

American Mathematical Society Council Minutes

06 January 2004

Abstract

The Council of the Society met at 1:30 p.m. on Tuesday, 06 January 2004, in Regency Ballroom D of the Hyatt Regency Hotel, 122 N. Second Street, Phoenix, Arizona 85004.

These are the minutes of the meeting. Although several items were treated in Executive Session, all actions taken are reported in these minutes.

I. AGENDA

1. Call to Order

1.1. Opening of the Meeting and Introductions

The meeting began promptly at 1:30 p.m. President David Eisenbud, who presided throughout, called on the members and guests to introduce themselves and to mention past AMS meetings which they found memorable. The members present were Colin C. Adams, Hyman Bass, William Beckner, Eric Bedford, Sylvia T. Bozeman, John L. Bryant, Walter L. Craig, Robert J. Daverman, Keith J. Devlin, David Eisenbud, John M. Franks, Irene M. Gamba, Henri A. Gillet, Susan Hermiller, Michel Lapidus, Brian Marcus, John E. McCarthy, Donald E. McClure, David R. Morrison, Alexander Nagel, Louise A. Raphael, Donald G. Saari, Paul J. Sally, Chi-Wang Shu, B. A. Taylor, Karen Vogtmann, and Paul Zorn. The voting Associate Secretary was Michel Lapidus. Jerry Bona served as a delegate in place of Peter Landweber. Among the guests present were James W. Cannon (AMS Council-Elect), John Ewing (AMS Executive Director), Sandy Golden (Admin. Asst., AMS Secretary), Ron Graham (MAA President), Roger Howe (Chair, AMS Committee on Education), Allyn Jackson (AMS Staff), Jane Kister (Math. Reviews Executive Editor), James W. Maxwell (AMS AED), Sam Rankin (AMS AED), Tina Straley (MAA Executive Director), Jean Taylor (AMS Board of Trustees), John Thompson (CMS representative) and Carol Wood (AMS Board of Trustees).

Members elect who were in attendance were given privileges of the floor.

1.2. 2003 Council Elections

The Society conducted its annual elections in the fall of 2003. Except for the new members of the Nominating Committee, those elected will take office on February 1, 2004. The newly elected officers, members of the Council, the Editorial Boards Committee, the Nominating Committee and the Board of Trustees are listed under Item 4.1.

1.3. Retiring Members

The terms of Hyman Bass as Immediate Past President, of Ingrid Daubechies as Vice President, of Walter L. Craig, Keith J. Devlin, Irene Fonseca, Alexander Nagel and Louise A. Raphael as Members at Large of the Council, of Bernd Sturmfels as chair of the *Journal of the American Mathematical Society* Editorial Committee, and of Robert L. Bryant on the Executive Committee will end on 31 January 2004. This will be their final Council meeting in their current positions. The Council approved the Secretary's request to send thanks to each of them for sharing their wisdom with the Society and with the Council and for their service to the mathematical community.

1.4. Council Members

Lists of Council members can be found in Attachments A and B for the 2003 and 2004 Councils, respectively.

2. Minutes

2.1. Minutes of the April 2003 Council

The minutes of the 12 April 2003 Council were approved as distributed. These are available on the web at <http://www.ams.org/secretary/council-minutes/council-minutes0403.pdf>.

2.2. The 05/2003 and 11/2003 Executive Committee and Board of Trustees (ECBT) Meetings

The ECBT met in Providence RI May 2003 and November 2003. The minutes of those meetings, which had been distributed earlier, are considered part of the minutes of the Council.

3. Consent Agenda

There were no items on the Consent Agenda.

4. Reports of Boards and Standing Committees

4.1. Tellers' Reports on the 2003 AMS Elections [Executive Session]

The Society conducted its annual elections in the fall of 2003. The tellers reported that the following individuals were elected.

4.1.1. Tellers' Report on the Elections of Officers

Those elected will take office on February 1, 2004. The term of the President Elect is one year, followed by two years as President and then another year as Immediate Past President. Terms of the newly elected Vice President and the Members at Large of the Council are three years. The term of the Trustee is five years. The newly elected officers are:

President Elect	James G. Arthur, University of Toronto
Vice President	Vaughan F.R. Jones, University of California, Berkeley
Members at Large	James W. Cannon, Brigham Young University Sylvain E. Cappell, Courant Institute, NYU Beverly E.J. Diamond, College of Charleston Mark Goresky, Institute for Advanced Study Alejandro Uribe, University of Michigan
Trustee	Linda Keen, CUNY

4.1.2. Tellers' Report on Elections to the Nominating Committee

The following people were elected to the AMS Nominating Committee. Their terms of office are 01 January 2004 - 31 December 2006.

Annalisa Crannell
Arthur Jaffe
Joel H. Spencer

Franklin and Marshall College
Harvard University
Courant Institute, NYU

4.1.3. Tellers' Report on Elections to the Editorial Boards Committee

The following were elected to the Editorial Boards Committee. Their terms of office are 01 February 2004 - 31 January 2007.

Emma Previato
Karl Rubin

Boston University
Stanford University

4.1.4. Tellers' Report on the Bylaws Amendment

The amendment to the bylaws concerning eligibility criteria and dues amounts for life membership in the AMS was adopted.

The Council approved the Tellers' Report, which appears as Attachment C.

4.2. Editorial Boards Committee [Executive Session]

The Editorial Boards Committee (EBC) made recommendations about two appointments.

4.2.1. Reappointment to the Transactions and Memoirs of the AMS Editorial Committee

Upon the recommendation of the EBC the Council reappointed WILLIAM BECKNER as Managing Editor, Transactions and Memoirs of the AMS, for a one year term, 01 February 2004 - 31 January 2005.

4.2.2. Appointment to the Journal of the AMS Editorial Committee

Upon the recommendation of the EBC the Council appointed INGRID DAUBECHIES as Chief Editor, Journal of the AMS, for a three year term, 01 February 2004 - 31 Jan 2007.

4.3. Executive Committee and Board of Trustees (ECBT) [Executive Session]

Officers of the Society other than the President Elect, President, Immediate Past President and Vice Presidents are appointed by the Council, upon recommendation by the ECBT. The ECBT recommended reappointment of several officers, recommended initial appointment of another, and also made recommendations on two other matters.

4.3.1. Secretary

The Council appointed ROBERT J. DAVERMAN to a fourth term as Secretary. The new term runs 01 February 2005 - 31 January 2007.

4.3.2. Treasurer

The Council appointed JOHN M. FRANKS to a fourth term as Treasurer. The new term runs 01 February 2005 - 31 January 2007.

4.3.3. Associate Treasurer

The Council appointed DONALD E. MCCLURE to a second term as Associate Treasurer. The new term runs 01 February 2005 - 31 January 2007.

4.3.4. Associate Secretary for the Eastern Section

The Council appointed LESLEY SIBNER to a seventh term as Associate Secretary for the Eastern Section. The new term runs 01 February 2005 - 31 January 2007.

4.3.5. Associate Secretary for the Southeastern Section

John L. Bryant, the current Associate Secretary for the Southeastern Section, has declined reappointment. Based upon the suggestion of a Search Committee comprised of Robert Daverman (chair), Hugo Rossi and Carol Wood, the ECBT recommended the appointment of MATTHEW MILLER as Associate Secretary for the Southeastern Section for a two year term, effective 01 February 2005 and ending 31 January 2007. The Council appointed Miller to the post.

4.3.6. Committee on Science Policy Charge

At its May 2003 Meeting the Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC) reviewed the operation of the AMS Washington Office (roughly 10 years after its creation). There was widespread satisfaction with the overall operation of the Office. However, the LRPC was concerned that the charge to the Committee on Science Policy (CSP), which is closely connected to certain aspects of the Washington office, did not accurately reflect either current practice or intended goals. A subcommittee drafted a revised charge, which the LRPC approved and passed on to the ECBT, and the ECBT, in turn, recommended it to the Council. The proposed charge reads:

Principal Activities

To discuss and act on questions of policy as it affects the discipline.

- 1. To serve as a forum for dialogue about matters of science policy involving representatives of the AMS, government and quasi-government officials and other interested parties.**

2. **To be responsible for the selection of those elements of AMS meeting programs, such as lectures and panel discussions, which bear directly on such policy questions as are within the purview of the Committee.**
3. **To provide occasional advice to the Society on matters of broad scientific policy.**
4. **As a committee, and individually upon request, to interact with Federal agencies and policymakers.**
5. **To provide occasional advice about ways in which the Society can work favorably with other organizations on matters of science policy.**
6. **To conduct periodic reviews and appraisals of Society activities in areas of science policy, for example:**
 - **Policy Forums**
 - **The Society's relations with international societies and the international community**
 - **Scientific policies promoted by the Society, and strategies used to implement them**
 - **The ways in which the society collaborates with other organizations on matter of science policy**
7. **To prepare an annual report on the Committee's activities and goals for the AMS Council and for possible publication in the *Notices*.**

The Council adopted the proposed charge.

