

## MSU Math dept meeting, presenting a motion

Following is a summary (from transcript) of what happened in the rambunctious dept meeting on 12/15/2015, when I presented a motion to remove the penalty Chair got me from the Provosts office.

- (1) I red my motion which was: *“Prof. Selman Akbuluts course Math 996-002 in Spring Semester 2015 was cancelled inappropriately, the department requests that the Provost’s Office remove the resulting “Abrogation of Duty” from Prof. Akbulut’s academic record, and restore his salary.”* and gave a brief explanation. I reminded Chair’s August 24 message to faculty which was: *“The Advisory Committee discussed the cancelation of Prof. Akbuluts spring 2015 MTH 996.002 and determined that all parties acted in good faith with the information they had at the time. They also determined that apart from a series of miscommunications, Prof. Akbulut met the established criteria, and that the appeal process outlined above would have resulted in the course running. Given that Prof. Akbulut held an associated graduate course, and had his salary reduced, the decision is to compensate Prof. Akbulut with one-course teaching reduction (\*) effective during the 2016-17 academic year”.* I said since Chair declined to remove Abrogation of Duty penalty from my academic record (in Associate Provost Terry Curry’s office) I am making this Motion.
- (2) Teena Gerhardt and Matt Hedden asked me to weaken this motion by removing half of it (because of (\*)). My worry was if I ask Terry Curry to remove only half of the penalties he gave me (Abrogation of Duty citation + a salary cut) I would be admitting some guilt for Chair’s fraudulent actions. So I refused, and I said “Chair doesn’t have to give me any course reduction, after all he had lied about my academic record to get me this penalty, how can I trust his promise? I have done all my duties fully by teaching my assigned courses: 425 and 996”.
- (3) Jeff Schenker got up and repeated Chairs and Jon Wolfson’s lie that my class was cancelled because there were not enough students, and Chair assigned me some another extra course, that was my assignment. I attempted to correct Jeff by presenting my evidence file, but people hushed me up. Jeff continued with his monologue, and there were some laughter from the people..
- (4) Jon Hall said I can not conduct this motion myself, it is Chair’s job to do it. I replied “How can it be? My motion is about my conflict with Chair”. There were much noise and yelling. Then I was slowly pushed aside and Chair took over conducting the administrating this motion.
- (5) R. Kulkarni asked why I didn’t ask grievance from T.Curry, I said “I did, and I also went to faculty FGO as Curry suggested, but got no results” (FGO declined to hold any hearing on it).
- (6) Sheldon Newhouse said he can not support this motion because he doesn’t know the facts (even though whole year I have been asking my colleagues to look at my evidence files, which I repeated again weeks before this meeting, so that the intent of this motion would be clear to everyone).
- (7) Tom Parker spoke against the motion, because I didn’t accept weakening this motion as in (2).
- (8) By this time there were about 20 people left in the meeting, I asked for an open-vote, Chair and J. Schenker objected, then I asked for a vote to decide if people want closed-vote (I thought this was a common practice) again the Chair and J. Schenker objected vehemently and there was much yelling (at this point Keith was running the meeting, not me any more). After the closed vote count, it is declared that this motion did not pass by wide margin, then I left the meeting.