constraints imposed on DMS do not allow outstanding US mathematical research to be supported at the level

needed both to maintain world leadership in mathematics and to fulfill the crucial enabling roles of mathematics in science, engineering, applications, and education. The current policy of DMS, even if modified as suggested above, represents a compromise made necessary by the current low level of funding at NSF for the mathematical sciences. This compromise is in many ways unsatisfactory. The only truly satisfactory level of funding is the full support necessary to maintain US leadership in this discipline.

The AMS should pursue all possible avenues necessary to achieve support for mathematics research that reflects its importance in achieving these national priorities. The preparation of a federal policy agenda for the AMS as well as a joint agenda for the JPBM organizations will be an important step in this process. New mechanisms for liaison with NSF will also be important in view of the demise of the DMS Advisory Committee.

3.5 COMMITTEE on EDUCATION.

The Council was informed of the location, in the ECBT minutes mentioned in 1.2, of draft copies of the minutes of the 8/92 COE meeting minutes.

3.6 COMMITTEE TO MONITOR PROBLEMS IN COMMUNICATION.

The minutes from the January 1993 meeting of the Committee to Monitor Problems in Communication can be found as Attachment #4 of the 05/93 ECBT Minutes.

3.7 AAAS-AMS-MAA COMMITTEE ON OPPORTUNITIES IN MATHEMATICS FOR UNDERREPRESENTED MINORITIES.

The Committee request that the number of members be increased to fifteen (15) was referred to the Committee on the Profession.

4 REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES.

4.1 Committee to Review Member Publications (CRMP).

The ECBT received and discussed the report of CRMP (Attachment #7 of the 05/93 ECBT Minutes and Attachment C.1) and then voted to recommend approval of the report to the 8/93 Council. The Council approved the recommendations as follows:

DETAILED RECOMMENDATIONS.

1. PROPOSAL FOR AN "ENHANCED" NOTICES OF THE AMS (The "enhanced" NOTICES will be referred to as "eNAMS.")

The principal mission of the AMS is the furtherance of mathematical research through its programs and publications. It does so by publishing a number of research journals, along with the Bulletin, all of which are primarily aimed at research mathematicians. On the other hand, the Society has a diverse membership including many who, while not actively

engaged in mathematical research, are intensely interested in learning about new developments and ideas. The goal of the enhanced Notices of the American Mathematical Society is to serve all mathematicians by providing a lively and informative magazine, which contains news about mathematics and mathematicians as well as information about the Society and the profession. Our recommendations are designed to provide opportunity to explore and experiment with this concept without adversely affecting existing functions of the Notices. While we shall leave the actual realization to the proposed editorial board, we pass along the thinking of the CRMP.

While the enhanced Notices would be published for mathematicians, the articles would not be written for the experts. Most articles would be short. They would seldom contain full details but rather strive to inform a large number of readers about the topic or event.

An essential feature of the new enhanced Notices is a single Editor-in-Chief with both the responsibility and control to shape the magazine in new directions.

Specifically, we recommend the following six points.

- (a) The journal eNAMS would communicate information on the discipline, the profession, and the Society and its activities, be a privilege of membership in the AMS and serve as the journal of record of the Society.
- (b) eNAMS would have an Editor with full editorial responsibility within the very general outline provided as part of this recommendation. The Editor of eNAMS would be a mathematician (compensated at half-time) with strong research experience and broad mathematical interests and be appointed by the Council of the AMS, following a recommendation of the EBC. The Editor would serve a 3-year term. After consultation with the EBC, the Editor of eNAMS would recommend to the Council a board of Associate Editors for eNAMS, with the Secretary serving *ex officio*, which will work with the Editor to fashion the content of eNAMS. The terms of these associate editors are to be specified in a way that permits overlap and promotes continuity.
- (c) eNAMS would have sufficient AMS staff assigned to provide editorial, production, and advertising support. This would include an assistant editor with appropriate training and experience, staff writer, production editor, and marketing staff.
- (d) eNAMS would begin publication with a January, 1995 issue. It would be published every four (4) weeks for a total of 13 issues per year with less than 120 pages per issue (with a total of 1496 pages annually).
- (e) The editor and the editorial board should have responsibility for content within the broad guideline of communicating information

of the discipline, the profession, and the Society and its activities. To be effective, departments and columns ought to be designed by the people who have responsibility for obtaining the material. Nonetheless, the committee has made some suggestions for the kind of departments and layout that an editorial board might choose (see Attachment 1).

- (f) eNAMS will continue to publish meeting announcements and the scientific programs of meetings. However, the Editor of eNAMS will conduct a thorough review of meetings announcements with the expectation that there will be some changes in how this information is communicated in eNAMS, with no loss of content. The amount or extent of meetings information contained in different issues of eNAMS will vary greatly, according to the meetings schedule. The timeliness of meetings information will be addressed by the increase from 10 to 13 issues annually, published at regular intervals.

2. PROPOSAL FOR “IMPROVED” BULLETIN OF THE AMS (The “Improved” BULLETIN will be referred to as iBAMS)

A powerful way of inspiring our community to provide more good expository writing is to set high standards and provide examples, mathematical and literary, in respected journals. The current Bulletin is such a journal, reporting mathematics to a sophisticated audience. It plays an irreplaceable role in maintaining the identity and cohesiveness of the AMS, providing the unique sample of mathematical research to which the entire membership is exposed.

In our proposals we aim to preserve this tradition, while addressing specific shortcomings in the existing journal. To some extent, these failings are simply the result of the natural aging of the institution, and correspondingly we have sought to find ways to sharpen the definitions of its parts. The problems with the Research Announcements are somewhat deeper. Among the failings ascribed to the R/A’s, we have identified the following: the selection of topics they report on does not accurately reflect the major advances in Mathematics; the format does not produce reports on new advances in mathematics which are maximally useful to the audience; the results claimed in them are sometimes of dubious veracity, because they are often based on privileged information and not on publicly accessible detailed papers; and they are or soon will be obsolete because of the wide accessibility of preprint archives over the Internet. While the Committee members themselves hold a wide variety of views on these matters, there is unanimous agreement that research announcements in their current form are inappropriate for the Bulletin. At the same time, it must be clearly understood that the committee is not taking a position on any final decision as to whether the AMS should publish Research Announcements. We recognize from both our surveys and various informal samplings of opinions that this

is a very controversial question. The Council may well feel it is appropriate to ask the Publications Committee or an ad hoc Committee to consider the matter fully once again.

The three existing parts of the Bulletin do respond to obvious common interests of the membership. We thus propose that The Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society continue with a division into corresponding sections, to be called “Research Reports,” “Research Surveys,” and “Book Reports.” (These are defined and discussed in detail in Attachment #2.) Each section represents an evolutionary modification of a corresponding section of the current Bulletin, but with significant changes in the two with new titles.

Each section will have an Editor, with a Board of Associate Editors, but the direction of the publication as a whole will be shared by the three editors. While it is clear that the Editors will have a great deal of impact on the details of the journal described here, we include sample guidelines to indicate what we believe the Editors should have in mind. Such guidelines are also appropriate, we feel, even necessary, for a journal published by a professional society, especially one that is distributed as part of the privileges of membership. The numbers indicated in these guidelines should be taken as merely indications. The more important numbers are the annual page allocations, which we suggested be set, ab initio, at 640 pages annually (160 for each of the four proposed issues). This is a slight reduction from the present actual size of 720 pages. The division of the authorized page limit into the three sections should be agreed upon annually by the editorial board.

We envision the Research News section of the Notices as an appropriate place for members to first learn of new results very quickly. The Bulletin can then provide a follow-up which is both archival and timely, and which includes the details for which our profession is noted. Depending on circumstances, this follow-up could be either a Research Report or a Research Survey, or perhaps even a Report followed later by a Survey.

The success of our recommended changes will rest ultimately on the willingness of the intellectual leaders of the mathematical community to redirect more of their energies toward producing expository writing of the highest quality. By the act of joining the Society the members have implicitly stated an interest in supporting and being informed about mathematical research, confirmed by our surveys. This creates a need, now largely unmet, for the AMS to communicate mathematics to its members (and to the world at large) at various appropriate levels. Both the identity and cohesiveness of the AMS will be served by continuing to have a high-quality research publication sent to the entire membership. But this presents a difficult challenge for authors and editors to provide serious exposition that is accessible to a wide audience.

We recommend that an Editor-in-Chief be chosen from among the three editors by the EBC. The term of office will end with the Editor's term as an Editor, but may be extended at the discretion of the EBC if the Editor continues for a further term. In the current Bulletin, the position of Editor-in-Chief rotates among the three editors, each serving in this position during his second year as Editor. The EBC considered the advisability of adding a separate Editor-in-Chief a few years ago, and concluded that what was needed instead was simply an improvement of communication among the three Editors and between them and the Providence office. This improvement seems to have occurred. However, the CRMP recommendations make the role of the editorial board more complex, because of the emphasis on coordination among the three sections (especially Research Reports and Research Surveys) and interaction with other AMS publications (in particular the Research News proposed for the Notices). While the Editors are mainly selecting among submissions, and do so independently, the present arrangement works well; but as the content of the Bulletin turns more and more to solicited material, it becomes essential that there be coherence of editorial policy and responsibility produced by the collaboration of the three main editors under the guidance of one of them. The CRMP feels that the proposed mechanism is more flexible than the existing one or other alternatives considered, while simultaneously providing more continuity of leadership.

See Attachment #2 for an elaboration of the thinking of the CRMP on the contents of the three proposed sections.

3. ABSTRACTS OF PRESENTATIONS OF THE AMS

Finding: The Abstracts provide members with 1) a guide to the scientific content of meetings; 2) an opportunity to inform one's colleagues of one's ideas and progresses; and 3) an overall view of the mathematical activity in the community. Lack of quality control is an essential feature of this publication, and this could have adverse effects when the journal is confused with a research publication.

Recommendation: That the Abstracts for a particular meeting be available to registrants for that meeting, and available for purchase upon request. In addition, that the Abstracts be published as a journal quarterly, with each issue containing the Abstracts accumulated since the preceding issue, including by-title Abstracts.

4. MEETINGS ANNOUNCEMENTS AND PROMOTIONS

Recommendation: That the Notices continue to publish announcements of meetings and scientific information on the meetings, including their program. These announcements may be reformatted with an eye toward removing information that is redundant or of use only to participants. That the AMS prepare independent announcements and

brochures on its Annual and Sectional meetings for specific target audiences (e.g., math departments). That the detailed programs, together with the Abstracts, be available to all registrants and be available for purchase upon request.