4.3.7. Associate Membership in ICIAM

The International Council for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (ICIAM), an umbrella organization consisting of mathematics societies whose primary purpose is to promote the interests of industrial and applied mathematics, recently (1999) created a new membership category of "Associate Member" in order to allow mathematics societies whose focus is not primarily on applied mathematics to join. Since the AMS represents research mathematics of all kinds and has many members in applied fields as well as industry, and since the AMS and ICIAM share common goals, the ECBT recommended applying to become an associate member of ICIAM. The Council approved.

4.4. Committee on Education

The Committee on Education (CoE) met in Washington, D.C. on 24-25 October 2003. Its annual report was filed with the Council and can be found in the AMS Committee Report Book as Report Number 031116-016. In addition, CoE conducted a review of the AMS Young Scholars Committee, and a report prepared by a reviewing subcommittee was filed and can be found in the AMS Committee Report Book as Report Number 031116-017. The CoE chair, Roger Howe, provided an oral report, which was followed by a discussion period.

4.5. Committee on Meetings and Conferences

The Committee on Meetings and Conferences met in Chicago IL on 29 March 2003. Its annual report was filed with the Council and can be found in the AMS Committee Report Book as Report Number 030501-013.

4.6. Committee on the Profession

The Committee on the Profession (CoProf) met in Chicago IL on 13 September 2003. Its annual report was filed with the Council and can be found in the AMS Committee Report Book as Report Number 031028-014. The committee chair, Walter Craig, provided an oral report, which was followed by a brief discussion period. In addition, CoProf put forward specific items requiring Council action.

4.6.1. Prize for an Exemplary Program or Achievement by a Mathematics Department

CoProf proposed that the AMS establish a new prize to be awarded for “Outstanding Achievement by a Mathematics Department... which has distinguished itself by undertaking an unusual or particularly effective program of value to the mathematics community.” The ECBT supported creation of this prize and suggested appropriate edits in the prize description to make it clear that all departments of mathematical sciences (in North America) would be eligible. During Council discussion of the edited prize description, it was moved to amend by replacing the words “Outstanding Achievement by” in the name of the prize with the words “an Exemplary Program or Achievement in”. The amendment carried. The amended proposal, reproduced below, was adopted.

The Award for an Exemplary Program or Achievement in a Mathematics Department recognizes a department which has distinguished itself by undertaking an unusual or particularly effective program of value to the mathematics community, internally or in relation to the rest of society. Examples might include a department that runs a notable minority outreach program, a department that has instituted an unusually effective industrial mathematics internship program, a department that has promoted mathematics so successfully that a large fraction of its university's undergraduate population majors in mathematics, or a department that has made some form of innovation in its research support to faculty and/or graduate students, or which has created a special and innovative environment for some aspect of mathematics research.

Prize Amount: \$1200

**(Coffee and doughnuts once a week for a departmental tea or seminar.
30 weeks x \$40 per week = \$1200.)**

Frequency: Once a year.

Eligibility: Departments of mathematical sciences in North America that offer at least a bachelors degree in mathematical sciences.

Nomination process: A letter of nomination may be submitted by one or more individuals. Nomination of the writer's own institution is permitted. The letter should describe the specific program(s) for which the department is being nominated as well as the achievements that make the program(s) an outstanding success, and may include any ancillary documents which support the success of the program(s). The letter should

not exceed two pages, with supporting documentation not to exceed an additional three pages.

Selection process. The selection committee shall consist of five members, appointed for three year terms. It should be broadly constituted, involving individuals drawn from various areas of the mathematical profession, such as a person working outside academia, one having experience with educational issues, or one from a department devoted solely to undergraduate mathematics. In addition, the committee should include at least one mathematician with administrative experience (e.g., a current or recent department chair).

In considering a department's achievements, the committee should seek to recognize achievement that 1) came about by systematic, reproducible changes in programs that might be implemented by others, and/or 2) may have value outside the mathematical community. The committee should keep in mind the full range of departments that make up the mathematics education community -- doctoral-granting, master's-granting, and bachelor's-granting departments --- and should seek to recognize outstanding departmental programs in all these areas, over time.

Deadlines: Nominations due by April 1 of the year preceding the annual meeting at which the award is to be presented. The selection committee should make its selection known to the Secretary by October 1.

4.6.2. Revisions to the AMS Ethical Guidelines

SEE ALSO JAN 2005 COUNCIL MINUTES, ITEM 2.2 FOR CORRECTION

CoProf recommended revisions to the AMS Ethical Guidelines. The major additions involve statements describing and deploring plagiarism in Part I of the Guidelines. Moreover, there are proposed editorial changes from various parts of the document. Attachment D contains a short history indicating reasons why this revision came forward, and it presents a marked version of the Guidelines which contrasts the old and new versions.

The discussion led to several amendments. See Amendment D for context. It was moved and seconded to amend the second bullet under **I. MATHEMATICAL RESEARCH AND ITS PRESENTATION** of Attachment D by changing the word "proper" to "appropriate" and by changing the phrase "and when only the results are known" to "or announced results". This amendment carried. It was moved and seconded to amend further by taking the paragraph immediately preceding **II. SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF MATHEMATICIANS** in Attachment D, interpolating it as a new bullet between the second and third bullets in the original, and rephrasing it to read "To publish full details of results that are announced without unreasonable delay, because claiming a result in advance of its having been achieved with reasonable certainty injures the community by restraining those working toward the same goal." This second amendment also carried. The revised guidelines, as amended, then were adopted, and they are:

ETHICAL GUIDELINES OF THE AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY

SEE ALSO JAN 2005 COUNCIL MINUTES, ITEM 2.2 FOR CORRECTIONS

To assist in its chartered goal, "...the furtherance of the interests of mathematical scholarship and research ...", and to help in the preservation of that atmosphere of mutual trust and ethical behavior required for science to prosper, the Council of the American Mathematical Society sets forth the following ethical guidelines. These guidelines reflect its expectations of behavior both for AMS members, as well as for all individuals and institutions in the wider mathematical community, including those engaged in the education or employment of mathematicians or in the publication of mathematics.

These guidelines are not a complete expression of the principles that underlie them. The guidelines are not meant to be a complete list of all ethical issues. They will be modified and amplified by events and experience. These are guidelines, not a collection of rigid rules.

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

I. MATHEMATICAL RESEARCH AND ITS PRESENTATION

The public reputation for honesty and integrity of the mathematical community and of the Society is its collective treasure and its publication record is its legacy.

The knowing presentation of another person's mathematical discovery as one's own constitutes plagiarism and is a serious violation of professional ethics. Plagiarism may occur for any type of work, whether written or oral and whether published or not.

The correct attribution of mathematical results is essential, both because it encourages creativity, by benefitting the creator whose career may depend on the recognition of the work and because it informs the community of when, where, and sometimes how original ideas entered into the chain of mathematical thought. To that end, mathematicians have certain responsibilities, which include the following:

- * To endeavor to be knowledgeable in their field, especially about work related to their research;
- * To give appropriate credit, even to unpublished materials and announced results (because the knowledge that something is true or false is valuable, however it is obtained);

- * To use no language that suppresses or improperly detracts from the work of others;
- * To correct in a timely way or to withdraw work that is erroneous.

A claim of independence may not be based on ignorance of widely disseminated results. On appropriate occasions, it may be desirable to offer or accept joint authorship when independent researchers find that they have produced identical results. All the authors listed for a paper, however, must have made a significant contribution to its content, and all who have made such a contribution must be offered the opportunity to be listed as an author. Because the free exchange of ideas necessary to promote research is possible only when every individual's contribution is properly recognized, the Society will not knowingly publish anything that violates this principle, and it will seek to expose egregious violations anywhere in the mathematical community.

To claim a result in advance of its having been achieved with reasonable certainty injures the community by restraining those working toward the same goal. Publication of the full details of results that are announced must not be unreasonably delayed.

II. SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF MATHEMATICIANS

The Society promotes mathematical research together with its unrestricted dissemination, and to that end encourages all to engage in this endeavor. Mathematical ability must be respected wherever it is found, without regard to race, gender, ethnicity, age, sexual orientation, religious belief, political belief, or disability.

The growing importance of mathematics in society at large and of public funding of mathematics may increasingly place members of the mathematical community in conflicts of interest. The appearance of bias in reviewing, refereeing, or in funding decisions must be scrupulously avoided, particularly where decisions may affect one's own research, that of colleagues, or of one's students. When conflicts of interest occur, one should withdraw from the decision-making process.

