

---

# From the AMS

## 1997 Reports of the AMS Policy Committees

In 1992 the Council of the AMS decided to reorganize its committee structure. At that time there were already two so-called "policy committees": one on education policy and the other on science policy. To these were added three more policy committees: one on the profession, one on meetings and conferences, and one on publications. The skeleton charge given to all of these committees was as follows:

- a. to provide advice to the leadership of the Society and to make recommendations as to Society policy;
- b. to be responsible for taking a long-range view in their areas;
- c. to conduct an annual high-level review of activities and structure within their areas and evaluate progress towards Society goals;
- d. to report regularly to the membership, both in writing and by presentations at meetings;
- e. to maintain communications with the membership and to keep aware of their views;
- f. to coordinate with other professional organizations.

The *Notices of the AMS* conceived of itself, as the journal of record for the Society, as an appropriate vehicle to execute (d): reporting regularly to the membership in writing.

## Committee on Publications (CPUB)

*Susan Montgomery, Chair*

CPUB met twice last year, on March 8 and on October 18, 1997.

Much of our time in both meetings was devoted to a discussion of the health of the *Bulletin*. In March we received the report of a special subcommittee (chaired by Brian

Conrey) set up in late 1996 to look at the member journals (BAMS and *Notices*); we delayed taking any action until this fall after further e-mail discussion and consultation with various other people. Our recommendations appeared as Item 2.6.1 on the ECBT agenda and are on the Council agenda, along with some background material.

Each year CPUB is charged with reviewing part of the AMS publication program, on a four-year schedule. In 1996 our charge was to review the AMS primary journals (JAMS, *Math of Comp*, PAMS, TAMS). A task force to do this was established by Steve Krantz, the 1996 chair of CPUB, though it did not report to us until our meeting in March 1997, since CPUB did not meet in the fall of 1996. Although in general the task force (chaired by Eric Bedford) felt that the primary journals were in good health, they did have several concerns, in particular the large backlogs of PAMS and TAMS and the large size of the PAMS editorial board. CPUB accepted the report of the task force without recommending any further action.

In 1997 CPUB was charged with reviewing AMS e-only journals (*Electronic Research Announcements*, a free journal; *Conformal Geometry and Dynamics* and *Representation Theory*, subscription journals). A subcommittee was appointed by the current CPUB chair to carry out this review; the chair of this subcommittee was Fan Chung Graham. This committee's recommendations were in three parts. The first was directed to the editors of the e-only journals, the main point being to encourage the editors to broaden the scope of the type of articles they consider for publication. CPUB approved these recommendations and will pass them on to the editors.

The second set of recommendations was directed to the AMS staff; most were specific suggestions for more widely publicizing the existence and virtues of the AMS e-only journals. The committee recommended that a backlog report for all journals, including all e-only journals, be maintained on e-MATH. CPUB approved these recommendations. The third set of recommendations was not directly

concerned with the review of the AMS e-only journals but was more generally concerned about electronic publishing. CPUB had been concerned about most of these issues already.

In both meetings we received reports from Don Babbitt and Keith Dennis about the most noteworthy activities taking place in the Publication Division and *Mathematical Reviews*. The book program is doing well, with many more titles, and is now bringing in some income to the Society. Recently the AMS acquired Chelsea, including its inventory; some titles will be reprinted in an AMS/Chelsea series. At our October meeting CPUB discussed and endorsed an AMS Undergraduate Book Series proposal; this was Item 2.14 of the ECBT agenda and is on the Council agenda. *Math Reviews* is also doing well, and MathSciNet is increasingly popular. Slowly the older reviews are being added to the database, and eventually all will be on it.

Finally, we continued our discussions of access/ownership/archiving issues, in particular for e-journals. CPUB, as a matter of policy, wants to extend the current ownership policy so that the AMS site license will allow the subscriber to download the year's subscription so as to make it available electronically to authorized users and/or make a paper copy of articles for that year. See Item 2.6.2 for CPUB's specific recommendation to the Council.

Concerning electronic archiving, the AMS already has a policy of maintaining in perpetuity an online accessible electronic archive of all of its electronic journal articles. A question arises about the relation of this type of archiving and the ownership policy discussed above. CPUB endorsed a policy which says that if a subscriber had an online subscription in a certain year and articles from that year subsequently had to be reformatted, then that subscriber could have access to the reformatted archive for a fee determined by cost plus a small profit.