5. RESEARCH ANNOUNCEMENTS

Finding: One of the principles of the AMS has been—and continues to be—to provide mathematicians with opportunities to present their research to the mathematical community in a timely way. The ABSTRACTS and the Research Announcements of the Bulletin are designed to serve this purpose, the former as a record of presentations before the Society, and the latter to announce breakthroughs of major significance, and a sense of the ideas behind them. Since the basic principle is to provide researchers with that opportunity, the result is that, taken as a whole, this section of the Bulletin gives a skewed picture of contemporary mathematical research. The intent of our recommendations of Research News in eNAMS and Research Reports is to provide a broad overview of contemporary research. The issue of continuing Research Announcements as a viable AMS program, and where, should be resolved by another body.

Recommendation: That Research Announcements be discontinued as a section of a member publication. That a new ad hoc committee be appointed to consider whether they should be continued, and if so, where their publication would be appropriate.

6. ENTITLEMENT ARTICLES

Finding: This heading broadly covers the Society's obligation to provide its membership with appropriate text of all presentations before its meetings and conferences. This ranges from proceedings of AMS conferences, through major talks at AMS meetings to abstracts of presentations at topical sessions at meetings. This should continue, but such offerings to AMS publications should be in alignment with that publication's purpose.

Recommendation: That Editors, in their communications to prospective authors, make clear what is the appropriate style of exposition of that publication and the intended audience, and alert them that articles will be subject to editorial review in that context.

7. EMPLOYMENT INFORMATION IN THE MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES

Finding: This is a good publication and seems to be an appropriate format (both electronic and paper) for its purposes. Nevertheless, it together with other employment programs of the AMS are not very

effective, either in placement or in reduction of paper work. Our recommendation is that the Policy Committee on the Profession consider what should be the proper role of the Society in coordination of employment opportunities.

8. ELECTRONIC PUBLICATIONS

Finding: Part of the Committee's charge was concerned with electronic publication. It became clear in the Committee's discussion that this is both an extremely important and a very complex area whose development will have great consequences for the discipline, as well as the publishing industry (in particular the AMS). We feel that the CRMP is not equipped to tackle the problem in the large, and it would be inappropriate to do less than that. Thus, we have passed this concern, along with a summary of our thinking, on to the newly formed Committee on Electronic Products and Services via its chair who is also a member of CRMP.

Recommendation: Questions about electronic publications should be referred to the Committee on Electronic Publications and Services, with this advice: no member publications should be excluded from electronic publication and that it is desirable to make member publications available electronically whenever feasible. Further, it is the sense of the CRMP that electronic access to these publications should be available to all people whether members or not.

4.2 Special Committee on Guidelines and Procedures for the Committee on Professional Ethics.

The procedures were adopted by the January 1993 Council subject to review by Society counsel. The Council recommendations were once again put on the floor as follows:

4.2.1 Membership

COPE shall be a committee of 6 members representing a broad spectrum of membership of the Society. They shall be appointed by a vote of the Council with the advice of the Committee on Committees, and have three year staggered terms. The Chair of COPE shall be elected by the Committee. The Committee normally is to conduct business via conference calls, mail, and e-mail (for official business printed e-mail records will be kept.) COPE, however, is encouraged to meet at least once each year (normally at the annual meeting) to review its activities or conduct on-going business. COPE should prepare a summary of its activities to be presented to Council at its summer and winter meetings.

Outlined below are recommended procedures for resolution of conflict. The Committee may deviate from these procedures as cases warrant and parties

agree, but COPE is encouraged to follow standardized procedures in the interest of perceived fairness. Indeed, 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, and the Council shall entertain such suggested modifications.

4.2.2 Procedures

1. COPE receives a written inquiry from a member of the Society concerning professional ethics. The Chair of COPE makes an informal inquiry, taking no more than several weeks. The chair reports to the Committee and the Committee then determines if the case should be handled by an ombudsperson or proceed directly to an investigation.
2. In case reconciliation seems possible, the Chair selects a member of the Committee to act as ombudsperson for that case. The Chair and the ombudsperson shall agree on a time limit for this procedure (this will depend on the parties involved, time of year, and other circumstances). At the end of this period, or any extension mutually agreed upon by the chair and the ombudsperson, the ombudsperson shall report on the solution of the issue to COPE or recommend that the case be investigated formally by COPE.
3. In case a formal investigation is called for, the Chair, 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. 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.
4. The special committee shall gather facts and statements from all interested parties. Committee members conducting interviews will make written summations of any interviews. Any person interviewed by the Committee shall be fully apprised that parties to the conflict shall be aware of their identity and the written summary of their statements. In rare cases the committee might decide it necessary to obtain confidential material or assure the confidentiality of a source. In these circumstances

the material and or source shall not be used as sole or primary material in rendering any decision. In that case the special committee should tell the source that it will try to protect the confidentiality, but it cannot guarantee it. Minutes or other written records of the special committee's discussions and deliberations, as well as discussions with the Chair of COPE, need not be kept. All paper and electronic correspondence shall be kept as part of its records. After any discussions or interview sessions involving parties to the case, all parties, including those interviewed, shall have the opportunity to see and comment on the written summaries.

5. 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. Such report shall be presented within the allotted time. In case parties disagree on statements of facts contained in the record submitted by the special committee or in the completeness of the report, their written disagreement shall constitute a part of the report.
6. This report shall consist of a copy of the complete record, as determined by the special committee, and the special committee's determination in case of conflicting statements or claims as to factual or other matters. The special committee shall recommend to COPE action to reprimand any party or parties or steps to correct any action or inaction. All parties to the dispute shall be given copies of the special committee report. COPE and any special committee COPE established to investigate any case shall have access to AMS legal counsel for advice. 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.
7. COPE shall take the special committee's recommendations under advisement and make a recommendation to the AMS Council within a reasonable time. COPE shall take into consideration the precedents for any recommendations. COPE may modify the recommended action or actions of the special committee; however, if COPE intends to modify the recommendations of the special committee, it shall confer with the special committee on the final recommendations.
8. At the earliest opportunity, COPE shall issue a summary report and recommendation on any completed case to the Council. The Secretary of the Society shall circulate the report to the Council straightaway. Parties to the dispute will receive the COPE recommendations and may offer the Council such written statements as they feel would be helpful to the Council. The Council will act on the COPE recommendation by approving it or returning it to COPE with instructions as to further action. Council action shall be at the next Council meeting after COPE has submitted a report on a case.

- 9. Appeal of any case shall be made only to the Council. The only grounds for appeal are either: procedural errors or substantial new facts. Written notice of intent to appeal shall be made within three months of the Council's action to the Secretary of the Society. The Council shall act on any appeal at its next meeting after receipt of the appeal.**

COPE and its special committees shall be indemnified under article XIII of the AMS Bylaws. (This may require amendment of the bylaws and, if so, is part of this Council action).

It was moved, seconded and passed to amend the sentence:

They shall be appointed by a vote of the Council with the advice of the Committee on Committees, and have three year staggered terms.

to read

They shall be appointed the President with the advice of the Committee on Committees, and have three year staggered terms.

The amended procedures were then passed by the Council.

5 UNFINISHED BUSINESS.

5.1 Copyright Policy.

At its September 1992 meeting the Council passed a resolution (submitted by Cox, Fossum, Keen and Lieb) about AMS publications policy. (See page 426 of the April 1993 NOTICES). A report from the Executive Director regarding the publication policy was deferred until the January 1994 meeting.

5.2 Meetings in Cuba.

Chandler Davis received unanimous consent to consider the following resolution:

The American Mathematical Society has consistently supported freedom of all mathematicians to travel to scientific meetings. Those traveling to the conference on Approximation and Optimization in Cuba (26 September 1993 to 01 October 1993) and similar meetings risk legal proceedings against them by the US Treasury Department. It is the sense of this meeting that in such cases the Society should undertake the defense of individual mathematicians.

A motion to amend this to read

The American Mathematical Society has consistently supported freedom of all mathematicians to travel to scientific meetings. Those traveling to the conference on Approximation and Optimization in Cuba (26 September 1993 to 01 October 1993) risk legal proceedings against them by the US Treasury Department. It is the sense of this meeting that the Society should undertake the defense of these individual mathematicians.

was passed. The amended resolution then passed.

6 NEW BUSINESS

6.1 International Meetings.

The Council adopted the following resolution:

The Society has the policy that women and minority mathematicians be appropriately represented among invited speakers at its meetings. Clearly this objective should also be pursued at meetings held jointly with other organizations. The Secretary is instructed in particular to communicate it to program committees of meetings held jointly with mathematical societies of other countries.

6.2 United States National Committee on Mathematics.

The Council considered, in executive session, the following resolution which was moved and seconded:

WHEREAS the primary role of the IMU is to promote the dissemination of the highest levels of research in the mathematical sciences to the international community of mathematicians, and

**WHEREAS the professional organizations best represent the active research community in the US,
therefore be it**

RESOLVED that the AMS Council charges its Executive Committee to transmit to the BMS its dismay at their dissolution of the previously broadly representative USNCM.

It also charges the Executive Committee to investigate the possibility of either:

- 1. reinstating the former USNCM, or**
- 2. replacing the National Academy of Sciences by the AMS or a consortium of professional organizations as the adhering organization of the United States to the International Mathematical Union.**

The Council agreed to amend the resolution to read as follows:

WHEREAS the primary role of the IMU is to promote the dissemination of the highest levels of research in the mathematical sciences to the international community of mathematicians, and

**WHEREAS the professional organizations best represent the active research community in the US,
therefore be it**

RESOLVED that the AMS Council charges its President to transmit to the BMS its great dismay at the dissolution of the previously broadly representative USNCM. and its demand that the former USNCM be reinstated immediately.

Further it also charges the Executive Committee to investigate the possibility of replacing the National Academy of Sciences by the AMS or a consortium of professional organizations as the adhering organization of the United States to the International Mathematical Union.

The amended resolution was passed by the Council.

7 ANNOUNCEMENTS, INFORMATION, AND RECORD.

7.1 Future Meetings

See the listing in Attachment D

7.2 Co-sponsorship of Meetings

Two requests for co-sponsorship of meetings were considered by the 11/92 ECBT, approved, and forwarded to the 1/93 Council for action. Co-sponsorship of these meetings was approved by the Council.

In each case, co-sponsorship involved agreement on the part of both organizations that the Society should be able to appoint a member to the program committee of the meeting and that the meeting is listed in several locations in the NOTICES as one that is being co-sponsored by the Society.

At one time the Society had a Committee that considered these requests. Since there were few requests, that Committee recommended, and the Council approved, that it be discharged.

There is still need for a committee to screen such requests and, if the request involves more than the routine as mentioned in the paragraph above, to forward them to the appropriate body for approval. (For example, if co-sponsorship would involve any expenditures, approval by the BT would be required.) Since these requests come to the Society at odd times and in a random fashion, and since they often must be handled in a timely fashion, the committee that considers them should be one that meets frequently. The committee should also be one that consists of members who are familiar with the meetings program of the Society.

