RUTGERS UNIVERSITY SENATE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
MEETING AGENDA
Friday, November 6, 2026, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

https://rutgers.zoom.us/j/96015136494?pwd=5RbunYIrkrrah9ahnslOn1pruqdYqQ.1

Chair's Report– Anna Haley, Senate Chair

Secretary's Report– Taryn Cooper, Senate Executive Secretary

- Approval of Agenda
- Approval of the October 2, 2026 Senate Executive Committee Minutes
- Administrative Response
    - Resolution on Supporting International Scholars' Duration of Status and Graduate Academic Mobility
- Communications
    - Senate committee co-chairs, caucus chairs, and Executive Committee meeting on Friday November 13, 2026, from 11:00 a.m. – 12:00 pm.

Forum with Cathy Brennan (12:20 – 12:50 p.m.)

Budget Kick-Off Meeting (Consolidated PowerPoints**,** Notes**) (12:50 – 1:00 p.m.)**

EC Business Confidentiality (1:00 – 1:10 p.m.)

NJ-MADC Update (1:10 – 1:20 p.m.)

Camden Chancellor Meeting Summary (1:20 – 1:30 p.m.)

President Tate Newark/Camden Visit Summary (1:30 – 1:40 p.m.)

Committee Representation Selection Discussion (1:40 – 2:00 p.m.)

- **Executive Committee Subcommittee on Social Media**
- **NB Chancellor Commencement Committee Volunteer Selection**
- **SAS-C DEC Volunteer Selection**
- **Joint Committee on Immigration Enforcement Nomination Process**

Provost Roundtable Topics (2:00 – 2:10 p.m.)

Standing Committees/Panels

Committee Report and Recommendations (2:10 – 2:10 p.m.)

None.

Surveillance/Security Camera Discussion AND

Proposed Charge (2:10 – 2:30 p.m.)

Information Gathering for University Surveillance Technologies – Senator Troy Shinbrot

Charge: I believe this committee should be a targeted, ad hoc committee of interested and informed senators. It does not appear to fit well within existing committees, and cross-committee collaborations tend to function more slowly than is needed for this charge. 1) Gather information on the following concerning new security camera installations at Rutgers. THIS SHOULD BE A TIME RESTRICTED, SHORT TERM part of the charge as the questions below inform policy and advice decisions that may no longer be relevant beyond a month or two. a) How extensive are the new camera installations planned to be? Is the report that all buildings on Busch campus will be equipped with these cameras? How about other campuses? b) What are the current and projected costs for installation, operation, and maintenance of these systems? c) Who bears the costs under what conditions: reportedly departments or organizations within specific building are charged, but this may or may not be a uniform allocation. d) What are the capabilities, and what, if any, options are possible concerning these capabilities? Especially: i) are all security cameras equipped with "analysis kits" or other systems that can perform facial identification? ii) are all security cameras equipped with "appearance search" that is advertised to be able to track chosen individuals or individuals matching appearance criteria? iii) can "secure watchlists" be disabled (this advertised feature sends an alert when chosen individuals, or individuals matching appearance criteria appear on campus)? iv) are all new security cameras connected in an open platform, an advertised feature that allows camera data to be accessed from outside of Rutgers, or can they be implemented in a CCTV mode that is only available to RUPD? e) Can a survey be performed to solicit community input on the security cameras? 2) THIS IS A LONGER TERM SET OF ISSUES: Assess current organizational and policy provisions with respect to: a) Who makes decisions re. which systems, what options, what costs, where the systems will be placed, etc. b) Who is advised when these decisions are made? c) What are the relevant policies currently (esp. 30.1.11 & 60.9.6), and what additional policies or policy revisions called for? d) What signage should be placed to inform people when they are entering a zone where camera features such as facial ID, appearance tracking, and license plate ID may be active?

Rationale: Security cameras that are reported to have invasive capabilities including tracking individuals and people with specified appearances are being installed on Rutgers campuses. The costs of these cameras are unknown, who bears the costs are unknown, the capabilities and possibilities of limiting the capabilities are unknown, and the community has not been informed of the implementation of these cameras. At the same time, similar - even less powerful - camera systems have been abused by stalkers and by masked and armed federal officers. This is concerning and is rapidly changing: the Senate needs to acquire accurate information and provide advice concerning these systems as rapidly as possible.

Proposed Charge (2:30 – 2:40 p.m.)

Review of Secondary Teaching Opportunities for Non-Exempt Rutgers Staff– Non-Senator, Gabrielle Land

Charge: The Faculty and Personnel Affairs Committee should review Rutgers University's policies and practices governing secondary teaching appointments for full-time staff, with particular attention to the restrictions affecting employees whose primary University positions are classified as non-exempt under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA). The Committee should examine the basis and continued necessity of the University's current restrictions and determine whether legally compliant alternatives could permit otherwise qualified non-exempt staff to accept secondary teaching assignments while maintaining their non-exempt status and appropriately accounting for all compensable work, overtime, workload, scheduling, compensation, supervisory approval, and other applicable requirements. As part of this review, the Committee should examine relevant FLSA regulations and U.S. Department of Labor guidance addressing employees who hold full-time non-exempt positions while also performing additional teaching duties for the same educational institution, as well as the University's rationale and prior review of its Multiple Assignment policies. The Committee should also review the University's processes for approving and verifying secondary teaching appointments, including what safeguards are in place to identify eligibility concerns before a semester begins and how academic continuity and student impact should be addressed when an appointment issue is discovered after instruction has already begun. Based on its findings, the Committee should recommend whether University policies or procedures should be revised or clarified to provide legally compliant and equitable opportunities for qualified staff to contribute to Rutgers' teaching mission while maintaining appropriate wage-and-hour protections.