## Committee on Education (CoE)

*Hyman Bass, Chair*

The full committee now meets only once a year, so much of this report is a report on its September 26-27, 1997, meeting, based on notes of Monica Foulkes, and on activities pursuant thereto.

### Proposed National Test in Mathematics

As a result of the request from CSP and CoE to involve more mathematicians in the development of the test, the Department of Education appointed several mathematicians to the numerous advisory panels being set up. Invited to discuss the progress of the project at this meeting were Gary Phillips (director of the test project), and Judy Wurtzel and Pat O'Connell Ross (Office of Educational Research and Improvement). Support in Congress for the proposed test has been mixed, and the day before the meeting Secretary of Education Richard Riley issued a statement that development of the test has been halted until a final appropriations bill is signed. There was discussion of the ways mathematicians have been involved in the process, and

Phillips promised to look into the concerns expressed. CoE members were encouraged to submit names of mathematicians to the Department of Education representatives for future involvement. This was done, and a substantial list was sent by the chair to Gary Phillips.

Judy Sunley (NSF) reported on the work of the joint NSF/Department of Education working group on plans for the support needed in conjunction with the test in areas such as teacher preparation and enhancement, development of instructional material, and public information and encouragement. There was discussion of emerging public backlash to the test and what professional organizations could do to calm the rhetoric. Daniel Goroff reported on the work of the administration's Office for Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) to support the president's initiative, which was motivated by the poor performance of U.S. eighth-grade students in the Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS). It was President Clinton's intention to "set the bar high" and set world-class standards in the test in order to "ratchet up the system", rather than to produce a test based on an assessment of what current eighth-grade students could pass.

Secretary of Education Richard Riley has accepted an invitation to speak to the Joint Mathematics Meetings in Baltimore in January 1998. He is jointly sponsored by CoE and CSP.

### NCTM Standards 2000

Roger Howe, chair of the subcommittee appointed by CoE to act as an Association Resource Group (ARG) to the writing teams working on the revision of the Standards, reported that the ARG had already submitted two reports to the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. A public report will soon appear in the *Notices* and on the AMS Web site, and a joint panel session with the MAA ARG will be held at the Baltimore meetings. CoE members who are also members of NCTM's writing teams reported that the AMS ARG's comments had been well received. The subcommittee was thanked for its hard work—which is still ongoing—and thoughtful reports, and CoE will express its appreciation to NCTM for setting up a process to involve the whole mathematical community in the rewriting of the Standards.

### National Science Foundation—Division of Undergraduate Education

Norman Fortenberry, interim division director while Robert Watson is on assignment, informed CoE about the restructuring of DUE programs into a new entity, to be announced December 1. Programs will be: Course, Curriculum and Laboratory Improvement (CCLI), Advanced Technological Education (ATE), and Collaboratives for Excellence in Teacher Preparation. This restructuring reflects the recommendations made in the 1996 Review of Undergraduate Education. Fortenberry posed four questions for CoE comments: (1) What can we do to better prepare future mathematics teachers? (2) What can be done to change the institutional climate? (3) Is the M.S. degree likely to become a more accepted terminal degree in the mathematics community? (4) What are your perceptions about the

Calculus Reform backlash, and how do we best address the issues raised? CoE appointed a subgroup, chaired by David Bressoud, to respond. The subgroup's report was received with great appreciation by Fortenberry and the staff at NSF.

### National Science Foundation—Division of Mathematical Sciences

Ann Boyle described the new VIGRE program (Vertical Integration of Research and Education in the Mathematical Sciences) to support departmental, as opposed to individual, activities. This new and complex program will subsume the GIG program (Group Infrastructure Grants) as a response to the recommendations of the 1995 Workshop on Graduate Education. Boyle reported that NSF was pleased with the response to the interdisciplinary grants program that provides sabbatical support for mathematicians to work in other departments.

### Preparation of Future Mathematics Teachers

A common theme in all the above discussions was an increased emphasis on improvements in the preparation of mathematics teachers. C. Lacampagne, Department of Education, reported that funding had been approved for an MAA proposal ("Mathematics Education of Teachers Project") that the department wished to see expanded to include other mathematical societies. This proposal will be discussed at the December CBMS meeting, and CoE appointed a subgroup to explore AMS involvement and proposals for the design of the project and to make recommendations at the CBMS meeting. The Department of Education is also interested in developing departmental workshops with the AMS and other interested societies.