Such a committee already exists, namely the Secretariat, whose members are the Associate Secretaries and the Secretary. This Committee is empowered by the EC and the Council to decide on dates and times for meetings. It does meet (by formal mail ballot) once a month.

The EC voted to refer this matter to the new Policy Committee on Meetings and Conferences. The following was approved as an interim procedure until the Policy Committee has a chance to act: The Secretariat is empowered to approve or deny simple requests by other organizations for AMS co-sponsorship of meetings (with the provisos that the Society can appoint a member or members to the program or organizing committee and that the Society has the right of first refusal on publication of the proceedings). Requests that are more complicated, such as those that might involve expenditures of funds, should be considered first by the Secretariat which will make appropriate recommendations to the ECBT (and Council).

7.3 Expanding Role of AMS Publications.

Council Member Birman has written a letter (See Attachment #14 in the 05/93 ECBT Minutes) expressing concern about publications. The letter was referred to the Policy Committee on Publications.

7.4 Committee on Younger Mathematicians

Council member Steven Weintraub proposed (in letter which appears as Attachment #29 in the 05/93 ECBT Minutes) the creation of a Committee on Younger Mathematicians. It would identify and consider issues of particular concern to undergraduates, graduate students, post-docs, and junior faculty members and represent the point of view of this population on issues facing the Society.

The 3/93 ABC had recommended that the letter be shared with the Committee on Education (COE), which was meeting prior to the ECBT and planning to form subcommittees on undergraduate and graduate and postdoctoral affairs. It was suspected by the ABC that these subcommittees would be considering a number of the concerns expressed in Weintraub's letter.

The COE met on 25 April and authorized subcommittees on undergraduate and graduate and postdoctoral affairs. The COE believes these subcommittees will address the educational concerns expressed in the letter from Weintraub. However, the COE acknowledged that there were "professional" concerns that did not come under the charge to COE and its subcommittees; hence, the Chair of COE will be writing to the newly-formed Committee on the Profession, forwarding it a copy of Weintraub's letter.

7.5 Complimentary Copy Policy.

The 1/93 Committee on the Publication Program voted to recommend to the ECBT the following change in policy regarding the inclusion of abstracts or summary papers in a proceedings volume (see item 3 of Attachment #5 of the 05/93 ECBT Minutes):

...that papers in conference proceedings either consist of original material or that they contain substantial expository content so they are still a value to the reader. Abstracts or summary material are to appear elsewhere and not constitute an appropriate paper in a proceedings volume.

The ECBT approved this recommendation.

7.6 Bequest from the Estate of Israel Berstein

The Society received notification that the Last Will and Testament of Israel Berstein left a portion of his estate to the AMS for the purpose of working with young topologists. "The application of the gift shall be supervised by the Topology Group in the Math Department of Cornell University of Ithaca, New York." Because of a long illness, the estate was left with nothing. Professor Berstein's sister, Gita Fonatov, was beneficiary of Professor Berstein's retirement funds, and she wants to make a donation to the AMS to fulfill his wish. Since the conditions of the Will would technically no longer apply, there are several ways to address this matter. However, the ED believes that the wishes of Professor Berstein, as expressed in his Will, are that the Topology Group at Cornell

administer this fund; therefore the ED recommended, and the BT approved, that the he write to Ms. Fonatov suggesting that the monies be awarded to the Department of Mathematics at Cornell for their administration of the fund in accordance with Professor Bernstein's wishes.

7.7 Special Donations to General Fund.

The NOTICES has received a letter to the editor supporting the decision to move the January 1995 meeting out of Colorado. The author of the letter included a contribution against the costs of that move and urges other members to do likewise. This letter has been accepted for publication and will appear in the July/August 1993 issue of NOTICES. The Development Officer has been advised that the costs of the cancellation of the Denver meeting (if any) will be accounted for in the general fund. The BT approved accepting the above-mentioned contribution (and future ones restricted in this manner) into the AMS General Fund (as opposed to establishing a separate restricted fund).

7.8 Department Chair's Newsletter.

The Director of Publication is considering developing a quarterly newsletter for mathematics department chairs. This newsletter would contain information that is useful for department chairs and their departments, such as updated information on funding trends and opportunities in mathematics and mathematics education, information from the AMS Committees on Science Policy, Education, Rewards, and Resources. It would contain information on AMS activities which are beneficial to mathematicians and mathematics departments as well as general information for department chairs on such things as faculty development, teaching evaluation, assembling a tenure dossier, getting the most resources for the department from the administration, etc. Recently in discussions with the ED, the Director of Publication has presented the idea of establishing an association made up of AMS Institutional Members. This Department Chair's Newsletter would be a natural publication for this association.

7.9 Developing a Mathematics Policy Agenda.

The Committee on Science Policy (CSP) recommended that the AMS put forth annual policy agendas on issues regarding federal science policy and mathematics. The task was assigned to a special subcommittee of the CSP appointed by the President with the advice of the Chair of CSP. The members of the AMS Federal Policy Agenda Subcommittee for 1993 are: Hyman Bass, John Bradley, Arthur Jaffe, Linda Keen, John Morgan, John Polking, Margaret Wright, Frank Warner (Chair) and Robert Zimmer. The President, Ronald Graham; the Ex-President, Michael Artin; the Chair of JPBM, Richard Herman; the JPBM Congressional Liaison, Lisa Thompson; and the ED are included in the communications and meetings of the Committee. The Committee met in San Antonio during the Annual Joint Meetings and held a two-day meeting in New York at the end of February. The Committee had hoped to have a draft Policy Agenda ready by the end of April 1993; however, their plans are now to have a draft ready for the 9/93 CSP meeting and a final versions for the 11/93 ECBT.

Both MAA and SIAM are preparing policy agendas. The MAA has a draft agenda that is circulating within MAA, JPBM, and the AMS Federal Policy Subcommittee. JPBM is expected to draft a common agenda from the individual participating JPBM organizations. This will be in addition to the planned AMS agenda.

7.10 Postdoctorate Fellowships.

The 11/92 ECBT received for information a draft discussion paper on the need for a broad, national program for postdoctorates in the mathematical sciences. The 1/93 Council approved the draft for submission, by JPBM, to NSF. The AMS proposal was revised by the JPBM Chair, Richard Herman, to include suggestions from Avner Friedman (on industrial postdoctorates) and MAA (on educational postdoctorates). On March 31, JPBM submitted a white paper to NSF entitled "Investing in Human Resources in the Mathematical Sciences" (see Attachment #27 of the 05/93 ECBT Minutes). It is understood that the white paper has been favorably received and that DMS has moved it forward to the directorate level at NSF.

7.11 Centennial Fellowships.

The Centennial Fellowship Committee reported its recommendations to the Secretary in mid-January 1993. Based on the report, three fellowships in the amount of \$41,500 each, with \$1,350 travel stipends, were awarded to Jacques Hurtebise, McGill University; Andre Scedrov, University of Pennsylvania; and David Webb, Dartmouth College. All awardees have accepted the fellowships. The ECBT set the stipend for the 1994-95 Fellowship at \$42,600, with an expense allowance of \$1,400.

7.12 Presidential Decrees.

President Artin issued the following decree on 31 January 1993:

DECREE**WHEREAS:**

1. The benefits of uninterrupted membership in the American Mathematical Society are manifest,
2. In the case of some members, for sound reason or through mere inadvertence, a temporary interruption in membership may occur, leading to the denial of said benefits to such members,
3. It would be inconsistent with humane principles for the American Mathematical Society to subject its members to the potential embarrassment, anguish and other deleterious effects of the denial of said benefits;

NOW THEREFORE,

I, the undersigned Michael Artin, President of the American Mathematical Society, issue the following decree as my final presidential action:

Be it decreed that for long-term members in good standing, and subject to the approval of the Membership Committee, a temporary interruption in membership shall be pardonable, and membership in the American Mathematical Society shall be deemed to have been continuous despite a deplorable temporary lapse.

Signed this the thirty-first day of January, 1993.

Michael Artin

7.13 National Meetings Coordinating Committees.

In response to the Strategic Plan and other initiatives, methods have been sought to gradually broaden the AMS program at the National Joint Meetings to include more activities outside the scientific program. These activities address such issues as federal science policy and its impact on mathematics, connections of mathematics to its uses, education reform, crisis in academic research libraries, employment of mathematicians, national reports, etc. Currently, sessions requiring time on the AMS program must be approved by the Program Committee for National Meetings. This Committee has viewed the increasing number of these events with some concern, since it considers its charge limited to consideration of the scientific program only. Recently, however, consideration has been given to ways to better coordinate these activities with the scientific program at National Joint Meetings, and to provide well-designed, balanced programs that successfully serve as broad a segment of the community as possible.

The ED and the Secretary proposed that the ECBT recommend to the Council the establishment of a Meeting Coordinating Committee for each National Meeting (Annual and Summer) as described in the draft charge outlined in Attachment #61 of the 05/93 ECBT Minutes. The ECBT referred this proposal to the Policy Committee on Meetings and Conferences. There was no objection to appointing these committees immediately on an ad hoc basis.

7.14 Reviewer Credits for fSU, Eastern Europe, and PRC

Beginning in 1994 a new reviewer credit policy for MR reviewers will be put into place. The new policy will have a negative impact on reviewers from the fSU, the PRC, and eastern Europe. One feature of the old policy which will no longer be available to reviewers from these countries is the opportunity for three reviewers to band together to receive a highly discounted subscription to MR. There were 58 such subscriptions in 1992, including eight in the fSU. MR was then made available to all mathematicians affiliated with the subscribers' institutions. With the new policy there is a real danger that most of the mathematicians and their respective libraries will no longer have access to MR.

It was expected that by 1994 a program for making AMS publications available at an affordable price to institutions in currency-weak countries would be in place. Unfortunately, primarily due to the sudden and unexpected collapse of the fSU and concentration of aid to the fSU, such a plan has not been developed. There is a plan presently being developed by the Society to provide significant donations of mathematical journals, including MR, to various sites in the fSU. However, this will not affect reviewers from the PRC and eastern Europe. It is anticipated that by 1996 the Society, through a new International Affairs Committee, will have developed an effective program to make AMS publications available at an affordable price (probably for free in many cases) to institutions in currency-weak countries.

As an interim measure, the ECBT approved the continuation of MR subscriptions being sent to the fSU, eastern Europe, and the PRC as a result of its former reviewer credit policy, as long as it can be ascertained that the gratis copies go to libraries. This interim aid will be coordinated

with other donations and will terminate when the International Affairs Committee recommends and establishes a discount policy for currency-weak countries.

