



SSMU Library Improvement Fund Report 2016-2017



Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Preface | 3 |
| I. Overview | 5 |
| II. Outreach and Methodology | 6 |
| II. New Initiatives | 6 |
| II. Dual Semester Allocations | 6 |
| II. Touchtable | 7 |
| III. Allocations | 8 |
| III.01 Student Employment Proposal | 8 |
| III.02 Microfilm Readers | 8 |
| III.03 HSSL Digital Signage Solution | 9 |
| III.04 Music Lockers | 10 |
| III.05 Extended Music Hours | 10 |
| III.06 HSSL & Schulich Charging Stations | 10 |
| III.07 LIF Commissioner Fee & Administrative Costs | 11 |
| III.08 Black History Month | 11 |
| III.09 Redpath Prayer Space | 12 |
| III.10 Supply Vending Machines | 13 |
| III.11 Standing Desks | 13 |
| III.12 HSSL, Schulich, Law, & Islamic Studies Library Extended Hours | 14 |
| III.13 Law Library Lounge Seating | 14 |
| III.14 Law Library Charging Stations | 15 |
| III.15 Law Library TV Collaboration Screens | 15 |
| III.16 3D Printer Cameras | 15 |
| III.17 Touchtable | 16 |
| III.18 Schulich EMF Computers | 16 |
| IV. Recommended Improvements | 17 |
| V. Conclusion | 18 |
| Appendix A: Proposal Evaluation Criteria | 19 |
| Appendix B: LIF Proposal Form | 20 |



Preface

For over twenty years, the Library Improvement Fund (LIF) has been tasked with ensuring that McGill undergraduate students have access to the highest quality library facilities and resources. The fund, overseen by the Students' Society of McGill University (SSMU) and the Library Improvement Fund Committee (LIFC), works to ensure that students' most important needs are communicated to Library staff in an open dialogue. This is accomplished through continuous feedback. It is comprised of over a \$700,000 contributed through student fees matched in equal amount by alumni donors annually.

This year, the Committee worked towards reevaluating the means by which proposals are evaluated. Most notably this includes the division of allocations onto a semesterly basis. This permitted more growth for the committee overall, with the opportunity to grow in the Winter semester based on the experience in the Fall semester. The Committee also continued the quantitative proposal evaluation process introduced in 2015-2016, as well as building off of a variety of outreach techniques.

In the past, with the support of students and alumni, the LIF has gone towards capital improvements and technology additions to enhance our study spaces, student contract positions across the Library system, and various special projects. The LIF attempts to allocate funding according to need, longevity, accessibility, and feasibility. In the 2016-2017 year, the Library Improvement Fund will be used to extend library hours, employee student hires, additional electrification & charging devices, a supply vending machine, and more.

The committee has made motions to making the collection and evaluation process more accessible and efficient. With the experiences had this year, the recommended improvements recommended for next year, and the carryover of multiple committee members, the LIF is setup to have momentum carried forward for the following year.

This report contains brief overview of the proposals evaluated, a full rundown can be found in [this Google Drive folder](#), in addition to a variety of other relevant documents.

This year's student contributions and matched contributions by alumni totalled \$730,391.00; however, due to cost underruns of previous LIF projects, \$755,391 is available to allocate this year. The Committee spent over \$45,000 more than was originally designated for this year.



I. Overview

This year, the combined available funds of the SSMU students and matched contributions by alumni totalled \$730,391; however, due to cost underruns of previous LIF projects, \$755,391 is available for the LIF to spend this year. With these funds, the SSMU Library Improvement Fund Committee asks the McGill Library to undertake the following projects:

[The full budget can be found here](#)