A recommendation accurately reflecting the writer's views is often given only on the understanding that it be kept confidential; therefore, a request for a recommendation must be assumed to carry an implicit promise of confidentiality, unless there is a statement to the contrary. Similarly, a referee's report is normally provided with the understanding that the name of the writer be withheld from certain interested parties, and the referee must be anonymous unless otherwise indicated in advance. The writer of the recommendation or report must respond fairly and keep confidential any privileged information, personal or mathematical, that the writer receives. If the requesting individual, institution, agency or company becomes aware that confidentiality or anonymity can not be maintained, that should be immediately communicated.

Where choices must be made and conflicts are unavoidable, as with editors or those who decide on appointments or promotions, it is essential to keep careful records that would demonstrate the process was indeed fair when inspected at a later time.

Freedom to publish must sometimes yield to security concerns, but mathematicians should resist excessive secrecy demands whether by government or private institutions.

When mathematical work may affect the public health, safety or general welfare, it is the responsibility of mathematicians to disclose the implications of their work to their employers and to the public, if necessary. Should this bring retaliation, the Society will examine the ways in which it may want to help the "whistle-blower", particularly when the disclosure has been made to the Society.

No one should be exploited by the offer of a temporary position at an unreasonably low salary and/or an unreasonably heavy work load.

III. EDUCATION AND GRANTING OF DEGREES

Holding a Ph.D. degree is virtually indispensable to an academic career in mathematics and is becoming increasingly important as a certificate of competence in the wider job market. An institution granting a degree in mathematics is certifying that competence and must take full responsibility for it by insuring the high level and originality of the Ph.D. dissertation work, and sufficient knowledge by the recipient of important branches of mathematics outside the scope of the thesis. When there is evidence of plagiarism it must be carefully investigated, even if it comes to light after granting the degree, and, if proven, the degree should be revoked.

Mathematicians and organizations involved in advising graduate students should fully inform them about the employment prospects they may face upon completion of their degrees.

IV. PUBLICATIONS

Editors are responsible for the timely refereeing of articles and must judge articles by the state of knowledge at the time of submission. Editors should accept a paper for publication only if they are reasonably certain the paper is correct.

The contents of submitted manuscript should be regarded by a journal as privileged information. If the contents of a paper become known in advance of publication solely as a result of its submission to or handling by a journal, and if a later paper based on knowledge of the privileged information is received anywhere (by the same or another journal), then any editor aware of the facts must refuse or delay publication of the later paper until after publication of the first---unless the first author agrees to earlier publication of the later paper.

At the time a manuscript is submitted, editors should notify authors whenever a large backlog of accepted papers may produce inordinate delay in publication. A journal may not delay publication of a paper for reasons of an editor's self interest or of any interest other than the author's. The published article should bear the date on which the manuscript was originally submitted to the journal for publication, together with the dates of any revisions. Editors must be given and accept full scientific responsibility for their journals; when a demand is made by an outside agency for prior review or censorship of articles, that demand must be resisted and, in any event, knowledge of the demand must be made public.

Both editors and referees must respect the confidentiality of materials submitted to them unless these materials have previously been made public, and above all may not appropriate

to themselves ideas in work submitted to them or do anything that would impair the rights of authors to the fruits of their labors. Editors must preserve the anonymity of referees unless there is a credible allegation of misuse.

All mathematical publishers, particularly those who draw without charge on the resources of the mathematical community through the use of unpaid editors and referees, must recognize that they have made a compact with the community to disseminate information, and that compact must be weighed in their business decisions.

The Society will not take part in the publishing, printing or promoting of any research journal where there is some acceptance criterion, stated or unstated, that conflicts with the principles of these guidelines. It will promote the quick refereeing and timely publication of articles accepted to its journals.

4.6.3. Life Membership in the AMS

In the Fall 2003 election the membership approved an amendment to the AMS bylaws that allows the eligibility and dues level for life membership in the AMS to be set by the Council, subject to approval by the Board of Trustees (BT). Before the election was concluded, but subject to passage of this bylaws amendment, CoProf recommended certain changes in the criteria for life membership. The BT approved that proposal, which is spelled out below, and the EC recommended it the Council.

Life Membership

A person may become a life member by making a single payment of dues determined by age at the start of the membership year according to the following:

Age 60 or above: five times ordinary high dues,

Age 50 or above: ten times ordinary high dues,

Age 40 or above: fifteen times ordinary dues.

A life member is subsequently relieved of the obligation of paying dues. The status and privileges are those of ordinary members.

An exception to the above would be made for a person who is currently a member by reciprocity, has been a member by reciprocity for the previous two years and asserts the intention of continuing to be a member by reciprocity. Such a person may purchase life membership by a single payment of dues determined by the formula above but with ordinary high dues replaced with reciprocity dues.

The Council approved. These new eligibility criteria will be put into effect for renewals for the 2005 membership year.

4.7. Committee on Publications

The Committee on Publications (CPub) met in Chicago on 19-20 September 2003. Its annual report

was filed with the Council and can be found in the AMS Committee Report Book as Report Number 031029-015. The committee chair, Robert Bryant, was invited to provide an oral report. Since Bryant could not attend, David Morrison delivered a report, which was followed by a brief discussion period.

4.7.1. AMS Copyright Policy

During its meeting, CPub reviewed the Society's copyright policy for journal articles, proceedings and collections. While CPub strongly endorsed the essence of that policy, it also recommended minor modifications in order to anticipate potential problems in the future. The recommended new policy, with a slight change, was unanimously endorsed by the ECBT at its November 2003 meeting. Background information is provided in Attachment E.

AMS Copyright Policy (Proposed) (for journals, proceedings, and collections)

- **AMS desires that authors transfer copyright but permits authors to hold copyright in exchange for broad rights given to the AMS,**
- **AMS will allow a flexible range of reproduction, including inclusions of AMS published articles in publications of other publishers without permission or fees and electronic distribution over internet as long as it is not part of a fee-based document delivery service,**
- **AMS will at the time of publication permit an author to dedicate an article to the public domain 28 years after the date of publication.**

The Council approved the proposed policy.

4.7.2. Editorial Guidelines

CPub also discussed the operation of the AMS research journals. It was agreed that the journals are healthy in almost every respect. Nonetheless, at this meeting (as at past meetings) the Committee expressed concern about the time-to-decision for papers submitted to the Society's journals. To supplement other initiatives designed to shorten that time, CPub recommended that the Society adopt a set of simple guidelines to help editors (especially new editors) to deal with submissions expeditiously. Background information and the recommended guidelines can be found in Attachment F.

It was moved and seconded to refer these guidelines back to committee, and the motion to refer was passed.

4.8. Committee on Science Policy

The annual report of the Committee on Science Policy, which met in Washington, D.C., on 12-13 April 2003, was filed with the Council and can be found in the AMS Committee Report Book as Report Number 030423-012.

4.9. Fan Fund Committee

The annual report of the committee was filed with the Council and can be found in the AMS Committee Report Book as Report Number 031201-010.

4.10. AMS Library Committee

The annual report of the committee was filed with the Council and can be found in the AMS Committee Report Book as Report Number 031114-008.

4.11 Mathematical Reviews Editorial Committee

The annual report of the committee was filed with the Council and can be found in the AMS Committee Report Book as Report Number 031208-011.

4.12. Arnold Ross Lecture Committee

The annual report of the committee was filed with the Council and can be found in the AMS Committee Report Book as Report Number 031112-007.

4.13. AMS Young Scholars Committee

The 2002 and 2003 annual report of the committee were filed with the Council and can be found in the AMS Committee Report Book as Report Number 030329-001 and Number 031118-009.

4.14. AMS-MAA Committee on Research in Undergraduate Mathematics in Education (CRUME).

The annual report of the committee was filed with the Council and can be found in the AMS Committee Report Book as Report Number 0321110-006.

4.15. AMS Committee on Professional Ethics.

The annual report of the committee was filed with the Council and can be found in the AMS Committee Report Book as Report Number 031211-017.

5. Old Business

No old business was treated at the meeting.

6. New Business

No new business was raised at the meeting.

7. Announcements, Information and Record

7.1. Budget

The Board of Trustees (BT) adopted the budget for 2004 as presented at the BT meeting of 21 November 2003.

7.2. Electronic Voting in AMS Elections

The 2003 AMS election marked the first time that AMS members were provided the option of voting electronically via a secure web connection. The AMS's service provider, Survey and Ballot Systems (SBS), handled all aspects of ballot distribution and tabulation, both paper and electronic. The voting process went smoothly. SBS proved itself to be an outstanding vendor of election services, flexible in its approach to setting up our election and extremely responsive to any questions, concerns, or adjustments in procedures.

The balloting process was implemented precisely as envisioned at the time the Council approved adding the option of electronic voting in January 2003. In late May, all members who had elected to receive the annual email reminder to update their membership information -- approximately 18,000 people -- were notified electronically that they would be sent their individualized voting instructions via email in the fall unless they elected to receive a traditional paper ballot. All remaining members were set to receive traditional paper ballots but retained the option of voting online after receiving ballot materials.