7.15 AMS fSU Mathematical Literature Donation Plan.

The Subcommittee of the Advisory Committee on fSU Mathematics, chaired by Susan Friedlander, has recommended that the Society support sending all current books and journals to five mathematical libraries within the fSU. These libraries are sites of significant mathematical activity and are NOT covered by the AAAS/AMS journal effort or the AMS support of the MMI. The libraries who would benefit from this AMS support include: The Library of the Moscow Mathematical Society, the Library of the Academy of Sciences in Moscow, the Library of the Steklov Institute in St. Petersburg, the Library of FTINT in Kharkov, and the Library of the Mathematics Institute in Novosibirsk. Attachment #35 of the 05/93 ECBT Minutes, and the summary accompanying it, supply background information as well as specific cost figures. The ECBT approved this proposal.

7.16 Travel Expense Reimbursement of Volunteers.

The ECBT approved policies for reimbursement of members serving on committees and other activities in the Society. Administrative procedures implementing these policies will now be prepared and submitted to the 11/93 ECBT for approval. In addition, recommended levels of reimbursement for volunteer activities will be presented for approval at that time. (This coincides with the usual approval of the upcoming year's committee budgets at the Fall ECBT.)

7.17 Journal Pages.

The ECBT authorized the following numbers of pages for 1994:

BULLETIN	900
JOURNAL OF THE AMS	1,000
MATHEMATICS OF COMPUTATION	1,750
MEMOIRS	3,200
NOTICES	1,408
PROCEEDINGS	3,645
TRANSACTIONS	5,505
SUGAKU	240

The ECBT also noted that the following numbers of pages are currently the staff's best estimates and were included in the version of the 1994 budget presented at this meeting:

ABSTRACTS	752
CURRENT MATHEMATICAL PUBLICATIONS	3,171
MATHEMATICAL REVIEWS	
Issue pages	7,489
Annual index pages	3,659
Total MR pages	11,148
DOKLADY	1,000
IZVESTIYA	1,255
SBORNIK	1,640
ST. PETERSBURG	1,361
THEORY OF PROBABILITY AND MATHEMATICAL STATISTICS	244
TRUDY MOSCOW	262
TRUDY STEKLOV	1,042
EMPLOYMENT INFORMATION IN THE MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES	380

7.17.1 SUGAKU Backlog.

Currently there are enough papers in Providence to take the journal through the December, 1995 issue. The Director of Publication has recently spoken with Professor Katsumi Nomizu, Chair of the Japanese Translation Committee about the backlog problem. Professor Nomizu and the Director of Publication favor being more selective in what papers are published in SUGAKU as well as possibly having issues which contain several papers from the same area(s). Having several papers from the same area in each issue has the possibility of helping sales. Professor Nomizu will be visiting Japan this summer and will speak with the chief editor of the Japanese SUGAKU about these ideas hoping to gain his support.

The Director of Publication presented the following options and recommended OPTION 1. If the Mathematical Society of Japan objects to this method of reducing the backlog, the Director of Publication recommended OPTION 2 as a fall back position. The ECBT approved these recommendations.

OPTION 1: Extract papers currently in the backlog that are in the same mathematical area and publish them as volumes in the AMS TRANSLATIONS - SERIES 2 rather than as SUGAKU journal issues. This would provide an immediate solution to the backlog problem

for SUGAKU and would additionally offer the possibility of increasing revenues over costs. SUGAKU would also continue as a journal.

OPTION 2: Increase the pages for SUGAKU for 1994 from 240 to 300 (already up from 227 in 1993). This allocation of 300 pages (60 additional pages would result in a marginal cost of approximately \$4,500) would have the effect of bringing the backlog down to a year and a half within approximately four years. A year and a half backlog is reasonable because of the translation process.

7.18 Journal Prices

The ECBT approved the following list prices for 1994 journal subscriptions:

THEORY OF PROBABILITY AND MATHEMATICAL STATISTICS	\$	359
ABSTRACTS	\$	71
BULLETIN	\$	228
CURRENT MATHEMATICAL PUBLICATIONS	\$	377
DOKLADY	\$	785
IZVESTIJA	\$	795
JOURNAL OF THE AMS	\$	151
MATHEMATICS OF COMPUTATION	\$	262
MATHEMATICAL REVIEWS	\$	4,821*
MATHEMATICAL REVIEWS SECTIONS	\$	87
MATHSCI DISC	\$	5,198*
MEMOIRS	\$	353
MOSCOW	\$	253
NOTICES	\$	146
PROCEEDINGS	\$	579
SBORNIK	\$	1,019
STEKLOV	\$	626
ST. PETERSBURG	\$	935
SUGAKU	\$	105
THEORY OF PROBABILITY AND MATHEMATICAL STATISTICS	\$	359
TRANSACTIONS	\$	938

*These prices may be changed depending on how the details of the MR Site License scheme are worked out (see item 2C.7).

7.19 Davis–Markert–Nickerson Lecture on Academic and Intellectual Freedom.

The faculty of The University of Michigan has established an Annual Senate Lecture on Academic and Intellectual Freedom to be named:

The University of Michigan Senate’s Davis, Markert, Nickerson Lecture on Academic and Intellectual Freedom

The full text of the resolution is found in Attachment D.2.

7.20 Executive Director Resigns.

William H. Jaco announced to the Board of Trustees on 22 June 1993 that he had accepted an offer from Oklahoma State University of an appointment as Kerr Professor effective 01 September 1993. He will be on leave-of-absence to continue his duties as Executive Director at the Society until 31 August 1995.

Respectfully submitted

Robert M. Fossum

Secretary

A Attachments: INTRODUCTIONS.

A.1 1993 Council.

AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY

effective 2/01/93

1993 COUNCIL

President	Ronald L. Graham	Secretary	Robert M. Fossum
Ex-President	Michael Artin	Associate Secretaries	Robert Daverman
Vice Presidents	Chandler Davis		Andy Roy Magid
	Linda Keen		Lesley Sibner
	Anil Nerode		Lance W. Small
Treasurer	F. P. Peterson	Associate Treasurer	B. A. Taylor

Representatives of Committees

Bulletin Editorial Committee	Murray Protter, Chair
Colloquium Editorial Committee	G. D. Mostow, Chair
Committee to Monitor Problems in Communications	Judy Green, Chair
Journal of the American Mathematical Society	Wilfried Schmid, Chair
Mathematical Reviews Editorial Committee	Philip J. Hanlon, Chair
Mathematical Surveys Editorial Committee	Marc A. Rieffel, Chair
Mathematics of Computation Committee	Walter Gautschi, Chair
Proceedings Editorial Committee	Irwin Kra, Chair
Representative on American Journal	M. Salah Baouendi
Science Policy Committee	Frank W. Warner III, Chair
Transactions and Memoirs Committee	James E. Baumgartner, Chair
Executive Committee	Joan Birman
Executive Committee	Arthur Jaffe

Members at Large

Ruth M. Charney	Carl C. Cowen, Jr.	David A. Cox
John M. Franks	Frank Gilfeather	Rebecca A. Herb
Svetlana R. Katok	Steven Krantz	Peter Li
Elliott H. Lieb	James K. Lepowsky	Gunther A. Uhlmann
Steven H. Weintraub	Ruth J. Williams	Susan Gayle Williams

Trustees

Roy Adler	Ronald Graham	Maria M. Klawe
M. Susan Montgomery	F.P. Peterson	John C. Polking
Paul Sally, Jr.	B.A. Taylor	

Executive Committee

Michael Artin	M. Salah Baouendi	Joan Birman
Robert M. Fossum	John M. Franks	Ronald Graham
	Arthur Jaffe	

B Attachments: REPORTS OF BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES.

B.1 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES.

B.1.2 Prizes

This is the report on the Prizes. Individual items will be mentioned in the agenda.

REPORT OF THE AMS AD HOC COMMITTEE ON PRIZES

Joan Birman
Frederick Gehring
Ronald L. Graham

J. J. Kohn
Gian-Carlo Rota
Joseph L. Taylor, chair

The Committee was appointed early this year by President Artin and asked to consider a number of policy questions regarding the awarding of AMS prizes. During its deliberations the Committee came up with a few issues of its own that were added to the agenda. The following represents the list of issues considered by the Committee and the recommendations that resulted from its deliberations.

1. Does the Society have enough prizes? The Society does not have many prizes in comparison with other scientific societies. In general, funds to award excellence in our field should be welcomed. On the other hand, each prize carries with it a substantial overhead cost in the time and effort expended to select and honor awardees. New prizes can also be burdensome to the Society through the conditions that are attached to the awards which may obligate the Society in undesirable ways.

Recommendation: The Society should welcome the creation of new prizes as a result of gifts when the following conditions are met: 1) The gift should be sufficient to fully endow a substantial prize and 2) any conditions attached to the gift should be acceptable to the Society.

What is a substantial prize? We will recommend below that any prize awarded by the AMS involve a monetary award of at least five thousand dollars. What conditions on an award are acceptable to the Society will have to be decided on a case by case basis. The proposed Blumenthal award provides an example that this committee was asked to deal with. It is discussed below.

2. Should the Committee on National Awards be a working committee? This is the committee that makes recommendations for such awards as the National Medal of Science and the Waterman Award. It currently has only one member who is not ex-officio.

Recommendation: We agree with President Artin's suggestion that this committee be reconstituted to be a working committee with more members who are not ex-officio.

3. Should there be a standing committee on awards? In other words, is there enough work to justify a standing AMS committee to answer the kinds of policy questions posed this year to our Ad Hoc committee and perhaps to oversee the work of the various selection committees? We were evenly split on this. Some members felt that there would not be enough work to justify such a committee on a yearly basis and that the appointment of an occasional Ad Hoc committee would be sufficient. Others felt that it wouldn't hurt to try a standing committee for a while and then decide whether or not its continuation was justified. Because of this split, we cannot recommend the appointment of a standing committee. However, for the same reason, we cannot recommend strongly against it.

Recommendation: President Artin should rely on his own judgement on this question and appoint a standing committee if he feels the need for the help of such a committee on a regular basis.

4. Should there be guidelines for awards when part of the work is joint? The committee feels that it would be difficult to write guidelines that would adequately cover all possible situations.

Recommendation: We should simply rely on the selection committees to exercise good judgement and deal with this issue on a case by case basis.

5. Should AMS awards be national or international? In other words, should awardees be required to be U. S. residents or members of the AMS. We don't think so. The mathematical community is a highly mobile international community of scholars. International exchanges and collaborations are common. Distinctions based on nationality are increasingly irrelevant.

Recommendation: The Society should remove any citizenship, residency or AMS membership requirements for AMS awards.

6. Were too many Fulkerson Prizes awarded last time? Yes, we think six is too many. However, the discussion that has already occurred concerning this issue will probably avoid a recurrence and we don't see any particular role here for our committee at this time.