| Full Allocation | Modified Allocation | Rejected Allocation | Postponed Allocation |
|-----------------------------------|---|---------------------|-------------------------|
| <u>Project Description</u> | | | <u>Cost (\$)</u> |
| | 1. Student Employment | | 200,000.00 |
| | 2. Microfilm Readers | | 9,900.00 |
| | 3. HSSL Digital Signage | | 9,106.93 |
| | 4. Marvin Duchow Music Library Lockers | | 0.00 |
| | 5. Marvin Duchow Music Library Extended Hours | | 12,240.00 |
| | 6. Schulich & Redpath Mobile Device Charging Station | | 42,714.00 |
| | 7. Library Improvement Fund Commissioner Fee & Administrative Costs | | 6,000.00 |
| | 8. Black History Month | | 2,500.00 |
| | 9. Redpath Prayer & Meditation Space* | | 0.00 |
| | 10. School Supply Vending Machine | | 0.00 |
| | 11. Standing Desks | | 0.00 |
| | 12. HSSL, Schulich, Law, & Islamic Studies Library Extended Hours | | 240,194.20 |
| | 13. Law Library Lounge Seating | | 15,000.00 |
| | 14. Law Library Charging Stations | | 10,000.00 |
| | 15. Law Library TV Collaboration Screens | | 15,000.00 |
| | 16. 3D Printer Cameras | | 1,000.00 |
| | 17. Redpath Touchtable | | 20,325.00 |
| | 18. Schulich EMF Computers | | 8,000.00 |
| Total: | | | 591,980.13 |

*Proposal 09 Redpath Prayer & Meditation Space pending further discussion with Deputy Provost of Student Life & Learning



II. Outreach and Methodology

This year the committee focused on a method of elucidation via discussion. Many of the aspects of how to evaluate proposals, how to better achieve students' needs, and how to solicit proposals from the various stakeholders across campus were made clear through conversation. After concerns were discussed, the committee would commit to action items, then regroup with updates accordingly. This could be developed further ([see recommended improvements](#)).

The Library Improvement Fund Committee continued the proposal criteria system created in 2015-2016. This system set different categories ([see appendix A](#)) on which each proposal was rated on. The points earned per proposal were weighted and amalgamated into their respective categories on a score from 0 to 10. The result for each proposal was not binding; there was not a threshold that each needed to reach, but instead it prompted the committee to think critically about the variety of criteria on which to evaluate each proposal. .

Given the need for the McGill Library to procure their own quotes for proposals regardless of whether an initial estimate is provided, the Committee decided to make logistical and budget considerations optional for initial proposal submissions. Using the initial proposal descriptions, Committee members worked with the Library to develop more detailed quotes and address any logistical concerns until they were ready for presentation at the allocation meetings ([see Appendix B for LIF proposal form](#)).

The gathering of proposals was multifaceted; it included whiteboard tabling in the libraries, direct contact with student leaders on campus, meeting with library administrators to discuss potential areas of improvement, and a stronger web presence. A large trend this year was promoting pre-existing LIF projects through the development of a touchtable presentation, a half-finished proposal notebook for tabling, and better signage. This year, it came to light too late that SSMU would not be pursuing a student experience survey; a survey of some sorts is highly recommended in the future.



II. New Initiatives

II. Dual Semester Allocations

Previously, the LIF was used to allocate funds once a year at the end of the Winter semester. This year, the committee went forward to offer two periods in which proposals would be evaluated and allocated. This proved to be very successful for the following reasons:

- This process allows pilot projects to be tried and re-evaluated in the same academic year, by with the same committee
- The committee gains the experience of evaluation, and can improve on it for the semester following
- Funds can be distributed earlier in the academic year

The committee highly recommends the structure to continue in this manner

II. Touchtable

This was a project devoted to making LIF projects more transparent, as well as offering a non-manned station to gather electronic feedback on future proposals. Developed with the library media staff, the touchtable showcased previous allocations as well as the history/structure of the Library Improvement Fund.

Following the use of the touchtable for LIF content, it was also used to promote the work done by the Open Educational Resource Researcher, funded by the LIF in 2015-2016. The touchtable has demonstrated it's ability to engage and adapt to a variety of projects, promoting the prompt of [proposal 17](#).

[See Section IV: Recommended Improvements](#)



III. Allocations

III.01 Student Employment Proposal

\$200,000 Summer & Fall Proposal

This allocation has a range of complications, namely whether or not student employment is a valid use for the fund and the transparency of the positions funded. Last year, the LIF committee did not receive enough information regarding how many positions and what they entailed, simply the amount requested. Coupled with a hesitance to fund something that is administrative in nature, the committee declined to allocate money to student employment in 2015-2016.

Over the summer, since this blindsided the library administrators, the LIF Commissioner and VP University Affairs allocated the remainder of the 2015-2016 LIF, approximately \$25,000, to student employment; not to renege on the committee's decision, but rather because more information was provided and it was made clear the money could assist in a variety of important projects (such as collection relocation and staffing the libraries over the summer).