### New Criteria for Accreditation of Engineering Programs

William Kelly gave an overview of the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology's (ABET) new accreditation criteria, currently in a pilot phase, but to be compulsory by 2001. Kelly did not feel that the new criteria would impact mathematics departments. CoE will continue to monitor the implementation of the new criteria for possible impact.

### CoE Focus

There was discussion of the focus on K-12 mathematics education, which has taken up most of CoE's energy recently. In connection with what was felt to be CoE's core concern, graduate education, there was discussion of data on decreasing enrollments by U.S. students in upper-level and graduate courses and the resultant impact on education. There was also debate about the structure of CoE meetings. CoE has agreed to meet September 11-12, 1998.

### Reports from Other Groups

Naomi Fisher reported on MER (Mathematicians for Education Reform) projects, including a joint AMS/MER proposal for workshops on professional master's degrees. Ron Rosier reported that the 1995 CBMS Survey had been published, reporting that enrollments in four-year college

mathematics courses had decreased by 9% from 1990 to 1995, but those in two-year colleges had increased 12%. Almost half (46%) of all undergraduate mathematics is now taught in two-year colleges. John Tucker reported on plans for the Board on Mathematical Sciences Department Chairs Colloquium and other projects. Gerald Kulm reported on the American Association for the Advancement of Science Project 2061, concerning middle-school mathematics curriculum. The CoE subcommittee appointed to make recommendations to the *Math Reviews* Editorial Committee on a possible classification for research in mathematics education is close to a final recommendation. Representatives from other organizations making short presentations included: Mathematical Association of America, Education Development Council, National Association of State Science and Mathematics Coalitions, and the Joint Policy Board for Mathematics.

### MR Coverage of Undergraduate Education Research

A subcommittee of the CoE, chaired by Joan Ferrini-Mundy, is looking into the possibility of MR listings of work in undergraduate education research. It has produced a draft classification scheme that is compatible, as required, with that of *Zentralblatt*. This is currently under review by MREC. Once a classification scheme is adopted, there remains the question of the scope of possible coverage by MR.

## Committee on Meetings and Conferences (COMC)

*Joel H. Spencer, Chair*

COMC met September 20, 1997, in Chicago. In attendance were Roy L. Adler, Bettye Anne Case, Robert Daverman, John H. Ewing, Robert M. Fossum, Susan Friedlander, Bill Harris, Isom Herron, Evan Houston, Arthur M. Jaffe, Leslie M. Sibner, Joel H. Spencer, Karen Vogtmann, Sylvia Wiegand, Jim Maxwell, Hope Daly, and Robin Hagan Aguiar.

There were four basic issues. Here is a brief report card:  
AMS Sectional Meetings: A-OK.

AMS Sessions at Meetings of Other Organizations: OK, but not done very often.

AMS Summer Conference Programs: Troublesome, survival problematic.

AMS National Meeting: Positive, optimistic, with perennial concerns of size and focus.

### 1. AMS Sectional Meetings

A subcommittee consisting of Bettye Anne Case, Robert Daverman, Evan Houston (chair), and Deborah Sulsky submitted its report, Evan Houston giving an oral summary.

The heart of the report (both written and oral) was a strong vote of confidence in the current system and, most particularly, in the Secretariat. The associate secretary in charge of each meeting is the key person. They have con-

siderable leeway. They encourage formation of special sessions, and they can experiment with new formats. This is all going very well.

Some technical matters in format had already been agreed to by the Secretariat. No action was necessary.

Moderate financial losses have been sustained at these meetings for the past few years. Steps are in place to correct this, but even if these problems persist, the importance of these meetings to the community far outweighs these concerns.

There was a discussion concerning putting abstracts on the Web. John Ewing pointed out potential technical problems with doing this. COMC felt this would be a significant aid to mathematicians planning or deciding on a trip to a sectional meeting. Further, seeing an abstract might lead to fruitful mathematical collaboration. The printed program remains the program of record. But a Web page that is updated daily (as is already done with authors, titles, and times), even if the formatting is less than perfect, is highly desirable. In the end we voted unanimously: COMC endorses assigning a high priority to the development of a system for putting abstracts on the Web in a timely fashion. (Staff is now investigating costs for implementing this new service, with the intention of implementing with modest effort.)