7. Should the three different Steele Prizes have separate names in order to give them more personality? We feel that the Steele prizes should continue to carry the name "Leroy P. Steele" in order to honor the donor. However, it would still be a good idea to have the names reflect the distinct natures of the three prizes.

Recommendation: The Steele prizes should carry the following three names:

- a) The Leroy P. Steele Prize for Seminal Contribution to Research;
- b) The Leroy P. Steele Prize for Lifetime Achievement;
- c) The Leroy P. Steele Prize for Mathematical Exposition.

8. Should the Society make a contribution to the MAA teaching award or to the Nevenlinna Prize? The monetary awards that go with many AMS prizes are rather small. We are recommending in 15) below that an effort be made to increase each of the existing awards to the \$5000 level. If the AMS has uncommitted endowment money to spare it should go for this purpose rather than to help support prizes offered by other societies.

Recommendation: We suggest the following general policy: "The AMS will not contribute funding to awards given by other organizations. It will, however, at the discretion of its governing board, consider contributions to awards made jointly by the AMS and another society provided the contributions are equal and the behavior being rewarded is considered sufficiently in line with the mission of the AMS."

Under this policy, we would not contribute to the Nevanlinna Prize and would consider contributing to the MAA teaching award only if it were to become a joint AMS-MAA award.

9. What should we do about the Award for Distinguished Public Service and the Citation for Public Service? We understand that the Award for Distinguished Public Service is \$2500 and is awarded every other year while it is intended that the Citation for Public Service be \$500 and as many as three a year should be awarded. We don't feel that having a greater and a lesser public service award is a very good idea. We feel that it would be much better to have a single public service award, with a substantial cash prize that is awarded each year, normally to one individual.

Recommendation: The two awards public service awards should be combined into one award to be called the Award for Distinguished Public Service and to be awarded yearly.

10. Should the Society accept the proposed Blumenthal Trust Award as proposed?

The problem here concerns two of the conditions specified in the award: a) the selection committee is to consist of the chairs of Berkeley, Chicago, Harvard, IAS, and Yale; and b) the recipient is to address the Society at a national meeting at the time of the award and again three years later. The committee voted "no" by a split vote on whether a) should be accepted and voted strongly "no" on the acceptability of condition b). However, it was the combined effect of the two conditions that really bothered the committee: that a committee not appointed by the AMS would choose one individual to give two invited addresses to national meetings of the AMS.

Recommendation: The AMS leadership should try to renegotiate the terms of this award to bring the conditions more closely in line with the other prizes awarded by the AMS.

11. How can we liven up the award ceremonies? Should recipients be required to attend? We came up with a number of suggestions, some of which are not new and none of which are very dramatic.

Recommendation: Recipients should be encouraged to attend but not required. The Society should pay travel expenses for recipients and provide a prestigious awards banquet. A distinguished mathematician should give a short (10 minute) description of the achievements for which the award is being given. We should have a separate awards ceremony and not combine our ceremony with that of the MAA. Someone, perhaps an AMS Chief of Protocol, should have the responsibility for planning this and other similar events.

12. What should be done about the Bergman prize? This amounted to a great deal of money for a prize to be administered by the AMS in a very narrow area (the Bergman Kernel) according to the original terms of the Bergman Will. A committee was established by the ECBT in 1988 to study this problem. A solution was suggested by the committee and adopted by the ECBT. It was decided that the AMS would agree to administer the Bergman Fellowship if the mathematical area were broadened significantly and certain other details were changed. The President then appointed a committee to select recipients and work out other details. The situation is not ideal – the award is not an official AMS prize though it is administered by the AMS, the award is still for work in a relatively narrow area and the size of the award is out of scale with AMS prizes. However, two members of our Ad Hoc Committee are also on the Bergman Fellowship Committee and they feel that the present system is working reasonably well. Finally, our Committee would not want to see this large endowment lost to the mathematical community.

Recommendation: The present situation represents an acceptable compromise between the original terms of the bequest and the ideal and this Committee has no further suggestions to offer other than the obvious one that members of the Bergman Fellowship selection committee should be replaced by the President on a regular basis.

13. How can we ensure that women are not overlooked in the awards process?

Recommendation: A conscious effort should be made to have more women mathematicians participate on the prize selection committees and to make the selection committees aware of the issue of the participation of women in the activities and rewards of the mathematical community.

14. Should the prize selection committees solicit nominations? The Committee had a spirited discussion of this issue. The present system was held to be undemocratic by some members. The selection process has often been strongly biased in favor of areas or individuals well known to the members of the selection committee. Many members feel that not every selection committee will be so widely knowledgeable as to be able to generate on its own a list of all worthy candidates for an award. On the other hand, some members pointed out that experience shows that the mathematical community will largely ignore calls for nominations for awards. Some felt

that soliciting nominations would restrict the freedom of action of the selection committee and that fairness should be ensured through careful choices of members of these committees. However, in the end the Committee decided in favor of soliciting nominations by a strong majority.

Recommendation: The Secretary of the Society should place an announcement in an appropriate issue of the Notices to the effect that certain prizes are to be awarded at the next Winter meeting and that nominations for these prizes are welcomed from the mathematical community. The procedure would be for nominations and supporting material to be sent to the Secretary who would forward them to the appropriate committees. This announcement should include deadlines. The selection committees should have complete freedom to add their own candidates to the list of nominees and to decide which nominees are to be considered finalists and which finalists are to be given awards.

15. Are the amounts of some prizes too small? Yes.

Recommendation: All prizes awarded by the AMS should carry a monetary award of at least \$5000.

We make this recommendation without any real sense as to whether or not it is practical. Does the AMS have enough endowment to finance this? We make the recommendation in any case and hope that there is sufficient funding to at least come close to this goal.

Submitted on behalf of the Ad Hoc Committee on Prizes

Joseph L. Taylor, Chair

B.1.3 Minute from the ECBT Meeting.

The following is the minute from the ECBT meeting concerning the question of prizes.

2E.3 Prizes. The President appointed an ad hoc Committee on Prizes that was requested to report to this ECBT meeting. The report of the Committee is attached (#23, this is the same report as the one above). The following are the actions taken by the EC and/or BT (the numbering below follows that in the report):

1. Does the Society have enough prizes? The ECBT approved the Committee's recommendation that the Society should welcome the creation of new prizes as a result of gifts when the following conditions are met: 1) The gift should be sufficient to fully endow a substantial prize and 2) any conditions attached to the gift should be acceptable to the Society.
2. Should the Committee on National Awards be a working committee? The ECBT recommended that the Council approve the Committee's recommendation that this committee be reconstituted to be a working committee with more members who are not ex-officio.
3. Should there be a standing committee on awards? No action was taken.
4. Should there be guidelines for awards when part of the work is joint? No action was taken.
5. Should AMS awards be national or international? The EC recommended that the Council approve the Committee's recommendation that the Society should remove any citizenship, residency or AMS membership requirements for AMS awards.

6. Were too many Fulkerson Prizes awarded last time? No action was taken.
7. Should the three different Steele Prizes have separate names in order to give them more personality? The EC recommended that the Council approve the Committee's recommendation that the Steele prizes should carry the following three names:
 - a) The Leroy P. Steele Prize for Seminal Contribution to Research;
 - b) The Leroy P. Steele Prize for Lifetime Achievement;
 - c) The Leroy P. Steele Prize for Mathematical Exposition.
8. Should the Society make a contribution to the MAA teaching award or to the Nevenlinna Prize? The ECBT recommended that the Council approve the Committee's recommendation that the following general policy be adopted:

"The AMS will not contribute funding to awards given by other organizations. It will, however, at the discretion of its governing board, consider contributions to awards made jointly by the AMS and another society provided the contributions are equal and the behavior being rewarded is considered sufficiently in line with the mission of the AMS."
9. What should we do about the Award for Distinguished Public Service and the Citation for Public Service? No action was taken.
10. Should the Society accept the proposed Blumenthal Trust Award as proposed? The ECBT approved the Committee's recommendation that the AMS leadership should try to renegotiate the terms of this award to bring the conditions more closely in line with the other prizes awarded by the AMS. This action was taken with the understanding that Artin, Birman, and Fossum will negotiate with the Trust Officer.
11. How can we liven up the award ceremonies? Should recipients be required to attend? No action was taken.
12. What should be done about the Bergman Prize? The ECBT approved the Committee's recommendation that the present situation represents an acceptable compromise between the original terms of the bequest and the ideal, and this Committee has no further suggestions to offer, other than the obvious one that members of the Bergman Fellowship selection committee should be replaced by the President on a regular basis.
13. How can we ensure that women are not overlooked in the awards process? No action was taken.
14. Should the prize selection committees solicit nominations? No action was taken.
15. Are the amounts of some prizes too small? The BT agreed that all AMS prizes should be a minimum of \$4,000, and that the Satter Prize should be raised to \$4,000. In the future, new prizes will not be accepted unless they meet the minimum set by the BT. The BT expects that a concerted effort will be made to raise money to fund AMS prizes, and that the ED will attempt to see if other prizes the AMS co-sponsors can be raised to the minimum of \$4,000.

C Attachments: REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES.

C.1 Special Committee to Review Member Publications (CRMP).

Final Report to the Executive Committee and Board of Trustees American Mathematical Society Committee to Review Member Publications

C.1.1 INTRODUCTION.

The Committee to Review Member Publications (CRMP) was charged in the Spring of 1992 to review the AMS member publications (NOTICES, BULLETIN, ABSTRACTS, EIMS and eMATH) in order to respond to concerns raised over the past decade in Council and ECBT discussions and as exposed in recent surveys of the membership. (See Appendix for CRMP survey results.) A report of findings and preliminary recommendations was presented to the ECBT at its November 1992 meeting.

At its January 1993 meeting, the CRMP discussed the various membership communications of the Society in light of the AMS mission, and made a first attempt to clearly define the various purposes of member publications and explore ways of achieving those purposes. Out of that meeting came a mock-up of a publication, tentatively called “Mathematics: the Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society,” which displayed the full range of communications of mathematics suggested by the Committee’s discussions. This mock-up was distributed fairly widely, in accordance to the request of the November ECBT. The reaction to it helped the Committee to distinguish further among varying modes of mathematics communication and their appropriateness for various purposes and to formulate a new set of proposals, the intent of which is to set the stage for wide-ranging and aggressive experimentation with modes of exposition without adversely affecting the successes of present publications.

It is our hope that these recommendations will

- move the Society to take leadership in exposition of mathematics at a broad range of levels and depths and to a very diverse target audience, and
- maintain, strengthen and deepen existing high standards of mathematical communications. In our view, “furtherance of mathematical research” not only encompasses both goals, but requires them.