This year, the committee received a detailed description of which positions, how many students per position, and to which libraries the students would be working. While this made it easier for the committee to evaluate the validity of the allocation, it was a difficult decision to make even still. Seeing as the positions are relatively integral to the libraries functions, we decided to allocate the full request of \$175,000; it supports the library and it provides work opportunities to students (who are undergraduates & valid for work-study), both of which we value higher than upholding the principle of the fund.

III.02 Microfilm Readers

\$9,900 Fall & Winter Proposal

Microfilm readers, though a thing of the past, are still an integral tool to accessing a sizable portion of the libraries collections (namely historical prints, records, etc.). Currently HSSL is equipped with six microfilm readers, three of which are mechanically outdated, often break down, and are not user friendly. This proposal was to replace two microfilm readers with contemporary digital imaging hardware.

The proposal was submitted for the Fall allocation, wherein the committee decided to table



the proposal for the following semester to encourage approaching those who use the technology more often; PGSS & AUS, organizations who also have their own Library Improvement Funds, have constituents who use the microfilm readers more often than the average SSMU student. By tabling the decision we had hoped their funds may be used jointly with the SSMU LIF to purchase the additional microfilm readers, but the AUS had allocated their fund in full and PGSS had other priorities. As a result, when the proposal was re-evaluated in the Winter semester, a consensus had been reached with HSSL to match funds; that is, the proposal was funded to purchase one reader, and HSSL will purchase the other accordingly.

III.03 HSSL Digital Signage Solution

\$9,106.93 **Fall & Winter Proposal**

This is a new pilot project for the HSSL library, with the potential of spreading to other libraries as well. In short, the proposal is for the purchase of two television screens whose purpose is to navigate the libraries different *daily* activities. Throughout the course of the week, there are a variety of workshops, learning opportunities, seminars etc. that happen in the McLennan- Redpath complex. The screens would display both schedule and directions to the relevant space. It will also showcase the various nuanced services offered in the library, such as VR demos, 3D Printing, the new research commons area, and more.

The committee responded to this proposal with great hesitance for a number of reasons. The HSSL lobby already contains two TV screens displaying a variety of slides, there are employees at the service desk for support, and there didn't appear to be any direct student *need* for such a tool. As such, it was rejected in the Fall allocation period. Upon further discussion with the proposer, Robin Canuel, head Librarian of HSSL, it became clearer that this was additive in nature, that the two existing TV screens already had explicit purpose, and the need for directions is consistently requested in the space.

After further deliberation, the LIF committee decided to fund the project in part; only the hardware was purchased, not the service that would be facilitating the screen's content (which is a monthly recurring cost). It was funded with the understanding that this was a pilot project and could be greatly expanded in the future, that it would be adding transparency to the many unknown services in the library, and that if the project is not effective the TV screens are easily



repurposable. The service itself, since it is a recurring cost, should be funded by the library; as well as displaying the hesitance felt by the committee. This proposal was therefore funded in part; the LIF funded the hardware, while the recurring cost of the software service shall be left to HSSL.

III.04 Music Lockers

\$9,442

Fall Proposal

This proposal was for 32 various sized, PIN-code locker units equipped with interior outlets for power. It's purpose would be to store valuables, namely musical instruments, in the Marvin Duchow Music Library.

The committee evaluated the lockers to be exclusive in nature; it serves a purpose for a relatively limited number of students. The project itself addresses a need that is not relevant to many students in SSMU, but just music students. Additionally, since passcodes would be provided semesterly to a small number of students, it would be serving a small number each term. As a result, this proposal was rejected. The committee suggests the library consider this request be advanced to the [music student society](#).

III.05 Extended Music Hours

\$12,240

Fall Proposal

This proposal covers the hiring of student casual staff for an additional 18hrs/week for 34 weeks of the year. This is different than [proposal no.10](#) since it requires the hiring of students in lieu of security officers. The committee largely supports extended hours due to the need it addresses, and in this case especially, the low cost. The LIF requests for appropriate recognition indicating support from the LIF, in addition to an approximate usage report of the number of students who use the library for next year's committee.