At the end of August, SBS emailed voting instructions to 17,300 members and sent paper ballots to the remainder. The email contained the link to SBS's voting web site and the two pieces of information that an individual needed to login in to vote: their AMS member code and their E-Signature (a unique code generated for each member by SBS). This same information was included with each paper ballot, allowing these members to also vote online. All the candidate materials were available online as well as in the September issue of the AMS *Notices*.

Reminders were sent on October 1 and October 30 to those who were scheduled to vote electronically (only) but who had not submitted their votes (by either method) as of those dates. Voting ended at midnight on Friday, 07 November 2003.

7.3. Next Council Meeting

The next AMS Council Meeting will be held Saturday, 03 April 2004, in Washington, D.C., starting 1:30 p.m. It is worth noting that the AMS Committee on Science Policy will be meeting in the same hotel 2-3 April 2004, ending with lunch on Saturday, just before the Council meeting begins, which Council members are invited to attend. As usual, a significant component of the Council meeting will be the actual nomination of candidates for election to AMS offices, as proposed by the Nominating Committee. In addition, plans are to have an oral report from the Committee on Science Policy (none from the Committee on Meetings and Conferences, whose next meeting is scheduled for later in April). There will be a Council discussion period about issues concerning AMS membership, which is the topic for the AMS focused planning effort in 2004. Two subissues of crucial importance will be (1) how to retain Nominee AMS members and (2) whether to make some parts of the archived AMS *Notices* a benefit available only to members.

The deadline for receipt of materials for the April 2004 meeting agenda is 02 March 2004.

8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

II. ATTACHMENTS

ATTACHMENT A

2003 AMS GOVERNANCE

2003 COUNCIL

Officers

President	David Eisenbud	MSRI/Univ. of California, Berkeley	2004
Immed. Past President	Hyman Bass	University of Michigan	2003
Vice Presidents	Ingrid Daubechies	Princeton University	2003
	Hugo Rossi	University of Utah	2004
	Karen Vogtmann	Cornell University	2005
Secretary	Robert J. Daverman	University of Tennessee	2004
Associate Secretaries	John L. Bryant	Florida State University	2004
	Michel Lapidus	University of California, Riverside	2005
	Susan Friedlander	University of Illinois at Chicago	2005
	Lesley Sibner	Polytechnic Institute of NY	2004
	John M. Franks	Northwestern University	2004
Treasurer	John M. Franks	Northwestern University	2004
Associate Treasurer	Donald E. McClure	Brown University	2004

Representatives of Committees

Bulletin Editorial	Donald G. Saari, Chair	Univ. California, Irvine	2004
Colloquium Editorial	Susan Friedlander, Chair	Univ. Illinois at Chicago	2004
Executive Committee	Robert L. Bryant	Duke University	2003
Executive Committee	Walter L. Craig	McMaster University	2006
Executive Committee	David R. Morrison	Duke University	2004
Executive Committee	Hugo Rossi	University of Utah	2005
Journal of the AMS	Bernd Sturmfels, Chair	Univ. California, Berkeley	2003
Math Reviews Editorial	B. A. Taylor, Chair	University of Michigan	2004
Math Surveys & Monographs	Peter S. Landweber, Chair	Rutgers University.	2004
Mathematics of Computation	Chi-Wang Shu, Chair	Brown University	2004
Proceedings Editorial	Eric Bedford, Chair	Indiana University	2004
Transactions and Memoirs	William Beckner, Chair	University of Texas at Austin	2003

Members at Large

Colin C. Adams	Williams College	2004
Sylvia T. Bozeman	Spelman College	2004
Walter L. Craig	McMaster University	2003
Keith J. Devlin	Stanford University	2003
Irene Fonseca	Carnegie Mellon University	2003

MAL (con't)

Irene M. Gamba	University of Texas at Austin	2004
Henri A. Gillet	University of Illinois at Chicago	2004
Susan M. Hermiller	University of Nebraska	2005
Brian H. Marcus	University of British Columbia	2005
John E. McCarthy	Washington University	2005
David R. Morrison	Duke University	2004
Alexander Nagel	University of Wisconsin	2003
Louise A. Raphael	Howard University	2003
Paul J. Sally, Jr.	University of Chicago	2005
Paul Zorn	St. Olaf College	2005

2003 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Hyman Bass	University of Michigan	<i>ex officio</i>
Robert L. Bryant	Duke University	2003
Walter L. Craig	McMaster University	2006
Robert J. Daverman	University of Tennessee	<i>ex officio</i>
David Eisenbud	MSRI/Univ. California, Berkeley	<i>ex officio</i>
David R. Morrison	Duke University	2004
Hugo Rossi	University of Utah	2005

2003 BOARD OF TRUSTEES

John B. Conway	University of Tennessee	2005
David Eisenbud	MSRI/Univ. California, Berkeley	<i>ex officio</i>
John M. Franks	Northwestern University	<i>ex officio</i>
Eric M. Friedlander	Northwestern University	2004
Linda Keen	CUNY	2003
Donald E. McClure	Brown University	<i>ex officio</i>
Jean E. Taylor	Rutgers University	2007
Carol S. Wood	Wesleyan University	2006

ATTACHMENT B

2004 AMS GOVERNANCE

2004 COUNCIL

Officers

President	David Eisenbud	MSRI/Univ. California, Berkeley	2004
President Elect	James G. Arthur	University of Toronto	2004
Vice Presidents	Vaughan F.R. Jones	University of California, Berkeley	2006
	Hugo Rossi	University of Utah	2004
	Karen Vogtmann	Cornell University	2005
	Robert J. Daverman	University of Tennessee	2006
Secretary	John L. Bryant	Florida State University	2004
Associate Secretaries	Michel Lapidus	University of California, Riverside	2005
	Susan Friedlander	University of Illinois at Chicago	2005
	Lesley Sibner	Polytechnic Institute of NY	2006
	John M. Franks	Northwestern University	2006
Treasurer	John M. Franks	Northwestern University	2006
Associate Treasurer	Donald E. McClure	Brown University	2006

Representatives of Committees

Bulletin Editorial	Donald G. Saari, Chair	Univ. California, Irvine	2004
Colloquium Editorial	Susan Friedlander, Chair	Univ. Illinois at Chicago	2004
Executive Committee	Walter L. Craig	McMaster University	2006
Executive Committee	David R. Morrison	Duke University	2004
Executive Committee	Hugo Rossi	University of Utah	2005
Journal of the AMS	Ingrid Daubechies, Chair	Princeton University	2006
Math Reviews Editorial	B. A. Taylor, Chair	University of Michigan	2004
Math Surveys & Monographs	Peter S. Landweber, Chair	Rutgers University.	2004
Mathematics of Computation	Chi-Wang Shu, Chair	Brown University	2004
Proceedings Editorial	Eric Bedford, Chair	Indiana University	2004
Transactions and Memoirs	William Beckner, Chair	University of Texas at Austin	2004

Members at Large

Colin C. Adams	Williams College	2004
Sylvia T. Bozeman	Spelman College	2004
James W. Cannon	Brigham Young University	2006
Sylvain E. Cappell	Courant Institute, NYU	2006
Beverly E. J. Diamond	College of Charleston	2006

MAL (con't)

Irene M. Gamba	University of Texas at Austin	2004
Henri A. Gillet	University of Illinois at Chicago	2004
Mark Goresky	Institute for Advanced Study	2006
Susan M. Hermiller	University of Nebraska	2005
Brian H. Marcus	University of British Columbia	2005
John E. McCarthy	Washington University	2005
David R. Morrison	Duke University	2004
Paul J. Sally, Jr.	University of Chicago	2005
Alejandro Uribe	University of Michigan	2006
Paul Zorn	St. Olaf College	2005

2004 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

James G. Arthur	University of Toronto	<i>ex officio</i>
Walter L. Craig	McMaster University	2006
Robert J. Daverman	University of Tennessee	<i>ex officio</i>
David Eisenbud	MSRI/Univ. California, Berkeley	<i>ex officio</i>
David R. Morrison	Duke University	2004
Hugo Rossi	University of Utah	2005
		2007

2004 BOARD OF TRUSTEES

John B. Conway	National Science Foundation	2005
David Eisenbud	MSRI/Univ. California, Berkeley	<i>ex officio</i>
John M. Franks	Northwestern University	<i>ex officio</i>
Eric M. Friedlander	Northwestern University	2004
Linda Keen	CUNY	2008
Donald E. McClure	Brown University	<i>ex officio</i>
Jean E. Taylor	Rutgers University	2007
Carol S. Wood	Wesleyan University	2006

ATTACHMENT C



THE AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY
ELECTION OF OFFICERS FOR 2004
OFFICIAL RESULTS

President (Two Years)

	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Percent</u>
James G. Arthur	2,349	49.1%
Donald G. Saari	2,039	42.6%
Write_In	13	0.3%
No Vote	386	8.1%
Invalid	0	