The road taken by this Committee was more like a random walk than a directed path; we felt that we were mandated to be adventurous and to test many different concepts. We think the experiment and the discourse which succeeded it was worth it. In considering member publications we became keenly aware that the AMS membership is a very heterogeneous group. It is a fallacy to expect that each membership publication, or even most of the articles in any one of them, should appeal to a large majority of the organization. By trying to satisfy everyone we risk satisfying no-one. At the same time, it is necessary that in the aggregate, AMS member publications should be varied in approach and style, responding to the very heterogeneity of our community, so that they have made intellectual contact sufficiently often with sufficiently many of our members.

Our work has stabilized at a set of recommendations which allow and encourage flexibility and experimentation in communication without compromising the standards of existing publications.

The core of these recommendations concern the Bulletin and the Notices. For the first, the intent is to move it toward presentation of a comprehensive view of contemporary mathematical research, with its highest priority being continued faithfulness to the discipline. The intent with the Notices is to introduce into it substantial exposition of mathematics, with its view focused directly on communicating to the diverse constituencies the nature and significance of mathematics as a developing discipline.

The formats and editorial structures we propose are conceived as initiating these transformations, and they themselves are to be perceived as flexible and subject to development. For example, some of our explicit suggestions of directions to take will surely prove not to work, and will be replaced by ones which succeed. We even envision that this new material, once established and successful, could spin off of these publications into a new journal devoted exclusively to exposition. We include with this suggestion a caution to move in new directions only after trials have shown success. Recent editorial boards of the Bulletin and Notices have strived hard for the goals toward which this Committee is pointing the AMS. These remain new and unfamiliar tacks for the Society (and mathematicians in general), and run counter to prevailing measures of success in our community. In this context, the success of these editors is remarkable, and we commend them for it. Our aim is not directed at them or their policies, but beyond to the mathematics community and its values. Our target is renewed vigor in scholarship, in the sense of communication as well as creation. Our hope is that their jobs will become easier, and the product better. In the meantime, it would be unwise to start such a new journal until its role in the AMS publication program is clearly established.

C.1.2 SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS.

Summary of recommendations to the ECBT, to be forwarded as appropriate to relevant Editorial Boards and to the Council:

NOTICES: To expand its contents (as illustrated in Attachment #1) so as to permit a wide range of exposition in mathematics. To enable this, to create the position of Editor-in-Chief and a board of associate editors, and to increase the size to 13 issues/year.

BULLETIN: To replace Research Announcements with Research Reports, the purpose of which (together with the Research/Expository Papers and Book Reviews) is to convey, in the aggregate, a broad overview of current mathematical activity, while maintaining and strengthening the current fidelity to mathematical content. The editors of the three sections shall collaborate closely in decisions about the contents as a totality.

ABSTRACTS: To more closely associate these with meetings. They shall appear with the Programs of Meetings as now, and subsequently bound together as a journal, published quarterly.

MEETINGS ANNOUNCEMENTS: That the meetings department prepare these for each meeting, so that they appear in appropriate format in the Notices, and can also be mailed separately. Programs, together with the Abstracts will be made available to all registrants, and, upon request, will be mailed. Programs of the meetings will appear in the Notices in a timely way in condensed form.

OTHER: On other issues contained in its charge, the CRMP felt that they had significant aspects which lay outside its charge. Therefore, our recommendations are that other committees continue the study of these issues. The specific recommendations are presented below.

It is expected that our recommendations for action will become effective upon approval by the Council at its next meeting (after approval by the ECBT), and be phased in so as to be fully implemented by January of 1995. Attachment #3 describes a possible timetable, and Attachment #4 reviews the fiscal implications of these proposals, both one-time and on-going. [NB. These attachments are not included in this council agenda. They are included in the 05/93 ECBT Minutes.]

C.1.3 DETAILED RECOMMENDATIONS.

1. PROPOSAL FOR AN "ENHANCED" NOTICES OF THE AMS (The "enhanced" NOTICES will be referred to as "eNAMS.")

The principal mission of the AMS is the furtherance of mathematical research through its programs and publications. It does so by publishing a number of research journals, along with the Bulletin, all of which are primarily aimed at research mathematicians. On the other hand, the Society has a diverse membership including many who, while not actively engaged in mathematical research, are intensely interested in learning about new developments and ideas. The goal of the enhanced Notices of the American Mathematical Society is to serve all mathematicians by providing a lively and informative magazine, which contains news about mathematics and mathematicians as well as information about the Society and the profession. Our recommendations are designed to provide opportunity to explore and experiment with this concept without adversely affecting existing functions of the Notices. While we shall leave the actual realization to the proposed editorial board, we pass along the thinking of the CRMP.

While the enhanced Notices would be published for mathematicians, the articles would not be written for the experts. Most articles would be short. They would seldom contain full details but rather strive to inform a large number of readers about the topic or event.

An essential feature of the new enhanced Notices is a single Editor-in-Chief with both the responsibility and control to shape the magazine in new directions.

Specifically, we recommend the following six points.

- (a) The journal eNAMS would communicate information on the discipline, the profession, and the Society and its activities, be a privilege of membership in the AMS and serve as the journal of record of the Society.
- (b) eNAMS would have an Editor with full editorial responsibility within the very general outline provided as part of this recommendation. The Editor of eNAMS would be a mathematician (compensated at half-time) with strong research experience and broad mathematical interests and be appointed by the Council of the AMS, following a recommendation of the EBC. The Editor would serve a 3-year term. After consultation with the EBC, the Editor of eNAMS would recommend to the Council a board of Associate Editors for eNAMS, with the Secretary serving *ex officio*, which will work with the Editor to fashion the content of eNAMS. The terms of these associate editors are to be specified in a way that permits overlap and promotes continuity.

- (c) eNAMS would have sufficient AMS staff assigned to provide editorial, production, and advertising support. This would include an assistant editor with appropriate training and experience, staff writer, production editor, and marketing staff.
- (d) eNAMS would begin publication with a January, 1995 issue. It would be published every four (4) weeks for a total of 13 issues per year with less than 120 pages per issue (with a total of 1496 pages annually).
- (e) The editor and the editorial board should have responsibility for content within the broad guideline of communicating information of the discipline, the profession, and the Society and its activities. To be effective, departments and columns ought to be designed by the people who have responsibility for obtaining the material. Nonetheless, the committee has made some suggestions for the kind of departments and layout that an editorial board might choose (see Attachment 1).
- (f) eNAMS will continue to publish meeting announcements and the scientific programs of meetings. However, the Editor of eNAMS will conduct a thorough review of meetings announcements with the expectation that there will be some changes in how this information is communicated in eNAMS, with no loss of content. The amount or extent of meetings information contained in different issues of eNAMS will vary greatly, according to the meetings schedule. The timeliness of meetings information will be addressed by the increase from 10 to 13 issues annually, published at regular intervals.

2. PROPOSAL FOR “IMPROVED” BULLETIN OF THE AMS (The “Improved” BULLETIN will be referred to as iBAMS)

A powerful way of inspiring our community to provide more good expository writing is to set high standards and provide examples—mathematical and literary—in respected journals. The current Bulletin is such a journal, reporting mathematics to a sophisticated audience. It plays an irreplaceable role in maintaining the identity and cohesiveness of the AMS, providing the unique sample of mathematical research to which the entire membership is exposed.

In our proposals we aim to preserve this tradition, while addressing specific shortcomings in the existing journal. To some extent, these failings are simply the result of the natural aging of the institution, and correspondingly we have sought to find ways to sharpen the definitions of its parts. The problems with the Research Announcements are somewhat deeper. Among the failings ascribed to the R/A’s, we have identified the following: the selection of topics they report on does not accurately reflect the major advances in Mathematics; the format does not produce reports on new advances in mathematics which are maximally useful to the audience; the results claimed in them are sometimes of dubious veracity, because they are often based on privileged information and not on publicly accessible detailed papers; and they are or soon will be obsolete because of the wide accessibility of preprint archives over the Internet. While the Committee members themselves hold a wide variety of views on these matters, there is unanimous agreement that research announcements in their current form are inappropriate for the Bulletin. At the same time, it must be clearly understood that the committee is not taking a position on any final decision as to whether the AMS should publish Research Announcements. We recognize from both our surveys and various informal samplings of opinions that this is a very controversial question. The Council may well feel

it is appropriate to ask the Publications Committee or an ad hoc Committee to consider the matter fully once again.

The three existing parts of the Bulletin do respond to obvious common interests of the membership. We thus propose that The Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society continue with a division into corresponding sections, to be called “Research Reports,” “Research Surveys,” and “Book Reports.” (These are defined and discussed in detail in Attachment #2.) Each section represents an evolutionary modification of a corresponding section of the current Bulletin, but with significant changes in the two with new titles.

Each section will have an Editor, with a Board of Associate Editors, but the direction of the publication as a whole will be shared by the three editors. While it is clear that the Editors will have a great deal of impact on the details of the journal described here, we include sample guidelines to indicate what we believe the Editors should have in mind. Such guidelines are also appropriate, we feel, even necessary, for a journal published by a professional society, especially one that is distributed as part of the privileges of membership. The numbers indicated in these guidelines should be taken as merely indications. The more important numbers are the annual page allocations, which we suggested be set, ab initio, at 640 pages annually (160 for each of the four proposed issues). This is a slight reduction from the present actual size of 720 pages. The division of the authorized page limit into the three sections should be agreed upon annually by the editorial board.

We envision the Research News section of the Notices as an appropriate place for members to first learn of new results very quickly. The Bulletin can then provide a follow-up which is both archival and timely, and which includes the details for which our profession is noted. Depending on circumstances, this follow-up could be either a Research Report or a Research Survey, or perhaps even a Report followed later by a Survey.

The success of our recommended changes will rest ultimately on the willingness of the intellectual leaders of the mathematical community to redirect more of their energies toward producing expository writing of the highest quality. By the act of joining the Society the members have implicitly stated an interest in supporting and being informed about mathematical research, confirmed by our surveys. This creates a need, now largely unmet, for the AMS to communicate mathematics to its members (and to the world at large) at various appropriate levels. Both the identity and cohesiveness of the AMS will be served by continuing to have a high-quality research publication sent to the entire membership. But this presents a difficult challenge for authors and editors to provide serious exposition that is accessible to a wide audience.

We recommend that an Editor-in-Chief be chosen from among the three editors by the EBC. The term of office will end with the Editor’s term as an Editor, but may be extended at the discretion of the EBC if the Editor continues for a further term. In the current Bulletin, the position of Editor-in-Chief rotates among the three editors, each serving in this position during his second year as Editor. The EBC considered the advisability of adding a separate Editor-in-Chief a few years ago, and concluded that what was needed instead was simply an improvement of communication among the three Editors and between them and the Providence office. This improvement seems to have occurred. However, the CRMP recommendations make the role of the editorial board more complex, because of the emphasis on coordination among the three sections (especially Research Reports and Research Surveys)

and interaction with other AMS publications (in particular the Research News proposed for the Notices). While the Editors are mainly selecting among submissions, and do so independently, the present arrangement works well; but as the content of the Bulletin turns more and more to solicited material, it becomes essential that there be coherence of editorial policy and responsibility produced by the collaboration of the three main editors under the guidance of one of them. The CRMP feels that the proposed mechanism is more flexible than the existing one or other alternatives considered, while simultaneously providing more continuity of leadership.