III.06 HSSL & Schulich Charging Stations

\$42,714

Fall Proposal

The charging stations were a pilot project from SSMU LIF 2015-2016 that was wildly well received. The model currently sits in the ground floor in the HSSL Lobby, sporting 8 individually electronically lockable charging cells. The usage reports indicate approximately 40-50 devices charged daily. As a result, many libraries expressed interest in purchasing more units across the different areas, corroborated by student feedback. In discussion with various head librarians,



charging stations have been purchased as follows:

- x6 Charging Stations for HSSL (one per floor in addition to the existing locker, as well as one in the Redpath sub-level)
- x3 Stations for Schulich
- x2 Stations for Law Library (not included in the cost here, see [proposal 14](#))

The lockers provides a much needed service: a *secure* charging solution for students, secure being the operative word. The LIF committee was very mindful of some critics of the lockers; the price for a purchase of this size costs 1/3 less than the proposal from 2015-2016, \$4,000 per unit.

III.07 LIF Commissioner Fee & Administrative Costs

\$6,000 **Fall Proposal**

As suggested by our VP University Affairs, the Library Improvement Fund should be self sustaining; this entails the absorption of the Library Improvement Fund Commissioners wage, as well as a base amount of ~\$500/year for the implementation of signage, purchase of coffee for tabling, and any other costs that may arise in the facilitation of the committee & fund.

The LIF is also trying to be forward funding- that is, setting the funds aside for the following year instead of the current year (e.g 2016-2017 would fund 2017-2018's annual expenses). This applies to student employment & extended hours as well (see [plans for next year](#)).

III.08 Black History Month

Part 1: N/A **Fall Proposal**

This proposal detailed a potential art exhibition portraying black art and artists during February 2017 for the HSSL complex. This proposal was different from the average proposal and inventive in the way it could improve the library. There were a lot of decisions that made deliberation difficult for the committee, particularly surrounding the lack of specific price points, specific pieces of art/artists, information on the space it would be presented in, where it would be displayed after February 2017, and so on. Whether or not art falls under the jurisdiction of the LIF was also a question raised. These reasons among others led to the committee to decide not to allocate any finances, but instead to offer assistance in liaising with the McGill Visual Arts Collective to rally for funding there.

**Part 2: \$2,500 Fall Proposal**

This part concerns the purchase of The ABC's of Canadian Black History Teaching Toolkit, an innovating teaching resource that provides concrete tools for faculty to incorporate perspectives from Black history into the classroom across a range of disciplines. The committee was in support of the content presented in the toolkits, and went ahead with fully funding 1 kit at \$2,500. The committee would like to use the first toolkit as a pilot project, and if the success of the resource demands another, another proposal is welcome for future LIF allocations. Similar to Initiative #1, we also recommended contacting the McGill Library Collections Services; McGill has one of the largest collections, and one of the largest funds per overall budget in Canada to continue increasing and diversifying the collection. We believe the toolkit is eligible for that source of funding, as well.

Part 3: \$8,000 Fall Proposal

This proposal was for a touch screen table to be used to display an interactive map for black history month during February, and to be used for various other purposes throughout the year. The price of the proposal included a student researcher(s) to assist with the development of the interactive map & facilitate the tech of the table, as well as the table itself.

We very much wanted to fund this project because of the futuristic elements and versatility the hardware could have provided both for the February exhibit and in general for the library, and ended up doing so in . However, there were little specifications regarding the hardware of the table itself, how the \$3000 pricemark was chosen to fund a researcher (hourly wage, stipend, etc?), whether the position would be year-round or only for Black History Month, feasibility with regards to the tight timeline, and so on. However, the committee did express if these faults can be addressed, and the hardware requested could be made with a broader vision in mind for after February, a proposal could potentially be approved in advance of the March funding period. Additionally, at the time of the proposal, a touchtable was in circulation across the libraries for rental via the Rare Books and Special Collections sect of the library.

As a result of the positive feedback on the table but uncertainties of the facilitation, when Winter 2017 semester came around the LIF did examine the purchase of a touchtable as a permanent feature in HSSL ([see proposal 17](#)).



III.09 Redpath Inter-Faith Meditation & Prayer Space

N/A

This space, proposed for the Redpath branch, has been in discussion since 2015. This year there was movement, but no action. After meetings with Trenholme Dean of Libraries Colleen Cook, it was made clear that for a prayer/meditation space to be created there would need to be a mandate from the Deputy Provost of Student Life and Learning Olivier Dyens. Unfortunately like last year, there was not enough progress for the committee to consider allocating funds to the proposal. The proposal will remain open as the discussion continues with McGill Administrators.