## 2. AMS Sessions at Meetings of Other Organizations

A subcommittee consisting of Isom Herron (chair), Jerrold Marsden, and James Hyman presented its report, Isom Herron giving the oral report.

The key connection of this type is with AAAS. There is a mathematics component in their annual meeting, Warren Paige heading their mathematics section. In discussion this was seen as a very positive collaboration so long as the mathematical content was interesting to a broad audience. A February 1997 session on geometry with Frank Morgan on soap bubbles, Doris Schattschneider on Escher, and other fine speakers was considered a model. Other sessions, such as one on mathematics education reform, were much less successful. COMC encourages continued support of this project.

There were few other such sessions, and that led to discussion of other possible venues. For example, in the report Jerrold Marsden writes of possible interaction with the IEEE CDC (control) meeting. Without endorsing any particular such sessions, COMC feels that the AMS should look favorably at holding such sessions when the opportunity presents itself.

## 3. AMS Summer Conference Programs

Here we have a problem. We concentrated on the AMS-IMS-SIAM Summer Research Conferences, which are run by the AMS. These consist of five to seven different one-week conferences held in the same place during the summer.

A timeline: Summer 1998 is set; funding for summer 1999 is set, and the committee is currently at work. The issue is really beyond that date, at which time a new funding proposal will have to be made.

On the positive side, these are good conferences. They attract typically fifty to seventy mathematicians, they concentrate in one area, and there is fruitful collaboration. This writer, Arthur Jaffe, and others reported very positive experiences at such meetings. Isom Herron noted the particularly good effect such conferences have on younger mathematicians.

The problem is the lack of applications. Over the past three years no proposals were rejected, and the committee itself went to considerable effort to get good people to submit proposals. The committee (now chaired by Barbara Keyfitz) is doing an excellent job. The AMS staff handles pretty much all of the chores of housing, finances, etc., so that the organizers do not have a particularly onerous burden.

We were somewhat at a loss to explain the lack of applications. Our general feeling was that it was connected to the great abundance of meetings and workshops that now exist. Both MSRI and IMA run many workshops, as do more specialized centers like DIMACS. Further, there is more opportunity for meetings in other countries. The feeling, though we were not at all certain, was that the AMS program was being crowded out. Then again, perhaps the program has simply run out of steam.

Still, on the mathematical side, there was relative agreement. While the programs are mathematically interesting, the lack of enthusiasm among potential applicants is a very serious drawback. If mathematics is not to be an enthusiastic enterprise, then it is hard to see the point of it. Ways to fix the program may be devised, but we cannot in good conscience recommend pushing for refunding of a program that our community itself seems so reticent to endorse.

## 4. The Annual Meeting: Size and Focus

The annual meeting is certainly a success. But is it too big? Is it focused enough on our core mission? Are researchers avoiding the meeting? A lively discussion of this perennial issue produced no clear results. Data giving participation from top research institutions over the past ten years indicate no diminishment of interest. The number of research papers given is strong, particularly in the Special Sessions, which now predominate. Some feel the program is too full, with far too many evening sessions. Others say that that is fine, as they can pick and choose what they want.

We are concerned that the control mechanism for the meetings has broken down. De jure, the National Program Committee must approve all events. But that committee (chaired by this writer 1994–96) sees its main mission as selection of Invited Speakers and, secondarily, of Special Sessions. Bob Daverman pointed out that they simply do not have the context in which to decide which new panels, forums, special events, or whatever to let in. De facto, these decisions are now being made by the Secretariat.

## 5. Future Projects

Karen Vogtmann will chair a subcommittee to examine Special Lectures and Special Projects in 1998.

COMC will meet again in Chicago on September 26, 1998.

## 6. COMC Membership

As of November 1997 the members of COMC are:

Roy L. Adler, Bettye Anne Case, John H. Ewing (ex-officio/AMS executive director), Robert M. Fossum (ex-officio/AMS secretary), Isom H. Herron, Evan G. Houston, James M. Hyman, Arthur M. Jaffe (ex-officio/AMS president), Jerrold E. Marsden, Joel H. Spencer, Karen Vogtmann, Sylvia M. Wiegand.

Permanent invited guests: Robert J. Daverman (Associate Secretary, Southeastern Section), Susan J. Friedlander (Associate Secretary, Central Section), William Harris (Associate Secretary, Western Section), Lesley M. Sibner (Associate Secretary, Northeastern Section).