See Attachment #2 for an elaboration of the thinking of the CRMP on the contents of the three proposed sections.

3. ABSTRACTS OF PRESENTATIONS OF THE AMS

Finding: The Abstracts provide members with 1) a guide to the scientific content of meetings; 2) an opportunity to inform one's colleagues of one's ideas and progresses; and 3) an overall view of the mathematical activity in the community. Lack of quality control is an essential feature of this publication, and this could have adverse effects when the journal is confused with a research publication.

Recommendation: That the Abstracts for a particular meeting be available to registrants for that meeting, and available for purchase upon request. In addition, that the Abstracts be published as a journal quarterly, with each issue containing the Abstracts accumulated since the preceding issue, including by-title Abstracts.

4. MEETINGS ANNOUNCEMENTS AND PROMOTIONS

Recommendation: That the Notices continue to publish announcements of meetings and scientific information on the meetings, including their program. These announcements may be reformatted with an eye toward removing information that is redundant or of use only to participants. That the AMS prepare independent announcements and brochures on its Annual and Sectional meetings for specific target audiences (e.g., math departments). That the detailed programs, together with the Abstracts, be available to all registrants and be available for purchase upon request.

5. RESEARCH ANNOUNCEMENTS

Finding: One of the principles of the AMS has been—and continues to be - to provide mathematicians with opportunities to present their research to the mathematical community in a timely way. The ABSTRACTS and the Research Announcements of the Bulletin are designed to serve this purpose, the former as a record of presentations before the Society, and the latter to announce breakthroughs of major significance, and a sense of the ideas behind them. Since the basic principle is to provide researchers with that opportunity, the result is that, taken as a whole, this section of the Bulletin gives a skewed picture of contemporary mathematical research. The intent of our recommendations of Research News in eNAMS and Research Reports is to provide a broad overview of contemporary research. The issue of continuing Research Announcements as a viable AMS program, and where, should be resolved by another body.

Recommendation: That Research Announcements be discontinued as a section of a member publication. That a new ad hoc committee be appointed to consider whether they should be continued, and if so, where their publication would be appropriate.

6. ENTITLEMENT ARTICLES

Finding: This heading broadly covers the Society's obligation to provide its membership with appropriate text of all presentations before its meetings and conferences. This ranges from proceedings of AMS conferences, through major talks at AMS meetings to abstracts of presentations at topical sessions at meetings. This should continue, but such offerings to AMS publications should be in alignment with that publication's purpose.

Recommendation: That Editors, in their communications to prospective authors, make clear what is the appropriate style of exposition of that publication and the intended audience, and alert them that articles will be subject to editorial review in that context.

7. EMPLOYMENT INFORMATION IN THE MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES

Finding: This is a good publication and seems to be an appropriate format (both electronic and paper) for its purposes. Nevertheless, it together with other employment programs of the AMS are not very effective, either in placement or in reduction of paper work. Our recommendation is that the Policy Committee on the Profession consider what should be the proper role of the Society in coordination of employment opportunities.

8. ELECTRONIC PUBLICATIONS

Finding: Part of the Committee's charge was concerned with electronic publication. It became clear in the Committee's discussion that this is both an extremely important and a very complex area whose development will have great consequences for the discipline, as well as the publishing industry (in particular the AMS). We feel that the CRMP is not equipped to tackle the problem in the large, and it would be inappropriate to do less than that. Thus, we have passed this concern, along with a summary of our thinking, on to the newly formed Committee on Electronic Products and Services via its chair who is also a member of CRMP.

Recommendation: Questions about electronic publications should be referred to the Committee on Electronic Publications and Services, with this advice: no member publications should be excluded from electronic publication and that it is desirable to make member publications available electronically whenever feasible. Further, it is the sense of the CRMP that electronic access to these publications should be available to all people whether members or not.

C.1.4 ATTACHMENT 1: SOME IDEAS FOR eNAMS CONTENTS.

EDITORIAL PAGE: This might include an editorial (by the editor) as well as letters to the editor.

FORUM: This would contain essays of no more than 2000 words on issues ranging from education to funding to rigor in mathematics to the future of the profession. This could serve as an op/ed section for the magazine.

NEWS BRIEFS: These would contain pithy and succinct news and information about science policy, education, and the profession.

NEW MATHEMATICS IN BRIEF: These short articles would represent a new kind of mathematical reporting on current mathematical achievements and controversies. Reports on “proofs” of the Riemann Hypothesis or the Poincare conjecture would be included, as well as more routine notes on recognized breakthroughs. These are short articles aimed at mathematicians who know little (or nothing) of the particular subject. Examples (from the Mathematics mockup) might include:

- The Buckeyball Kepler’s Sphere Packing Problem Announced Solved
- Simulating Flow in Root-Soil Systems
- Putting a Handle on a Minimal Helicoid

DEPARTMENTS: These would often vary from issue to issue, but would include the information of record that the Notices traditionally contains:

- Meetings and Conferences
- Inside the AMS
- AMS Reports and Communications (reports of AMS Committees— CSP, COE, Data, Library, etc.), AMS Elections, AMS Prizes and Awards, Issues Facing the AMS (Operational Planning, Publication Changes, Etc.)
- Mathematical Sciences Meetings and Conferences
- New AMS Publications
- New Members of the AMS
- Classified Advertising
- Forms

C.1.5 ATTACHMENT 2: CONTENTS OF iBAMS.

1. Research Reports

- (a) A Research Report is a timely account of a specific accomplishment in mathematical research. This should be regarded as a colloquium-style explanation of an important recent development. Most of the report should be accessible to colleagues who are not experts in the research area under discussion. Particular effort should be made to place the work in context, indicating its significance, its connections to what was previously known, and its consequences or potential consequences. Only the barest hint of methods of proof will be appropriate for this setting, but some suggestion of the nature of the novel elements allowing this advance should be given.

- (b) A Research Report will typically be solicited from, or contributed by, a specialist other than the individual or individuals whose work is being described, although the possibility of submissions from the primary researchers is not to be excluded.
- (c) Research Reports should be typically four to eight pages long.
- (d) Prior to the appearance of a Research Report, substantial details of the work should be available, at least in preprint form.
- (e) There will be approximately 25 Research Reports published per year.
- (f) There will be an Editor for Research Reports.
- (g) The Editor will appoint a panel of Associate Editors for Research Reports, in consultation with the Editorial Boards Committee.
- (h) The Editor is charged with obtaining approval from the panel of Associate Editors prior to the publication of a Research Report.

2. Research Surveys

- (a) A Research Survey is a detailed account of an active area of contemporary mathematical research. A principal goal of a Survey is to provide an overview suitable for a graduate student or for a researcher. From another area of mathematics. The motivating problems and examples should be clearly exposed; some historical development should be provided; the advances and open problems making this a vibrant area should be described. Proofs should be at most briefly sketched, often merely by reference to the methods. It is expected that only an expert in the area will have sufficiently broad knowledge and perspective to write a Research Survey. In the past there has been considerable confusion about what level of background and sophistication the writer of a Research-Expository Paper should assume and how technical these should be. Indeed, some of the “entitlement” articles (texts of major addresses) have been sometimes more a monograph than a survey. For this reason we recommend that there should be careful and detailed written guidelines for what constitutes a good Research Survey, and these should be widely publicized.
- (b) Research Surveys may be solicited or contributed, and may be the most suitable format for “entitlement” articles which would be subject to the guidelines for Research Surveys and to editorial approval.
- (c) A Research Survey should be fewer than 40 pages long, but may be significantly shorter (8-10 pages).
- (d) There will be approximately 8 Research Surveys published per year.
- (e) There will be an Editor for Research Surveys.
- (f) The Editor for Research Surveys will appoint a panel of Associate Editors for Research Surveys, in consultation with the Editorial Boards Committee.
- (g) The Editor is charged with obtaining approval from the panel of Associate Editors prior to publication of a Research Survey.

3. Book Reviews

- (a) A Book Review is a critical review of a recently published book on a mathematical subject. The choice of books for review will reflect the wide variety of Mathematics, although only books of particular interest or importance within a given area should be selected.
- (b) A Book Review will be solicited. Unsolicited reviews will not be considered for publication.
- (c) A review should not be more than six pages long, and may be shorter than a single page.
- (d) There will be approximately 60 Book Reviews published per year.
- (e) There will be an Editor for Book Reviews.
- (f) The Editor for Book Reviews will appoint a panel of Associate Editors for Book Reviews, in consultation with the Editorial Boards Committee.
- (g) The Editor is charged with organizing the panel to ensure that the selections of books for review and of reviewers provide high-quality and wide coverage of topics in Mathematics.

NOTES on Research Reports. Possible models for the Research Reports are the Bourbaki Seminar talks and the Arbeitstagung lectures. The Committee on Science Policy has recommended the institution of a series of expository talks (see their 21 Sept 92 report in Notices 39 #9). This might provide an important source for high-quality reports on current work. It may be appropriate for the Research Reports Editor to solicit written reports from selected speakers. In general the Editors should be allowed maximum discretion to solicit articles written by people other than the principals, if in their judgment others will do a better job of exposition; and they should be allowed the freedom to reject a paper without the red tape of a full review. Such a streamlining is essential if timely publication and consultation with the Associate Editors are to take place. The judgment of completeness of proofs will always be difficult in reporting on late-breaking work, but this in itself is not reason to abandon such reports entirely. One of the virtues of the Bourbaki-style system of reporting by an independent researcher is that it subjects the work to careful scrutiny by a disinterested party. This is a much more serious assessment than is sometimes given by a typical referee. It is also more serious than is sometimes possible for R/A papers in the current BAMS; the lack of verification in the current Research Announcements is a source of concern and skepticism on the part of some AMS members and editors. Publication of such a report is a highly competitive affair, and within a given field there may be only one or two reports in a year. Inappropriate style should be viewed as no less grounds for rejection than insufficient substance.

In January, 1978, the Council accepted recommendations made by an Ad Hoc Committee on Research Announcements. This led to the creation of the New Series of the Bulletin. Among the items they considered critical to the success of the Research Announcements they enunciate “The principle of not making individual mathematicians directly and publicly responsible for the decision to publish or not to publish individual manuscripts and to place that responsibility on a collegial editorial board acting as a body.” The Editor used his panel of Associate Editors in this way, submitting each article to a vote of the entire board, with good results. This practice was quietly abandoned sometime thereafter, probably because it became too cumbersome. We recommend a return to this policy.