Vice President (Three Years)

	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Vaughan F.R. Jones	2,352	49.1%
Nolan R. Wallach	1,913	40.0%
Write_In	15	0.3%
No Vote	507	10.6%
Invalid	0	

Trustee (Five Years)

	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Lenore Blum	1,667	34.8%
Linda Keen	2,450	51.2%
Write_In	18	0.4%
No Vote	652	13.6%
Invalid	0	



THE AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY
ELECTION OF OFFICERS FOR 2004
OFFICIAL RESULTS

Member at Large of the Council (Three Years)
(Vote for no more than Five)

	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Percent</u>
James W. Cannon	1,764	36.8%
Sylvain E. Cappell	2,081	43.5%
Beverly E.J. Diamond	2,098	43.8%
Mark Goresky	1,879	39.3%
Jacvques Hurtubise	1,535	32.1%
Kevin P. Knudson	1,669	34.9%
Michael T. Lacey	1,462	30.5%
Fred Stephen Roberts	1,735	36.2%
Alejandro Uribe	2,124	44.4%
Write_In	77	1.6%
No Vote	383	8.0%
Invalid	1	

Editorial Boards Committee (Three Years)

	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Percent</u>
David L. Colton	1,496	31.3%
Emma Previato	2,052	42.9%
Daniel Ruberman	1,249	26.1%
Karl Rubin	2,360	49.3%
No Vote	879	18.4%
Invalid	0	



THE AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY
ELECTION OF OFFICERS FOR 2004
OFFICIAL RESULTS

Nominating Committee (Three Years)

	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Annalisa Crannell	2,171	45.4%
Denis DeTurck	1,394	29.1%
Arthur M. Jaffe	2,278	47.6%
Robion C. Kirby	1,789	37.4%
Thomas G. Kurtz	1,317	27.5%
Joel H. Spencer	2,038	42.6%
No Vote	567	11.8%
Invalid	0	

Amendments to the AMS Bylaws

	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Approve	3,730	77.9%
Disapprove	354	7.4%
No Vote	703	14.7%
Invalid	0	

ATTACHMENT D

CoProf Proposal to revise the AMS Ethical Guidelines

In response to an inquiry regarding plagiarism, Secretary Daverman found no applicable statement in the current AMS Ethical Guidelines. At the Secretary's request and on behalf of CoProf, the Committee on Professional Ethics (COPE) reviewed the current AMS Ethical Guidelines to determine if a statement regarding plagiarism would be beneficial. In a May 2003 report, John Meakin, the chair of COPE, recommended that a paragraph be appended to the current ethics statement.

At its September 13, 2003 meeting CoProf reviewed the draft paragraph on plagiarism, which COPE recommended appending to the current AMS Ethical Guidelines. CoProf formed a subcommittee consisting of Charles Akemann (Chair), John Ewing and Eric Slade to review and revise, if necessary, the entire current AMS Ethical Guidelines.

The final wording approved by CoProf appears below.

ETHICAL GUIDELINES OF THE AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY

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

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

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

I. MATHEMATICAL RESEARCH AND ITS PRESENTATION

The public reputation for honesty and integrity of the mathematical community and of the Society is its collective treasure and its publication record is its legacy.

The knowing presentation of another person's mathematical discovery as one's own constitutes plagiarism and is a serious violation of professional ethics. Plagiarism may occur for any type of work, whether written or oral and whether published or not.

The correct attribution of mathematical results is essential, both as it encourages creativity, by benefiting the creator whose career may depend on the recognition of the work; and ~~as~~ **because** it informs the community of when, where, and sometimes how original ideas ~~have~~ entered into the chain of mathematical thought. To that end, mathematicians have certain responsibilities, which include the following:

- * To endeavor to be knowledgeable in their field, especially ~~as regards related work:~~ **about work related to their research;**
- * To give proper credit, (even to unpublished **material and when only the results are known** (~~sources~~ because the knowledge that something is true or false is valuable, however it is obtained);
- * To use no language that suppresses or improperly detracts from the work of others;
- * To correct in a timely way or **to** withdraw work that is erroneous. ~~or previously published.~~

A claim of independence may not be based on ignorance of ~~well~~ **widely** disseminated results. ~~Errors and oversights can occur, but it is the responsibility of the person making the error to set the record straight.~~ On appropriate occasions, it may be desirable to offer or accept joint authorship when independent researchers find that they have produced identical results. ~~However,~~ **All** the authors listed for a paper, **however,** must ~~all~~ have made a significant contribution to its content, and all who have made such a contribution must be offered the opportunity to be listed as an author. ~~To claim a result in advance of its having been achieved with reasonable certainty injures the community by restraining those working toward the same goal. Publication of results that are announced must not be unreasonably delayed.~~ Because the free exchange of ideas necessary to promote research is possible only when every individual's contribution is properly recognized, the Society will not knowingly publish anything that violates this principle, and it will seek to expose egregious violations anywhere in the mathematical community.

To claim a result in advance of its having been achieved with reasonable certainty injures the community by restraining those working toward the same goal. Publication of the full details of results that are announced must not be unreasonably delayed.

II. SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF MATHEMATICIANS

The Society promotes mathematical research together with its unrestricted dissemination, and to that end encourages all ~~and will strive to afford equal opportunity to all~~ to engage in this endeavor. Mathematical ability must be respected wherever it is found, without regard to race, gender, ethnicity, age, sexual orientation, religious **belief**, ~~or~~ political belief, or disability.

The growing importance of mathematics in society at large and of public funding of mathematics may increasingly place members of the mathematical community in conflicts of interest. The appearance of bias in reviewing, refereeing, or in funding decisions must be scrupulously avoided, particularly where decisions may affect one's own research, that of close colleagues, or of one's students; ~~in extreme cases one must withdraw.~~ **When conflicts of interest occur, one should withdraw from the decision-making process.**

A recommendation accurately reflecting the writer's views is often given only on the understanding that it be kept confidential; therefore, a request for a recommendation must be assumed to carry an implicit promise of confidentiality, unless there is a statement to the contrary. Similarly, A a reference or referee's report fully and accurately reflecting the writer's views is often given only on is normally provided with the understanding that it be confidential or that the name of the writer be withheld from certain interested parties; therefore, a request for a reference or report must be assumed, unless there is a statement to the contrary, to carry an implicit promise of confidentiality or anonymity which must be carefully kept unless negated by law, and the referee must be anonymous unless otherwise indicated in advance. The writer of the **reply recommendation or report** must respond fairly; and keep confidential any privileged information, personal or mathematical, that the writer receives. If the requesting individual, institution, agency or company becomes aware that confidentiality or anonymity can not be maintained, that **must should be** immediately be communicated, ~~and if known in advance, must be stated in the original request.~~

Where choices must be made and conflicts are unavoidable, as with editors or those who decide on appointments or promotions, it is essential to keep careful records ~~which, even if held confidential at the time, that would, when opened, demonstrate that~~ the process was, indeed, fair **when inspected at a later time.**

Freedom to publish must sometimes yield to security concerns, but mathematicians should resist excessive secrecy demands whether by government or private institutions.

When mathematical work may affect the public health, safety or general welfare, it is the responsibility of mathematicians to disclose the implications of their work to their employers and to the public, if necessary. Should this bring retaliation, the Society will examine the ways in which it may want to help the "whistle-blower", particularly when the disclosure has been made to the Society.

No one should be exploited by the offer of a temporary position at an unreasonably low salary and/or an unreasonably heavy work load.

III. EDUCATION AND GRANTING OF DEGREES

Holding a Ph.D. degree is virtually indispensable to an academic career in mathematics and is becoming increasingly important as a certificate of competence in the wider job market. An institution granting a degree in mathematics is certifying that competence and must take full responsibility for it by insuring the high level and originality of the ~~thesis~~ **Ph.D. dissertation** work, and sufficient knowledge by the recipient of important branches of mathematics outside the scope of the thesis. ~~The original results in a thesis should be publishable in a recognized journal.~~ When there is evidence of plagiarism it must be carefully investigated, even if it comes to light after granting the degree, and, if proven, the degree should be revoked.

Mathematicians and organizations involved in advising graduate students should ~~honestly~~ fully inform them about the employment prospects they may face upon completion of their degrees. ~~No one should be exploited by the offer of a temporary position at a low salary and/or a heavy work load.~~

IV. PUBLICATIONS

~~The Society will not take part in the publishing, printing or promoting of any research journal where there is some acceptance criterion, stated or unstated, that conflicts with the principles of these guidelines. It will promote the quick refereeing and timely publication of articles accepted to its journals.~~

Editors are responsible for the timely refereeing of articles and must judge articles by the state of knowledge at the time of submission. Editors ~~and referees~~ should accept a paper for publication only if they are reasonably certain the paper is correct.