III.10 School Supply Vending Machines

\$0 Fall Proposal

This proposal promotes the addition of a vending machine that dispenses school goods; a similar model can be found near the RVC Cafeteria. Often times when in the library you may need additional utensils & tools, with nary a store nearby. The vending machine offers 24/7 access to supplies without the need for staff or leaving the comfort of the library.

The vending machine is self sustaining; the cost of the machine itself is paid off by the revenues generated from the supplies sold. Depending on the success of the machine, the addition of McGill's OneCard system could be added; the committee did not see the addition as immediately necessary to such a new device, especially considering the limited number of students who rely on the OneCard system currently.

III.11 Standing Desks

N/A

Standing desks were a hot topic this year; sparked by general student interest, as well as a relevant [McGill Tribune article](#), the committee was dedicated to working standing desks into the variety of existing library furniture. In short, the committee agreed on easily adjustable, non-powered movement, and equipped with optional outlets as requisites for the desks. Models were agreed upon, and a pilot project was funded in the Fall 2016 allocation. Unfortunately, it came to light too late that the AUS LIF had already funded 24 standing desks for across the HSSL complex. Additionally, the library administration added funding towards a group standing desk pilot piece of furniture (an additional aspect the LIF intended to finance in F2016). As a result, the



LIF pulled the allocation from expenses, and attempted to find other locations on campus that may be relevant for the addition of standing desks. The Law Library expressed interest, but belayed the addition of furniture until the 2017-2018 academic year.

As a note for the record, the committee agreed upon Steelcase Airtouch desks with attachable USB/edison combo powerstrips.

III.12 HSSL, Schulich, Law, & Islamic Studies Library Extended Hours

\$240,194.20 Fall Proposal

Extended hours falls under a similar category as student employment (see [proposal no. 1](#)) with respect to hesitance; nevertheless, the LIF committee acknowledges the absolute *need* from students for extended hours, and decided to fund the proposal in full, despite it having become a crutch in the library budget. Funding is explicitly for the cost of the security guards to station the library, and does not include the building facilities or extended service hour costs (as services are not extended).

- 1386hrs to HSSL
- 2330hrs to Schulich Library
- 2414hrs to Law Library
- 640hrs to Islamic Studies Library

Total: 6770hrs extended for 2016-2017

Some relevant notes regarding the allocation: Schulich has been reopened 24 hrs this year during finals, HSSL is twice as expensive to keep open later since it requires 2 security guards, & approximately \$70,000 of the remainder of the 2016-2017 fund was put forward for extended hours in 2017-2018. This is because, as previously mentioned, the LIF is attempting to fund “regular” proposals the year prior rather than the year of.

III.13 Law Library Lounge Seating

\$15,000 Winter Proposal

This proposal would see to the addition of a soft seating, lounge style area to the Nahum Gelber Law Library. Such seating would serve the important function of providing students with more comfortable, informal seating to study. Currently law students have a lounge in the building adjacent, but even that area is unavailable after hours or over the weekend. Therefore, this



proposal was for the upgrade of a space in the lobby area to permit eating, relaxation, and light socialization. This area is optimal with respect to accessibility and maintaining the Law Library's delicate atmosphere with respect to noise.

Currently the LIFC is waiting to confirm the specifics of the furniture, and therefore the allotted amount may fluctuate in the immediate future, but within reason and at the discretion of the LSA Council & Law Librarians.

III.14 Law Library Charging Stations

\$10,000

Winter Proposal

This proposal was for the addition of 5 charging stations in the Law Library complex; one per floor. See [proposal 6](#) for a full explanation behind the charging stations. This proposal was funded in part, providing 2 charging stations for the library, with an invitation to re-apply in the Fall 2017 term. The LIF committee believed that the somewhat restricted access to floors 3-5 during finals, in which only law students can access, in addition to the lower person/charger ratio of Law Library compared to others on campus, was reason enough to provide some but not all of the charging stations. The LIF committee recommends the ground floor, with the second to be placed at the discretion of the Director of the Law Library, as floor two is occupied largely by collections.

III.15 Law Library TV Collaboration Screens

\$15,000

Winter Proposal

This proposal sees to the addition of a TV Screen in each of the three accessible group study areas in the Law Library. This would include a wireless cable connection tool for easy installation and the TV mount accordingly. The proposal also ruminated on the addition of TV screens in the case competition group study area of the library, but due to the restricted access of the space (which requires an application & participation on a case competition team), the committee did not add screens to this area. The technological need this addresses is pertinent, and will be useful for years to come. The LIF committee would like to recommend adding bookability to these spaces as well.