NOTES on Research Surveys: As already remarked, some of the principal criticisms leveled against the current Research-Expository Articles have been a consequence of the system of enti-

tlements. Entitlements can play an important role in generating the kind of excellent exposition we seek, but since there is a strong expectation that a paper submitted from one of the “entitlement” series of lectures will eventually be accepted, the editor’s leverage in getting the author to make needed changes is limited. To be successful, the ground-rules must be clear from the start. Authors will resist—or refuse—to alter the tenor or length of their work significantly after the fact. The expectations of length, level, and audience, must be made clear in advance.

NOTES on Book Reviews: The current practice of using the occasion of a book review to give a broad overview of an area is valued by the readers, and should continue. Indeed, it has emerged as one of the most successful components of the current Bulletin. As the other two categories become better understood, the pressure on the BR section to provide this service may lessen however. This should be allowed to evolve.

Our principal suggestion is increased care be taken in the book selection process. There are clearly too many books published for one editor to form an opinion of each in advance. Once a reviewer has been commissioned, a commitment to publish the review has been made. The panel of Associate Editors should have a key role at the early stages of the process.

C.1.6 Special Committee to Review Member Publications: Membership.

Committee Members

Dr. Hugo Rossi (Committee Chair)
Department of Mathematics
University of Utah

Professor Richard Palais
Department of Mathematics
Brandeis University

Professor Michael Artin (ex officio)
Department of Mathematics
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Professor John Polking
Department of Mathematics
Rice University

Professor Sheldon Axler
Department of Mathematics
Michigan State University

Professor Carol Wood
Department of Mathematics
Wesleyan University

Professor John Ewing
Department of Mathematics
Indiana University

Consultants to the Committee
Dr. John Bradley
Associate Director for Gov’t and Public Affairs
American Mathematical Society

Professor Robert Fossum
Department of Mathematics
University of Illinois

Ms. Hope Daly
Director of Meetings
American Mathematical Society

Professor John Franks
Department of Mathematics
Northwestern University

Dr. Samuel Rankin
Associate Executive Director for Publication
American Mathematical Society

Dr. Ron Graham (ex officio)
AT&T Bell Laboratories

Dr. William Woolf
Associate Executive Director
for Production and Computer Services
American Mathematical Society

Professor Judy Green
Department of Mathematics
Marymount University

Dr. William Jaco (ex officio)
Executive Director
American Mathematical Society

Professor Haynes Miller
Department of Mathematics
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

D Attachments: ANNOUNCEMENTS.

D.1 Future Meetings.

Future Meetings

DATE	MEETING	SITE
September 30, 1993	MSEB Exec Com Meeting	Washington, DC
October 1-2, 1993	MSEB Board Meeting	Washington, DC
October 1-3, 1993	AMS/DMV Meeting	Heidelberg, Germany
October 15-17, 1993	Second International Conference on Ordinal Data Analysis (cosponsored by AMS)	Amherst, MA
October 15 & 17, 1993	ABC Meeting	Providence, RI
October 16, 1993	LRPC Meeting	Providence, RI
October 21, 1993	MREC Meeting	Ann Arbor, MI
October 22, 1993	JPBM Meeting	Washington, DC
October 22-23, 1993	AMS Sectional Meeting @ Texas A&M Univ.	College Station, TX
October 28-29, 1993	BMS Meeting	Arlington, VA
October 29-30, 1993	BMS Chairs Colloquium	Arlington, VA
November 5-7, 1993	SUMMAC Meeting, MAA	Washington, DC
November 6-7, 1993	AMS Sectional Meeting @ Harvey Mudd College	Claremont, CA
November 19-21, 1993	ECBT	Providence, RI
November 20, 1993	MSEB Exec Com Meeting	Washington, DC
December 2-4, 1993	AMS-Sociedad Matematica Mexicana Meeting @ Universidad Autonoma de Yucatan	Yucatan, Mexico
December 5-7, 1993	CSSP Meeting	Washington, DC
January 11, 1994	AMS Council (2:00 PM)	Cincinnati, OH
January 12-15, 1994	AMS-MAA Annual Meeting (AMS's 100th Annual Meeting!)	Cincinnati, OH
January 21, 1994	BMS Executive Committee	Washington, DC
January 26-28, 1994	SLA Winter Meeting	Dallas, TX
January 27, 1994	MSEB Exec Com Meeting	Washington, DC
January 28-29, 1994	MSEB Board Meeting	Washington, DC
February 5-8, 1994	ALA Midwinter Meeting	Los Angeles, CA

DATE	MEETING	SITE
March 4-6, 1994	Southern Univ. Presses Mtg.	Jackson, MS
March 9-12, 1994	CESSE Midwinter Meeting	Bermuda
March 12, 1994	MSEB Exec Com Meeting	Washington, DC
March 18-19, 1994	AMS Sectional Meeting @ Univ. of Kentucky	Lexington, KY
March 19-20, 1994	ABC Meeting	Providence, RI
March 25-26, 1994	AMS Sectional Meeting @ Kansas State Univ.	Manhattan, KS
April 9-10, 1994	AMS Sectional Meeting @ Polytechnic Univ.	Brooklyn, NY
April 21-23, 1994	BMS	Washington, DC
May 12, 1994	MSEB Exec Com Meeting	Washington, DC
May 13-14, 1994	MSEB Board Meeting	Washington, DC
May 20-22, 1994	ECBT Meeting	Ann Arbor, MI
June 11-16, 1994	SLA Annual Conference	Atlanta, GA
June 16-18, 1994	AMS/MAA Sectional Meeting @ Univ. of Oregon	Eugene, OR
June 24-25, 1994	MSEB Exec Com Meeting	Washington, DC
July 19-22, 1994	CESSE Annual Meeting	Raleigh, NC
July 25-29, 1994	SIAM Annual Meeting	San Diego, CA
August 3-11, 1994	International Congress of Mathematicians (ICM-94)	Zurich, Switzerland
August 14, 1994	AMS Council (9:00 AM)	Minneapolis, MN
August 15-17, 1994	AMS-MAA Summer Mathfest @ Univ. of Minnesota	Minneapolis, MN
September 29, 1994	MSEB Exec Com Meeting	Washington, DC
September 30-		
October 1, 1994	MSEB Board Meeting	Washington, DC
October 10-16, 1994 TENT	AMS-MIT Wiener Conference	Cambridge, MA
October 15-16, 1994	ABC Meeting	Providence, RI
October 28-29, 1994	AMS Sectional Meeting @ Oklahoma State Univ.	Stillwater, OK
November 11-13, 1994	AMS Sectional Meeting @ Univ. of Richmond	Richmond, VA
November 18-20, 1994	ECBT Meeting	Providence, RI

DATE	MEETING	SITE
November 19, 1994	MSEB Exec Com Meeting	Washington, DC
January 4-7, 1995	AMS-MAA Annual Meeting	San Francisco, CA
January 7, 1995	AMS Council Meeting	San Francisco, CA
January 25-27, 1995	SLA Winter Meeting	Raleigh-Durham, NC
January 26, 1995	MSEB Exec Com Meeting	Washington, DC
January 27-28, 1995	MSEB Board Meeting	Washington, DC
March 4-5, 1995	AMS Sectional Meeting @ Univ. of Connecticut	Hartford, CT
March 11, 1995	MSEB Exec Com Meeting	Washington, DC
March 17-18, 1995	AMS Sectional Meeting @ Univ. of Central Florida	Orlando, FL
March 24-25, 1995	AMS Sectional Meeting @ DePaul Univ.	Chicago, IL
May 18, 1995	MSEB Exec Com Meeting	Washington, DC
May 19-20, 1995	MSEB Board Meeting	Washington, DC
May 19-21, 1995 TENT	ECBT Meeting	??
June 10-15, 1995	SLA Annual Conference	Montreal, Canada
June 23-24, 1995	MSEB Exec Com Meeting	Washington, DC
October 5, 1995	MSEB Exec Com Meeting	Washington, DC
October 6-7, 1995	MSEB Board Meeting	Washington, DC
November 3-4, 1995	AMS Sectional Meeting @ Kent State Univ.	Kent, OH
November 17-19, 1995 TENT	ECBT Meeting	Providence, RI
November 18, 1995	MSEB Exec Com Meeting	Washington, DC
January 10-13, 1996	AMS-MAA Annual Meeting	Orlando, FL
January 13, 1996	AMS Council	Orlando, FL
January 24-26, 1996	SLA Winter Meeting	Cleveland, OH
March 22-23, 1996	AMS Sectional Meeting @ Univ. of Iowa	Iowa City, IA
April 19-21, 1996	AMS Sectional Meeting @ Louisiana State Univ.	Baton Rouge, LA
May 17-19, 1996 TENT	ECBT Meeting	??

D.1 Future Meetings.

DATE	MEETING	SITE
June 8-13, 1996	SLA Annual Conference	Boston, MA
November 22-24, 1996 TENT	ECBT Meeting	Providence, RI
January 8-11, 1997 January 11, 1997	AMS-MAA Annual Meeting AMS Council	San Diego, CA San Diego, CA
May 16-18, 1997 TENT	ECBT Meeting	??
June 7-12, 1997	SLA Annual Conference	Seattle, WA
November 21-23, 1997 TENT	ECBT Meeting	Providence, RI
January 13-16, 1999 January 16, 1999	AMS-MAA Annual Meeting AMS Council	San Antonio, TX San Antonio, TX

D.2 Davis, Markert, Nickerson Lecture on Academic and Intellectual Freedom.**SENATE ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION**

The faculty of the University of Michigan affirms that academic and intellectual freedom are fundamental values for a university in a free society. They form the foundation of the rights of the free enquiry, free expression and free dissent that are necessary for the life of the university.

The faculty recognizes that such rights are human creations, the product of both the reasoned actions and the deep seated commitments of women and men. When such actions and commitments are set in human institutions, people may secure for themselves and for others, in the present and the future, the enjoyment of those rights.

We also recognize that these values and the rights they imply are vulnerable to the fads, fashions, social movements and mass fears that threaten to still dissent and to censure carriers of unpopular ideas. Such was the case in 1954 when the University of Michigan suspended three faculty members and subsequently dismissed two of them. We deeply regret the failure of the University Community to protect the fundamental values of intellectual freedom at that time. It is to guard against a repetition of those events, and to protect the fundamental freedoms of those who come after us that we make this resolution today.

The protection of academic and intellectual freedoms requires a constant reminder of their values and vulnerability. To provide for that reminder, the Faculty of the University of Michigan hereby resolves to establish an Annual Senate Lecture on Academic and Intellectual Freedom, to be named:

**The University of Michigan Senate's
Davis, Markert, Nickerson Lecture
on
Academic and Intellectual Freedom**

Adopted
November 19, 1990