The contents of ~~an unpublished and uncirculated paper~~ **submitted manuscript** should be regarded by a journal as privileged information. If the contents of a paper become known in advance of publication solely as a result of its submission to or handling by a journal, and if a later paper based on knowledge of the privileged information is received anywhere (by the same or another journal), then any editor aware of the facts must refuse or delay publication of the later paper until after publication of the first---unless the first author agrees to earlier publication of the later paper.

At the time a manuscript is submitted, editors should notify authors whenever a large backlog of accepted papers may produce inordinate delay in publication. A journal may not delay publication of a paper for reasons of an editor's self interest or of any interest other than the author's. The published article should bear the date on which the manuscript was originally submitted to the journal for publication, together with the dates of any revisions. Editors must be given and accept full scientific responsibility for their journals; when a demand is made by an outside agency for prior review or censorship of so-called "sensitive" articles, that demand must be resisted and, in any event, knowledge of the demand must be made public.

~~All mathematical publishers, particularly those who draw without charge on the resources of the mathematical community through the use of unpaid editors and referees, must recognize that they have made a compact with the community to disseminate information, and that compact must be weighed in their business decisions.~~

Both editors and referees must respect the confidentiality of materials submitted to them unless these **materials** have previously been made public, and above all may not appropriate to themselves ideas in work submitted to them or do anything that would impair the rights of authors to the fruits of their labors. Editors must preserve the anonymity of referees unless there is a credible allegation of misuse.

~~These are ethical obligations of all persons or organizations controlling mathematical publications, whatever their designation.~~

All mathematical publishers, particularly those who draw without charge on the resources of the mathematical community through the use of unpaid editors and referees, must recognize that they have made a compact with the community to disseminate information, and that compact must be weighed in their business decisions.

The Society will not take part in the publishing, printing or promoting of any research journal where there is some acceptance criterion, stated or unstated, that conflicts with the principles of these guidelines. It will promote the quick refereeing and timely publication of articles accepted to its journals.

ATTACHMENT E

AMS Copyright Policy

The American Mathematical Society has a 'progressive' copyright policy, which was put in place about ten years ago.

Most people think that the 'progressive' part of our policy deals with transfer of copyright: The AMS does not require authors to transfer copyright to the Society, instead allowing authors to give the Society a license to publish if they choose. But the truly progressive part of the Society's policy is something else: The AMS gives authors (and others) broad rights to use the material for scholarly purposes. Section 4 of the copyright agreement reads in part:

The Work may be reproduced by any means for educational and scientific purposes by the Author(s) or by others without fee or permission with the exception of reproduction by services that collect fees for delivery of documents. The Author(s) may use part or all of this Work or its image in any future works of his/her (their) own.

Allowing authors to keep the copyright gave the AMS a reputation as radical; giving them the right to use their articles for many purposes, almost without restriction, actually *was* radical.

Much has changed in scholarly publishing during the past 10 years. And for many reasons, this is a good time to update the Society's copyright policy for journals.

History of AMS Policy

The history of our copyright policy begins with controversy. The movement to modify the AMS copyright policy had its roots in 1989, when several mathematicians objected to transferring copyright to the AMS, which at the time was required for publication. The argument was simple and clear: Demanding transfer of copyright was unnecessary when a simple license to publish would suffice.

The AMS responded cautiously and slowly. The copyright form was changed, although not dramatically. The AMS borrowed ideas from the American Physical Society (perhaps infringing the copyright on their copyright agreement). The AMS staff consulted with publication attorneys. Meanwhile, publishing 'experts' debated copyright and saw disaster looming if changes were made to time-honored traditions. It was an odd time. Elsevier was held up as a model for a liberal copyright policy (since modified). The AMS and many other society publishers were seen as conservative.

By the April 1993 Council meeting, the Board of Trustees had appointed a special committee to study the copyright issue (because it had financial implications as well as scientific). In the meantime, the five policy committees were formed during 1993, which included the Committee on Publications. Those committees started to function during 1993, and Cpub naturally took on the copyright issue. The Chair appointed a subcommittee (Jaco and Lieb) to make recommendations. Those recommendations came to the May 1994 ECBT meeting, and subsequently to the August 1994 Council. They were approved, with minor modification, by both.

The final policy for journals was simple and straightforward

AMS Copyright Policy
(for journals, proceedings, and collections)

- AMS desires that authors transfer copyright but permits authors to hold copyright in exchange for broad rights (consent) to publish,
- AMS will allow a flexible range of reproduction, including inclusions of AMS published articles in publications of other publishers without permission or fees and electronic distribution over internet as long as it is not part of a document delivery service, and
- AMS will provide 50 free off-prints per article, a copy of an AMS published book, if the article appears in the book, and an electronic copy of the production files.

There was a corresponding statement for books, but it was less clear:

- At contract signing the AMS agrees to provisionally publish the work as a book,
- AMS desires that authors transfer copyright but permits authors to hold copyright in exchange for broad rights (consent) to publish; however, the author contracts not to use essentially the same material in any competing publication for a period of time that includes a period where there may be risk to the AMS financial investment,
- AMS will negotiate a royalty, will negotiate that a certain number of copies of the book go to the author, gratis, and will sell unlimited numbers of the book to the author, for personal use, at the member discount rate.

Copyright for Books

Why don't authors sign a copyright agreement for monographs? They do. The copyright terms, along with details about what rights fall to the publisher and author(s), are spelled out in the contract, which is negotiated with all authors. Occasionally, authors keep the copyright, giving the AMS an exclusive license to publish the work (which may expire after some years.) Copyright for monographs is therefore governed by contract law, and in many ways is far simpler to administer.

After agreement was reached on policy, a Consent to Publish agreement was crafted to implement that policy, which is included at the end of this document.

In the ensuing 8 years, only a small number of authors have kept the copyright for their articles (103 out of 7465, or 1.4%). But many authors have benefited from the right to use their articles for scholarly purposes—posting them on websites, circulating articles freely, and incorporating the material in subsequent publications. Disaster did not strike the Society's journals, and the progressive policy on copyright brought the Society much goodwill. It is a good policy. Nonetheless, there are some small problems with the Society's implementation of its copyright policy, and those problems should be fixed.

Reforming Copyright

When scholars debated copyright a decade ago, those who debated had a variety of motivations and goals. Some reformers foresaw the coming revolution in scholarly communication and wanted to be certain authors had the ability to use their articles in suitable ways. They wanted to expand the rights of authors (and other scholars) in copyright agreements. Other reformers, however, viewed publishers as inherently unscrupulous and unreliable. They wanted to limit the rights of publishers in order to prevent future abuses. Both groups promoted the idea of author-held copyright.

Most of the arguments against reform focused on the effects that changed agreements would have on journals and scholars today (just as most of the arguments *for* reform extolled the benefits to scholars today). But a few of those who argued against reform worried about the future. They wondered what scholarly communication would look like many years in the future if all authors held the copyright to their articles. Where would one go to obtain permission to use a particular article fifty years in the future? How could anyone compile collections? How would a publisher sell the rights to journals to someone else in order to keep back volumes in print?

A decade ago, these concerns were not taken seriously. Reformers who cared mainly about author rights viewed them as unimportant. (Who would bother to ask authors for permission anyway? Who would care?) Reformers who didn't trust publishers saw the inability of publishers to make use of journal articles in the future as a benefit. There seems to have been little response to these hypothetical problems, and in particular they were not addressed when the AMS implemented its copyright policy (by creating the Consent to Publish agreement).

Recent projects to digitize the past literature have changed all this. The projects have shown that the concerns about author-held copyright, and how it might affect scholars many decades in the future, are not hypothetical at all. The digitization projects have shown us that copyright may be an enormous problem for scholarly publishing in the future.

In much of Europe, these projects face a serious copyright problem because the law is intertwined with the notion of author rights—rights that are often inalienable (can't be transferred) and/or perpetual. In many European countries, even when copyright resides with the publisher, one is expected to obtain permission from the author (or the author's heirs) before updating any work, and that includes digitization. One has to obtain permission whenever a work is changed (which may include something as simple as adding links to the references in an article.) Digitizing an entire run of a journal may therefore require contacting tens of thousands of authors or their heirs, usually many decades after articles were written. This may be an insurmountable obstacle to digitization projects (although most current projects are experimenting with ways to circumvent or ignore the problem).

American copyright law makes things simpler, at least in principle. Since authors can transfer the copyright to the publisher, it is the *publisher* who most often holds all copyrights for the material in a journal. When someone wants to digitize, migrate, or update the material, only the publisher has to give permission. For example, when all four AMS primary journals went online at JSTOR in 1995, the Society could unambiguously give JSTOR permission to do the work. (For the material prior to 1991, the Society held all copyrights.) Under American copyright law, the publisher can guarantee that an entire journal can be updated, migrated, or archived.