III.16 3D Printer Cameras

\$1,000

Winter Proposal

The research commons space has been expanding over the past year, with the addition of a



variety of resources & tools for students to use. This includes the addition of 3D printers, which are made available to any student at McGill. The new initiative does require full attention however, as there is no security/dedicated staff member to oversee the production & completion of the unit; there have been cases in which the final product is stolen. As a result, this proposal would provide a live stream of the production of the item, as well as offer the opportunity for a timelapse of said production. This proposal adds to the “slice of life” offerings in the libraries, and was supported in full by the committee. There was an addition of a \$400 contingency in the event of installation costs being higher than expected.

III.17 Touchtable

\$20,325 Winter Proposal

A touchtable is a large touchscreen device, promoting an interactive way to get students involved with any variety of projects. The screen itself will be added to the HSSL complex lobby, freeing up one of the already two existing touch tables to roam amongst the libraries. The tables will be accessible to both library & student projects, at this discretion of the library media coordinator's discretion; the content is comparable to that which is displayed on the library TV screens across campus.

The touchtable first caught the attention of the LIFC (see [proposal no.8](#)), instigating an investigation to the existing touch tables on campus in the library. Thereafter, the LIFC employed one of the existing touch tables to showcase the Library Improvement Fund, which was very well received.

III.18 Schulich EMF Computers

\$8,000 Winter Proposal

This proposal adds 5 computers with Engineering Microcomputing Facilities (EMF) level hardware & domain access. In short, it would provide engineering students the ability to access their computer accounts in schulich, as well as providing the range of softwares made available on the EMF network & software to match. This proposal was an extension from an initiative in 2015-2016, which added 10 computers. This proposal came to light after the success of last years, only adding 5 computers.



IV. Recommended Improvements

This year the Library Improvement Fund Committee has been very mindful about the means by which proposals are gathered, evaluated, and outreach is conducted. That being said, with the addition of the [dual allocation period](#), the committee has received an opportunity to re-evaluate the process in the Winter 2017 semester. With that, the committee dutifully suggests the following changes be carried forward for the 2017-2018 year:

- Host a salon / meet and greet with the various members of the library staff in the beginning of the academic year. The purpose would be to introduce *the whole committee* in the various working groups within the library, promoting the opportunity to improve the library to an important demographic of stakeholders, the librarians.
 - o Bring back the practice of inviting Trenholme Dean of Libraries Colleen Cook & Director of Library Resources Diane Koen to a committee meeting
- Continue to promote previous projects the LIF has accomplished in a transparent fashion
 - o The addition of the touchable in the HSSL complex was successful
 - o A booklet outlining the various projects of the LIF was started, but not completed; would be very useful for students to flip through/get inspired for new ideas during tabling
 - o Continue branding & signage of completed projects
- Organize the proposers to speak in front of the committee; too often the commissioner was a liaison, which proved ineffective in a number of ways.
 - o Suggested sequence: committee evaluates proposal document, presentation & questions, re evaluation of proposal accordingly.
- Work in closer collaboration with the AUS & PGSS Library Improvement Funds
- Administrative:
 - o Rotate a minute taker every meeting amongst the committee members
 - o Have a more regularly occurring timeslot
- Outreach:
 - o Reddit was a surprisingly successful medium for feedback
 - o Continue tabling across the different libraries, and not relying on HSSL/Schulich exclusively
 - o Strongly encourage a Student Experience Survey through SSMU; if that project is not returning, promote a library explicit survey instead

[See Section II: New Initiatives](#)



V. Conclusion

In 2016-2017, the LIF made sizable and successful steps to increase consultation, transparency, and greater fund autonomy. Through this year's projects, the fund will greatly enhance Library spaces in scales both large and small. The edits this year to the committees structure will tighten up the process for the year to come; continuing projects from years preceding, the addition of a second allocation period, and the carryover of a few members.

Any concerns or questions that the McGill Library has regarding the allocations detailed in this report should be requested of the SSMU Vice-President University Affairs, who will bring these suggestions to the attention of the SSMU Executive Committee for consideration over the summer in lieu of the Library Improvement Fund Committee.