Rationale: Rutgers employs staff members with advanced degrees, professional expertise, and academic qualifications that may make them valuable contributors to the University's teaching mission. Current University policy restricts certain secondary teaching appointments based on an employee's exempt or non-exempt status, in part because of wage-and-hour compliance concerns. However, U.S. Department of Labor guidance has addressed circumstances in which full-time non-exempt employees also perform part-time teaching duties for the same educational institution, raising an important question about whether a categorical prohibition is necessary or whether compliant alternatives may exist that appropriately account for hours worked, compensation, and overtime. A University-wide review could clarify the legal and policy basis for the current restriction, examine whether alternative arrangements are feasible, and strengthen appointment-review procedures so eligibility concerns are identified before courses begin. Such a review could support employee protections and compliance while also promoting professional opportunities, academic continuity, and the University's educational mission.

Follow Up Information:

I wanted to share some additional context from my conversations with URA-AFT and Rutgers HR that may be helpful for the Executive Committee's reconsideration.
I was teaching a course this semester through a secondary teaching appointment when, four weeks into the semester, I was informed that I was ineligible to continue teaching because of my non-exempt staff status. After learning this, I contacted Christine O'Connell at URA-AFT to discuss the situation and determine whether the restriction was a union or contractual matter. Christine indicated that the broader question of exempt versus non-exempt eligibility for secondary teaching appointments was not something that fell under the union's purview. Her focus from the union perspective was primarily on ensuring that I was appropriately compensated for the teaching and course-preparation work I had already performed.
My discussions with HR have also reinforced why I think a broader policy review would be helpful. Thus far, the explanation I have received has primarily been that the Rutgers Multiple Assignment Matrix does not permit a non-exempt Class 1 employee to hold a Class 8 teaching appointment.
What remains unclear is the rationale behind that restriction and whether other legally compliant arrangements have been considered. U.S. Department of Labor guidance addresses FLSA requirements specific to higher education, including the teaching exemption, as well as circumstances involving public-sector employees performing additional work for the same employer in a different capacity.
I am not suggesting that these provisions necessarily apply to my individual circumstances or require Rutgers to permit these appointments. Rather, I think they raise broader questions worth examining: Is the restriction in the Matrix specifically required by the FLSA, or is it a University policy designed to manage compliance? What is the rationale and history behind the restriction? Have compliant alternatives that would allow qualified non-exempt staff to teach been considered?
HR has continued to reference the Matrix, but I have not yet received clarification regarding the rationale behind the restriction or how these federal provisions were considered in developing or applying the policy.
My individual experience brought this issue to my attention, but the proposed charge is intended to examine the broader University policy rather than resolve my individual employment situation.
I hope this additional context is helpful for the November 6 discussion. I'm happy to provide the relevant Department of Labor guidance or correspondence with HR if that would be useful.

Proposed Charge (2:40 – 2:50 p.m.)

Compulsory Charges for First Day Course Material – Senator Francisco Quevedo

Charge: Currently, students are charged for First Day Course Material in many classes. These charges can sometimes exceed $250 per class, and they are compulsory. Students are forced to opt out.

Rationale: If First Day Course Material were required in two classes per semester, the student would incur an avoidable cost of $1,000 per year. Avoidable, because sometimes

the professor does not use or require the materials, and also because in this day and age, e-books, PDF copies, and lab material can be found for free on the web, or physical copies can be handed down or sold at a discount from friends who already took the class. I propose to change these compulsory charges to an opt-in mode, so students are charged only if they want to buy the material.

Follow-Up Information: SAC was discharged from S-2401-1 Automatic Textbook Billing at December 2024 EC meeting. There are no active charges on the topic.

Proposed Charge (2:50 – 3:00 p.m.)

Does the LCME requirement for equal content within the future RSOM mean that the two schools need to teach from the same slide deck or can it mean that each school cover equivalent topics and teaching objectives but faculty have the right to create their own lectures? – Non-senator, Monica Roth

Charge: Examine what "equivalent content" means for lectures at the two campuses of the future RSOM.

Rationale: Currently, the Dean is saying that for LCME accreditation, the two campuses of RWJMS and NJMS need to teach from the identical slide deck. The faculty have never seen what the LCME has actually stated this means, just the interpretation of Dean Murtha. Faculty from both schools are now asked to share their current lectures and combine them into a "uniform" slide deck to be used for both schools. Faculty who cannot do this are giving up their teaching. There are many faculty who have dedicated their careers to teaching and have prided themselves in tailoring their lectures to convey their excitement and knowledge of the system. To ask them to rewrite their lecture so that another faculty in Newark (or vice versa) can "read" the identical slide for some misinterpretation of the LCME requirements is hard to understand. Unless the goal of the future RSOM is to have faculty give up their lectures or retire because the joy of teaching is gone. And if this only for one year, why provide this image to the LCME. Exemptions to faculty who want to maintain their own individual lectures should be provided. This is not how we promote high quality teaching to student who pay high tuition. A robot can read a slide deck. A professor should be doing this.

Open Charge Request (3:00 – 3:10 p.m.)

USGC requests to be discharged from the following charge:

- S-2316-1 University Senate Representation on Formal Governance Boards

The charge was discussed at the USGC meeting on September 18, noting work to date had not revealed any material issues to address; it was agreed at that meeting that a final review would be conducted to inform consideration of the charge at the October 16 meeting of USGC. No additional information was presented. As such, we move to seek approval to dismiss the charge.

Old Business

New Business

University Senate November 20 Agenda (3:10 – 3:20 p.m.)

- Provost's Roundtable – 1:30 – 2:20 p.m.
-

Adjournment