### Agenda/Topic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda/Topic</th>
<th>Discussion/Issues</th>
<th>Decision/Action</th>
<th>By Whom/By When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. University Librarian’s Report – Maloney</td>
<td>Maloney received a request from SVPAA Barbara Lee for a copy of the Libraries Faculty By-Laws; by-laws are under review to ensure compliance with University policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Guidelines for Area Updates – Agnew/Boyle/Just</td>
<td>A Cabinet sub-committee met to make recommendations for future updates to ensure that the updates align with those of other academic units and show that our efforts are impactful. The updates are intended to stress major international and national awards and honors. Items should include published scholarly works such as monographs and peer-reviewed journal articles; presentations and keynote speeches at international, national, or regional/local conferences external to Rutgers; grants received from international, national, or regional/local associations and agencies external to Rutgers; and, significant leadership in or recognition from international and national organizations, such as being elected president of the American Library Association or being certified as a distinguished member.</td>
<td>The October call for Area Updates will be sent to Cabinet; Cabinet members will send to their units. For the October updates, faculty and staff are asked to submit items to their Cabinet representative. At this point, they need not adhere to the new guidelines. Cabinet members will review the items received and forward to Fultz the items selected for submission to the Chancellor’s office.</td>
<td>Glynn will make a report to Cabinet by December.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Memberships – Boyle</td>
<td>There was a question at a recent Planning and Coordinating Committee as to who represents us at our major organizational groups. Boyle compiled a list of major paid memberships by the Libraries and formal representatives via an email call. Cabinet had concerns about whether membership is part of someone’s job or professional development, travel money, representation, and leveraging all of the groups to their fullest capacity. The Directors and AULs will work with their own units to make these determinations. Cabinet will review the list to determine if there are specific people who should be listed under each membership, and if there are other memberships that should be included or removed from the list. IFLA sections and informal CIC groups will be added. Boyle will revise the list based on Cabinet recommendations; it will be sent to Cabinet for a second review. The list will eventually be placed on the website and reviewed yearly.</td>
<td>Coordinating Committee will develop guidelines and recommend a place on our website where items that are not selected for the Chancellor’s updates may be kept in order to publicize the individual activities of our faculty and staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. SWOT Analysis Discussion – Maloney</td>
<td>Cabinet reviewed the SWOT analysis synthesis for the four campuses prepared by Cohn, Yang, and Askew. Maloney asked Cabinet to prioritize items in each section. The strengths on the surface were more diverse and reflect local points of interest. The group decided that Infrastructure and Special Collections will be reviewed in the same way as the campuses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
strengths would not be grouped and prioritized. Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats did have patterns across the Universities. The group developed drafts for the important major themes that emerged from the discussion (see below).

5. Announcements

Maloney received an email from the University asking for attendance at the kick-off celebration for Rutgers 250\textsuperscript{th} birthday, which will be held Tuesday, November 10, 2015 from 4-5:30 p.m. on the Old Queens Campus. All faculty, staff, students, and alumni from across the Rutgers system are invited. Cabinet will share the information with their units and follow their normal procedures for attendance at special events or activities.

Weaknesses:

- Communications (Local, system, external)
- Lack of collection development policies that are responsive to budget and space constraints, and university priorities.
- Lack of space use and allocations strategies and practices that are responsive to existing space constraints and university priorities.
- Lack of fiscal practices (planning, budgeting) that acknowledge the current financial environment.
- One-size-fits all approach to management
- Lack of transparency in decision-making throughout the organization
- Lack of support (financial or otherwise) for staff and faculty professional development.

Opportunities:

- Renewed focus at the university-system level on the unique contributions of individual universities.
- Granting agencies are asking for services and skill (e.g., open access to journal articles and data sets) that libraries possess.
- Increased need for accountability in higher education; libraries understand many approaches to research metrics.
- New focus on interdisciplinary research and new modes of scholarship.
- Established and growing need for informatics professionals in many disciplines.
Merger provides opportunities for the libraries to rethink our support for the health sciences.

Threats:

- Flat budgets combined with increased materials and staffing costs.
- RCM exposes the cost of the libraries to stakeholders – must be seen as responsive and demonstrating ROI.
- Increased and nearly viable competition for services that were once seen as the sole purview of the library. Vendors cutting libraries out of the loop and dealing directly with faculty and other administrators.
- Safety and security concerns.
- General visibility: Changing NJ politics and perception of Rutgers by the general public.