On behalf of the LIFC, I would like to thank Diane Koen, Francisco Oliva, every Head Librarian, and the various Library Staff of McGill for working tirelessly to generate quotes, gauge the feasibility of proposals, and supporting the efforts to improve the library environment. There are a lot of moving parts to the variety of proposals, and the committee could not have done it without the tireless work put in. The Committee continues to appreciate that the Library, under the leadership of Dean Colleen Cook, who has prioritized student consultation in many activities across their operations. We hope they continue to engage students thoroughly in the future.

Finally, I'd like to thank the members of this year's LIFC. Their passion, discipline, and hard work were the reasons why 2016-2017 was so pivotal for the fund. The discussions held this year regarding library improvements were often insightful and innovative; we attempted a variety of new methods, all of which will promote a stronger fund for the future.

The Committee consisted of:

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Marie Lemieux, | Member-at-Large |
| Michelle Meizhu Chen, | Member-at-Large |
| Patricia Neijens, | Member-at-Large |
| Saud Ayub, | Member-at-Large |
| Olivia Shi, | SSMU Legislative Councillor |
| Lawrence Angel, | Undergraduate Member of the Senate Committee on Libraries |
| Erin Sobat, | Vice-President University Affairs |
| Malcolm McClintock, | Library Improvement Fund Coordinator |

Respectfully Submitted,

Malcolm McClintock

Library Improvement Fund Commissioner



Appendix A: Proposal Evaluation Criteria

Student Experience:

- Relevance to student needs (present or future)
- Urgency of need addressed
- Positive effect on personal life
- Positive effect on academic life

Longevity:

- Technological relevance
- Functional lifespan

Accessibility:

- Number of students impacted
- Avoids exclusion of specific student groups
- Scalability

Feasibility/Logistics:

- Cost/benefit efficiency
- Consideration of logistical constraints



Appendix B: LIF Proposal Form



SSMU LIBRARY IMPROVEMENT FUND

2016-2017 Proposal Form

PREAMBLE:

For over two decades the Library Improvement Fund (LIF) has invested in the most important Library needs of the undergraduate student body in order to enrich the student academic experience. This fund is administered by the Students' Society of McGill University (SSMU) and is made up of a fee contribution of \$8.50 per full-time student per semester, matched equally by alumni donors. The LIF goes towards 24hr library access, student employment, study spaces, Open Educational Resource Research, and a variety of other special projects. To see previous allocations, reports, and more, please visit the SSMU University Affairs website ssmu.mcgill.ca/ua/libraries

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT:

The LIF accepts proposals of any scope or purpose pertaining to any branch library on McGill's Downtown Campus. Proposals may be submitted by any member of the McGill community so long as it's for the benefit of the student experience. The LIF Committee is available to assist with the development of proposals and liaising with internal and external parties. Submissions are accepted throughout the academic year, however there are two allocation periods per semester: the deadlines are Friday, November 20th, and Monday, March 6th, for Fall 2016 and Winter 2017 respectively. Early submissions are encouraged.

SUBMISSION AND REVIEW:

Completed proposal forms should be submitted in .docx or .pdf format to the LIF Commissioner at lifc@ssmu.mcgill.ca. If you have any questions, please visit [our website](#) or email the Commissioner.





General Information:

Name: Click or tap here to enter text.

Affiliation: Click or tap here to enter text.
(Student, Staff, etc.)

Email: Click or tap here to enter text.

Organization: Click or tap here to enter text.
(If applicable)

Position: Click or tap here to enter text.

Project Details:

Provide a description of the project to the best of your ability.

Any relevant details should be included e.g. which library branch, general purpose, who it would affect, and so on.

Click or tap here to enter text.

What problem does this solve or what aspect does this enrich?

This includes the motivation for the proposal and urgency of need

Click or tap here to enter text.

What monetary details can you provide?

OPTIONAL: Don't worry if you cannot provide this information. Any research on previous implementations of the proposal, quotes online, or general resources regarding the financial aspect are appreciated. The LIF committee will explore pricing if none is provided.

Click or tap here to enter text.

Are you aware of other sources of funding for this project?

There are a lot of funds offered by SSMU, your faculty, student society, Office of Sustainability, and so on that may overlap with your proposal.

Click or tap here to enter text.

Additional Details:

Click or tap here to enter text.