AMS Staff: Hope Daly (staff support), Robin Hagan Aguiar (staff support), and James Maxwell (senior staff liaison).

This report was prepared by Joel H. Spencer, chair of COMC, with the assistance of the committee.

## Committee on the Profession (CoProf)

*Joseph Lipman, Chair*

### Committee Meetings

CoProf held a face-to-face meeting on March 22-23. Additional business was conducted by e-mail. The committee was not able to settle substantive issues through this medium.

### Mathematics Department's Role in the University

What did the Rochester episode suggest about how mathematics departments can best function in a changing academic environment? Mathematics departments are still being eroded in a quiet way—"death by a thousand cuts". CoProf sponsored a panel discussion, organized by Frank Gilfeather, on this question at the 1997 annual AMS meeting in San Diego. (Several other sessions on "survival" were held at the same meeting.) The question remains a high priority for the profession.

Contact has been made with BMS about the possibility of a workshop on the subject, but little progress has yet been made in this respect. It is hoped that the long-awaited report of the AMS Task Force on Excellence in Mathematics Scholarship will provide further stimulus.

CoProf has been discussing ways in which the AMS might offer assistance to individual mathematics departments. CoProf is working on a document on why and how departments might conduct both internal and external reviews and what to do with the results. See also the section below on "Relations with Other Disciplines".

### Public Awareness

Following up on its public awareness report (<http://www.ams.org/committee/profession/pubaware.html>), CoProf established a Working Group on Public Awareness in Mathematics (WGPAM), chaired by Steven Weintraub, to serve as a focal point for public awareness efforts. Though

initially WGPAM will be a subcommittee of CoProf, it is anticipated that it will develop into a more autonomous AMS entity.

WGPAM's What's New in Mathematics (WNIM) page, the public awareness component of e-MATH (<http://www.ams.org/new-in-math/>), began operation in November 1996. WNIM aims to have a wide variety of items of interest to both mathematicians and nonmathematicians: articles specially written for WNIM, links to other parts of e-MATH, links to other Web sites, and references to print media. AMS statistics show that WNIM is one of the most heavily accessed areas of e-MATH, with numerous hits from many countries and from nonacademic domains such as .com and .net.

### Relations with Other Disciplines

For the area of its 1997 review of AMS activities, CoProf chose "Relations with Other Disciplines". (The two preceding reviews have been on Employment and Public Awareness; see <http://www.ams.org/committee/profession>.) The report was discussed both at the March meeting and by e-mail over the summer. The noncontroversial part of the report enumerates and praises efforts of Arthur Jaffe and Sam Rankin in the Washington arena to bring mathematics into closer contact with professional organizations representing other disciplines and with the federal government. AMS activities to make nonacademic employment opportunities more visible are also noted. The rest of the report raises questions which are important and complex. For example, should the AMS advocate for more interdisciplinary research and correspondingly broadened graduate programs, and if so, how? This has resulted in the report remaining internal to CoProf, as a basis for further face-to-face discussion, without which no consensus on the hard issues can be reached.

One result of the review is that CoProf is sponsoring a panel at the Baltimore meetings on "Building Connections to Industry within Graduate Departments". The panel has been organized by Annalisa Crannell. Panelists will discuss examples of industrial and commercial projects in traditional mathematics graduate programs—how and why these projects were started and the implications for graduate students and faculty involved. The goals are to provide information on professional development to the mathematics community, to stimulate senior mathematicians' awareness of opportunities for working with industry, and to enhance graduate advisors' abilities to help their students cross from academia into industry.

### Employment

CoProf oversees the maintenance of employment- and career-related information on e-MATH at <http://www.ams.org/committee/profession/>.

CoProf sponsored a three-hour program, organized by Annalisa Crannell, on "Preparing Ourselves and Our Students for Careers in Mathematics" at the 1996 Mathfest in Seattle. A video of the sessions was distributed in June of 1997 to all Ph.D.-granting mathematics departments.

CoProf sponsored a panel, organized by Ruth Williams, on “Careers for Mathematicians in Industry, Government, and Business” at the 1997 annual meeting in San Diego.

### Participation

Pursuant to Council approval of a CoProf resolution in January 1995, the AMS established a Task Force on Participation for Underrepresented Minorities in Mathematics, chaired by James Turner. A major Task Force recommendation on the establishment of a Washington Office of Minority Affairs has been actively pursued by the AMS, at first with MAA and NCTM, now also with SACNAS, NAM, Benjamin Banaeker, and AISIS; but difficulties in coordinating objectives and financial commitments with such a large group of sponsors has up to now hindered the process of defining what the operation should be.