The AMS progressive copyright policy may move the Society's publications closer to the European model. Suppose that each year, only a few dozen authors keep the copyright for their articles. At the end of 30 years, the Society or some other organization desires to include our journals in some new collection of materials, in some yet unknown format, with some yet unimagined enhancements. We might be faced with the prospect of 50,000 articles, for which the copyrights on 1,000 belong to the authors (or the authors' heirs). Obtaining permission from these 1,000 would be virtually impossible, or at least wildly expensive.

When discussions took place a dozen years ago, the idea of transforming vast collections of the older literature into new formats was not on anyone's mind. The thrust of the effort was to create an environment in which *today's* authors were treated well by *today's* publishers. Now, however, with some experience, we recognize that we should be thinking about tomorrow's scholars as well as today's.

Fixing the Problem

Our copyright policy is fundamentally sound; we shouldn't alter the policy in fundamental ways. The goal is to make very minor changes in order to anticipate potential problems in the future.

Here is the central issue. When an author retains the copyright, the policy states that the Society should be granted "broad rights (consent) to publish." The policy is implemented in section 6 of the consent agreement, which gives the Society a license to publish the material:

In this case the Author(s) nevertheless gives the Publisher unlimited rights to publish and distribute the Work in any form or and to translate (or allow others to translate) the Work wholly or in part throughout the World and to accept payment for this.

This is an extremely weak license, with two major omissions. First, it does not clearly give the Society the ability to publish the material in new formats in the future—formats that may be completely unknown at the moment. Second, it restricts publication to the Society alone, without mentioning third parties (for example, entities such as JSTOR). If the Society wanted to use another organization to archive our journals in the future, our hands would be tied.

The phrase "broad rights to publish" may be misinterpreted narrowly. What about translations? What about new formats? What about allowing other organizations to archive the material (like JSTOR)? The policy needs to allow an exchange of even broader rights when the author keeps the copyright in order to be certain that the Society can ensure access to the journals in the future.

It is possible that some copyright reformers will worry about the broader rights granted to the Society. The AMS can give articles to a JSTOR-like organization in the future, but it also can give them (or sell them!) to Elsevier. These concerns can be partially mitigated by adding one additional feature to our copyright policy, allowing authors to dedicate their journal articles to the public domain after 28 years. This may reassure authors who worry that the Society will abuse its control of the material: An article in the public domain is, after all, available to everyone.

Finally, when the copyright policy was formulated, it was in response to a mandate from the Council for the Society to be author-friendly throughout its publication program. The stipulation that every author receive 50 free reprints was a response to that mandate. Free reprints, however, have little to do with copyright. We should remove mention of reprints from a policy statement. There are no plans to change the Society's reprint policy at the present time, but it is likely that the Society *will* want to change its policy in the future as our publication environment changes.

Here then is the recommended new version of the copyright policy.

RECOMMENDED NEW VERSION
AMS Copyright Policy
(for journals, proceedings, and collections)

- AMS desires that authors transfer copyright but permits authors to hold copyright in exchange for broad rights given to the AMS,

- AMS will allow a flexible range of reproduction, including inclusions of AMS published articles in publications of other publishers without permission or fees and electronic distribution over internet as long as it is not part of a fee-based document delivery service,
- AMS will at the time of publication permit an author to dedicate an article to the public domain 28 years after the date of publication.

What would this new policy mean in practice? To give an idea, here is the likely new wording of the text in section 6 of the Consent to Publish agreement, specifying the right granted to the Society when an author keeps the copyright:

In this case the Author(s) nevertheless gives the Publisher unlimited rights throughout the world for all terms of copyright: (i) to publish and distribute the Work in any form and in all media now known or hereafter discovered, (ii) to translate the Work and exercise all rights in all media in the resulting translations, (iii) to transfer or sublicense the foregoing rights in whole or in part to third parties, and (iv) to accept and retain payment for these.

John Ewing

Consent to Publish and Copyright Agreement

(current version)

(Journals, proceedings, and collections)

It is required that Authors provide a formal written Consent to Publish.

It is also strongly recommended that Authors provide a Transfer of Copyright to the Publisher. The signed Consent to Publish gives the Publisher the Author(s)' permission to publish the Work. The signed Transfer of Copyright empowers the Publisher on behalf of the Author(s) to protect the Work and its image against any unauthorized use and to properly authorize dissemination of the Work by means of printed publications, offprints, reprints, electronic files, licensed photocopies, microform editions, translations, document delivery and secondary information sources such as abstracting, reviewing and indexing services, including converting the Work into machine readable form and storing it in electronic databases.

The Publisher hereby requests that the Author(s) complete and return this form promptly so that the Work may be readied for publication.

Title of Contribution

("Work"): _____

Author(s): _____

Name of

Publication: _____

1. The Author(s) hereby consents that the Publisher publishes the Work
2. The Author(s) warrants that the Work has not been published before in any form except as a preprint, that the Work is not concurrently submitted to another publication, that all Authors are properly credited, and generally that the Author(s) has the right to make the grants made to the Publisher complete and unencumbered. The Author(s) also warrants that the Work does not libel anyone, infringe anyone's copyright, or otherwise violate anyone's statutory or common law rights.
3. The Author(s) hereby transfers to the Publisher the copyright of the Work named above whereby the Publisher shall have the exclusive and unlimited right to publish the said Work and to translate (or authorize others to translate) it wholly or in part throughout the World during the full term of copyright including renewals and extensions and all subsidiary rights as indicated above subject only to item 4.

4. The Work may be reproduced by any means for educational and scientific purposes by the Author(s) or by others without fee or permission with the exception of reproduction by services that collect fees for delivery of documents. The Author(s) may use part or all of this Work or its image in any future works of his/her (their) own. In any reproduction, the original publication by the Publisher must be credited in the following manner: "First published in [Publication] in [volume and number, or year], published by the American Mathematical Society," and the copyright notice in proper form must be placed on all copies. Any publication or other form of reproduction not meeting these requirements will be deemed to be unauthorized.

5. In the event of receiving any request to reprint or translate all or part of the Work, the Publisher shall seek to inform the Author(s).

6. If the Author(s) wishes to retain copyright of the content and image of this Work, in the Author(s)' name(s) or the name of a third party (e.g., employer)*, the Author(s) may strike out items 3, 4, and 5 above. In this case the Author(s) nevertheless gives the Publisher unlimited rights to publish and distribute the Work in any form and to translate (or allow others to translate) the Work wholly or in part throughout the World and to accept payment for this. The copyright holder retains the right to duplicate the Work by any means and to permit others to do the same with the exception of reproduction by services that collect fees for delivery of documents. In each case of authorized duplication of the Work, the Author(s) must still ensure that the original publication by the Publisher is properly credited. If the Author(s) does not choose, or is unable, to assign copyright to the Publisher, the Author(s) agrees that the American Mathematical Society is not responsible for protecting the Work from misuse by others, and the copyright holder agrees to hold the American Mathematical Society harmless in all matters concerning copyright. If copyright is not to be transferred to the Publisher, please indicate how the copyright line should read:

7. The American Mathematical Society will provide the Author(s) with 50 offprints of the Work, gratis. It will also endeavor to provide the Author(s), gratis, with an electronic file of the text of the Work, although the Society cannot be held responsible for difficulties and errors encountered in the electronic transmission of the file or for incompatibilities among TeX environments. If the Society authorizes the publication of the Work or its translation in a book, or part of a book, in accordance with item 3 or 6 above, the Society will endeavor to secure a copy of said book for the Author(s), gratis; the Society cannot guarantee this performance by the second publisher.

This form is to be signed by the Author(s) or, in the case of a "work-made-for-hire," by the employer. If there is more than one Author, then either all must sign the Consent to Publish and Copyright Agreement, or one Author may sign for all provided the signer appends a statement signed by all the Authors that attests that each Author has approved this agreement and has agreed to be bound by it.

Date: _____

Name: _____

Signature: _____

*Please note: If the Work was created by U.S. Government employees in the scope of their official duties, the Work is not copyrightable and all provisions of this agreement relating to copyright (other than item 2) are void and of no effect. The Consent to Publish provisions remain in effect, however, and must be signed.

Guidelines for Refereeing

Why we should care

Whatever happens to scholarly journals in the distant future, scholarly journals remain a key component of scholarly communication today -- and they are likely to remain so for some years to come. For the Society, journals are important for two reasons. Our journals are a crucial way in which the AMS involves itself in research, and in that sense the journals are a signature for the Society -- they help to define us as an organization. In addition, however, the journals are financially vital for the AMS, providing support for the publications program and the rest of the Society's activities. All those responsible for the health of the Society should care about our journals and their health as well.

By most measures, our journals are indeed healthy. They are admired by most mathematicians in the research community. They are frequently cited (see sidebar). They have many subscribers. They appear on time, in fully functional electronic versions, as well print. One of our journals is frequently listed among the top three of all mathematics journals; all are respected. Our journals generally seem healthy.