### Professional Development

CoProf cosponsored a panel, organized by Curtis Bennett, on “Continuing Professional Development” at the 1997 annual meeting in San Diego.

The possibility of an AMS publication on professional development, based on articles from the *Concerns of Young Mathematicians* electronic newsletter, is being discussed.

### Tenure, Adjuncts, ...

CoProf subcommittees are currently considering questions having to do with changing attitudes toward tenure and with the use of adjuncts, especially in the teaching of lower-level mathematics courses. These are large questions affecting all of academia. At its next meeting CoProf will discuss proposals to the Council for statements on these matters.

### Membership, Dues

Could membership levels of certain groups of mathematicians be improved? Don McClure is currently investigating some characteristics of tenured and tenure-track faculty which may help to determine how representative the AMS membership is and where opportunities for increased membership might lie.

Should the dues structure be changed? After considerable discussion of a Providence staff study on the financial impact of changing to a single-tier dues structure at the lower dues level and on various partially compensating measures, CoProf recommended that there be no change in the current dues structure.

It was also recommended that the *Abstracts* should be removed as a benefit of Contributing Membership, thereby making the extra dues amount a tax-deductible contribution.

### Prizes

The ECBT requested that CoProf prepare a proposal for a Public Service Award, to be presented periodically by the AMS together with the American Chemical and Physical Societies to a member of Congress in recognition of work done in support of mathematics, science, and engineering. An e-mail discussion brought out several problems with the idea, among them the possibility of undesirable political

overtones. Consequently, any proposal will have to wait for face-to-face discussion.

## Committee on Science Policy (CSP)

*Jim Lewis, Chair*

### Invited Speakers at National Meetings

CSP activities began in January with the science policy addresses at the Joint Mathematics Meetings in San Diego. We were honored to have invited addresses by Neal Lane, director, National Science Foundation, and Congressman George E. Brown Jr., ranking Democrat on the House Committee on Science and longtime supporter of science. The talks were well attended and rank among the most successful science policy addresses that the Committee has sponsored. Encouraged by that success, CSP invited two government speakers to address the January 1998 Joint Meetings in Baltimore—U.S. Secretary of Education Richard Riley, and Lt. General Kenneth Minihan, director of the National Security Agency.

At the San Diego meetings CSP also hosted two focus group discussions with Don Lewis, director of the Division of Mathematical Sciences at the National Science Foundation, providing exchange of information and comments from leaders in the mathematics community about the (then) proposed changes to NSF's merit review criteria, as well as issues related to the support of graduate students. The CSP also sponsored a panel discussion on public awareness opportunities in the classroom and, jointly with the Joint Policy Board for Mathematics, sponsored a workshop on how to meet with members of Congress.

### Involvement in Congressional Activities

*Lunch Briefing on Mathematics for Congressional Staff:* In March the CSP chair joined other mathematicians for a lunch briefing on mathematics for congressional staffers on Capitol Hill, organized by President Jaffe and the AMS Washington Office. The speaker was Ronald Coifman of Yale University.

*Joint Statement on Federal Support for Science Research:* The briefing followed by one day a press conference of presidents of science societies, organized by President Jaffe and other society presidents, who released a statement calling for a 7% increase in FY 1998 in federal support for science (a significant increase over the 3% requested by President Clinton). This press conference was the kickoff activity of a year of coordinated activity by professional scientific groups to advocate for stronger support for science in the federal budget. Looking back from the end of the year, President Jaffe, the Washington Office, and the other societies with whom they have worked are to be congratulated for their success (one result of their efforts was a 4.9% increase in NSF's budget).

*Visits to Members of Congress:* The date of the April CSP meeting was chosen to coincide with Congressional Visits

Day (CVD) sponsored by the Science and Technology Work Group. Under Sam Rankin's leadership, the AMS Washington Office was heavily involved in the organization of Congressional Visits Day, and CSP congratulates them on the success of the event. Among the over two hundred scientists who participated in CVD were ten mathematicians, including six members of CSP. The day was spent visiting members of Congress and advocating for the 7% budget increase for scientific research that had been urged by the presidents of the scientific societies in March.

*Calls for Action:* Several calls for action by AMS members were issued (usually via e-mail or the AMS Web pages; see address below) over the course of the year by CSP's support staff, based at the AMS Washington Office, often in liaison with the Joint Policy Board for Mathematics and other scientific groups and coalitions. Providing background information on the issues involved and advice on how to contact members of Congress, these alerts increasingly involve AMS members in national issues affecting mathematics. Over the last two years the AMS has worked to improve its connections with other scientific societies in order to increase the visibility of science and mathematics in Washington circles. The most recent alert called for support for the "Unified Statement" issued in October 1997 by leaders of scientific groups calling for the doubling of federal investment in science research over the next ten years. Anyone wishing to participate in our AMS Contact Group and to receive these e-mail alerts should contact the AMS Washington Office (e-mail to [mxf@ams.org](mailto:mxf@ams.org)).

### CSP Meeting, April 1997

CSP meetings now have a two-pronged focus: (1) to use our presence in Washington to discuss science policy issues with federal agency officials and congressional experts, and (2) to conduct internal AMS committee business.

The first day of our meeting was devoted to invitees from federal agencies, congressional committee staff, and government relations staff from other scientific societies who provided information and expertise on issues related to advocating for mathematics on the federal scene. Among this year's visitors were former Congressman Doug Walgren, who provided an insider's view of how to influence Congress, John Crowley of MIT's Washington Office, who discussed the Science Coalition and its efforts to bring the scientific community into closer contact with Congress, and Janis Tabor of the Council for Chemical Research, who discussed a "town meeting" approach for grass roots communication by scientists in the local districts and states of members of Congress.

The CSP also heard from James Turner, a staff member of the House Science Committee, and Tim Peterson of the House Appropriations Subcommittee with oversight responsibility for NSF. The Committee presented a certificate of appreciation to Turner for his advice and counsel over the past few years. Beverly Hartline of the Office of Science and Technology Policy presented an overview of the Clinton Administration's support for science and technology and discussed the stress that such discretionary funds were under because of efforts to balance the federal budget. Mike Lubell of the American Physical Society gave an

overview of APS efforts to involve their members in grassroots activities in support of science.

During CSP's second day of meetings we heard from Judy Sunley of NSF regarding NSF's involvement in the proposed national voluntary eighth-grade mathematics test. Following the discussion, CSP directed the chair (in cooperation with the chair of the Committee on Education) to write to the Department of Education and to NSF advocating a larger role for mathematicians in the development of the national test. The one noticeable result of this letter was that both AMS chairs were appointed to the Mathematics Committee which developed the specifications for the voluntary national test of mathematics at grade eight.

The CSP considered the AMS Council's resolution on AMS involvement with the U.S. National Committee on Mathematics (USNCM) and appointed CSP member Cora Sadosky to stay in contact with the USNCM chair, Mike Artin. The CSP was concerned, and remains concerned, that groups such as the CSP, or even the AMS Council, have very little input into issues such as how the U.S. delegation will vote on the location of ICM 2002. This is a matter that the Council should consider further for how best to influence the activities of the USNCM. One further concern of the CSP is the fact that the USNCM will now be housed at the International Relations branch of NAS, further distancing it from the mathematics community.

### Future Plans

A revised AMS National Policy Agenda is planned. In the meantime, that document and statements by the president on specific issues are available on the Web at the AMS site's Government Affairs section (see address below).

CSP also will actively support the AMS Washington Office's efforts to increase grassroots involvement by AMS members in support of funding for science.

Continued involvement is planned in the bipartisan congressional long-range Science and Technology Policy Study, conducted by Congressman Vernon Ehlers. AMS president Arthur Jaffe has taken part in initial discussions by the scientific community with Study staff. Members of the science community are invited to send comments about the future needs of science and technology via the House Science Committee's Web page ([http://www.house.gov/science/science\\_policy\\_study.htm](http://www.house.gov/science/science_policy_study.htm)).

### Science Policy on the Web

In 1997 increased news and information about science policy has been posted on the AMS Web site (<http://www.ams.org/government>), where you will find news on developments in Congress concerning science funding; alerts to AMS members to contact their members or senators about specific legislation; advice on how to contact Congress; latest federal budget information; text of addresses by CSP-sponsored speakers at national meetings; links to useful sites, such as the Ehlers' Study site listed above; and information on membership of CSP, our charge, and copies of our annual reports.