One aspect of our journals has been frequently mentioned as a concern, however. Each year, the Notices publishes information about the time to publication for a variety of journals, and the AMS journals are often among those with the longest times. Each time the Committee on Publications reviews our journals, the time to publication is an issue of concern. In fact, the Committee has now asked that data on the time to publication be provided at its meetings each year in order to monitor the situation. This is not a uniform problem for all journals, and it varies over time, but it is clearly an increasingly important concern for the health of our journals.

Why is this more important today? Partly because all journals face increased competition as library budgets continue to shrink (in real dollars). Our journals need to be as competitive as possible, and that means maintaining high scientific quality ... and *that* means treating authors well in order to attract the best papers. There is a more subtle reason for the increased concern, however. In an age when authors can circulate papers on the Internet, either by posting them on their home pages or placing them on preprint servers, the pace of communication has quickened. Most mathematicians continue to view journal publication as a way to make their papers a permanent part of the literature. But they expect the publication process to be faster, like the other parts of scholarly communication. Technology has changed not only the way in which we communicate, but our expectations as well.

Impact Factors

While impact factors are of limited value in judging the quality of journals, they are still widely considered, especially by librarians. And impact factors contain *some* information—just not complete

The most recent impact factors for 2002 were recently released.

1. Journal of AMS:	2.533
2. Comm. Pure and Appl. Math:	2.022
3. Annals of Mathematics:	1.905
4. Bulletin of the AMS:	1.824
5. Memoirs of the AMS:	1.661
6. Acta Mathematica:	1.621
7. Inventiones:	1.616

(all others are below 1.100)

The problem

The data published in the Notices each year provides the median times from submission to acceptance, and from submission to publication, for a number of journals. In the past, we have evaluated this aspect of journal health by considering this data, with the goal of lowering those times. Is this the right data? Are we solving the right problem?

Selected Journals (Median times in Months)		
Journal	Submit to accept	Accept to post
Ann. Of Math	12	12
Confor. Geom Dyn	8.5	1.4
Duke Math J	18	11
Elec. J. Prob.	6.4	4
Illinois J. Math	5	11
Indiana Univ. Math J.	4	9
Invent. Math	10	6.8
Jour. Of AMS	13.4	4.1
J. Eur. Math. Soc.	7.8	11.6
Math. Of Comp.	12.7	16.8
Numer. Math.	13	12.7
Pacific Journal	9	15
Proc. Of AMS	5.4	14.1
Represent. Thy	5	8.8
SIAM J. Math. Anal.	9.54	10.23
Topology	10	20
Trans. Of AMS	8.3	6

The answer to both questions is likely No. First, the median time is too little information to provide real understanding. More importantly, the median says nothing at all about "outliers" -- the papers that get stuck in the system for years rather than months. Just a few outliers can greatly decrease the reputation of a journal, even if they affect the median time only slightly. It is the distribution of times, as well as the existence of outliers, that measures this aspect of a journal's health.

Even more profoundly, the data only provide information about those papers that are *accepted*, ignoring all the papers that are rejected—the majority of submissions for our journals! For many reasons, "time to acceptance" is less important than "time to rejection". An author who waits 12.

months to get good news is less likely to grumble than an author who waits 12 months to get bad. And again, the outliers are the key to measuring the health of a journal: An author who waits 36 months to be rejected will likely do more than grumble.

The problem is not merely how to improve the median time to acceptance or publication—the problem is how to improve the process, so that authors feel they are treated well when submitting papers to the Society's journals.

Solving the problem

Publication of a journal article divides into two distinct time periods—before acceptance (refereeing) and after acceptance. The Society has worked on the second period in recent years, improving the way in which papers are queued and posting papers before the printed journal appears. This part of the publication process depends largely on the backlog of accepted papers, and the editors can adjust the standards of acceptance to control that backlog. There is only slight variation in the time required to prepare papers for publication, and hence there are seldom outliers. We can improve this part of the process, and we should. But the best way to shorten this time is by controlling the backlog of accepted papers (which means accepting fewer or publishing more pages). There is not much more to be done.

The refereeing process, however, affects *all* papers submitted to journals, not just the ones that are accepted. The time for refereeing is far more variable than for the rest of the publication process. There are more outliers, and they seem to occur more often for rejected papers. In fact, the majority of complaints about journals concern refereeing (both the process and the substance).

Editorial Policy Statements

EXCERPT FROM ETHICAL GUIDELINES, JANUARY 1995:

Editors are responsible for the timely refereeing of articles and must judge articles by the state of knowledge at the time of submission. ... At the time a manuscript is submitted, editors should notify authors whenever a large backlog of accepted papers may produce inordinate delay in publication.

STATEMENT FROM AUGUST 1996 COUNCIL ABOUT REFEREEING:

Editors for journals of the American Mathematical Society are expected to follow the Society's ethical guidelines, treating all potential authors with reasonable professional courtesy, responding promptly to submissions and making decisions based on the merit of the paper as well as its suitability to the journal. Editors are not obliged, however, to provide a rationale for not accepting a paper, nor are editors obliged to provide an author with a detailed list of errors and corrections.

The Society has paid little attention to the refereeing process for our journals, in part because we know so little about it. By tradition, AMS journal editors have had considerable autonomy, and they carry out their responsibilities with great independence and few guidelines (see sidebar). Editors are admonished to treat authors with respect and to respect confidentiality, but they create their own process for handling manuscripts, often with no advice and little oversight. As a consequence, we have almost no information about the number of papers submitted or the length of time it takes to make decisions. We have largely anecdotal information, which is gathered (mainly) when the refereeing process breaks down and authors complain.

We would like to improve the process by which submissions to our journals are processed, both to reduce the median time to make decisions and to eliminate outliers (those papers that get stuck in the system.) To do this, we are taking some steps during the coming year. We will experiment with a complete software system for central control and submission of *one* of our primary journals, *Mathematics of Computation*, during the next year. And to gather more information, as well as to help managing editors control the refereeing process, we will implement a web-based manuscript-tracking tool for our other research journals beginning in January 2004.

There is another important step we can take, however. The Society should adopt a set of "guidelines" for managing the refereeing process for AMS journals. The guidelines are not meant to control the principles behind refereeing—those are complicated and matters of individual taste (as illustrated in the recent article in the 2003 June/July issue of the *Notices*, "Three Views of Peer Review," <http://www.ams.org/notices/200306/comm-peerreview.pdf>). The guidelines are not meant to be absolute laws (that's why they are called "guidelines"), but rather advice for our journal editors, describing a common set of editorial practices for managing the decision-making process. This will be especially valuable for new editors, who have to learn how to manage a complicated process, often without any experience or much advice.

These guidelines are intentionally minimal—the more guidelines, the less likely they will be followed. These focus on the key steps that will improve the process, not on every imaginable step that can go wrong.

In a sense, like the web-based tracking tool mentioned above, these guidelines are meant to be a tool for editors and managing editors to help them in carrying out their responsibilities. If the guidelines are universally adopted, even loosely, this will be an extremely effective tool for improving the editorial process.

John Ewing

GUIDELINES FOR NEW JOURNAL EDITORS

To guide the decision-making process

The journals of the American Mathematical Society are managed by editors who are appointed by the Society, but who carry out their responsibilities with much independence. The Society values the editorial independence of its journals and their editors. Nonetheless, the Society has endorsed these guidelines for editors to ensure that all authors feel respected and that the Society's journals maintain a high reputation.

Newly appointed editors are urged to adhere to these practices as a way to learn the skills needed to manage a difficult process. Because editors carry out their responsibilities in the midst of busy professional lives, it is not possible to specify precise timetables for completing their work. The times specified below are therefore meant to be approximate.

1. Every submission will be acknowledged within a short period of time, usually two weeks after a submission is received. The acknowledgment will provide the author with an expected time for a decision, usually six months. Editors usually will make arrangements for acknowledgment when they are traveling or unable to send acknowledgment themselves.
2. Submissions that are judged unsuitable for publication without a referee's report will be declined promptly, usually within two months.
3. Each referee who agrees to review a manuscript will be asked to specify a target date for completion of a report, no more than three months in the future.
4. An editor will write to the referee on or slightly before the target date for a report in order to ask for a new target date, usually no more than one month in the future.
5. An editor (or group of editors) will have a specific procedure to decide when to choose an alternative referee in order to restart the refereeing process. An editor will write to the author when the refereeing process is restarted, providing a new expected time for a decision.
6. Even with best efforts, decisions will occasionally require long periods of time for. In all cases, if a decision has not been made 12 months after submission, the editor will write to the author to explain the reasons for delay and to offer the option of withdrawing the paper from the journal.

The goals of these guidelines are to ensure that for at least half the manuscripts submitted to journals of the AMS, decisions are made within 6 months, and that without the author's agreement, no manuscript will require more than 12 months for a decision.