Models are not mutually exclusive. It is likely that a combination of some of these strategies will create the best outcomes for Tisch Library.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODEL DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ADVANTAGES</th>
<th>DISADVANTAGES</th>
<th>TISCH CONTEXT NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Digital Delivery</strong>&lt;br&gt; Journals and multi-author works are sent off-site and able to be scanned for article and chapter document delivery (electronically)</td>
<td>• Same day digital delivery may be possible for some/many items&lt;br&gt; • Little to no fossil fuels for delivery&lt;br&gt; • Easy selection of journals to clear shelves quickly&lt;br&gt; • Convenient for remote users</td>
<td>• May be higher retrievals&lt;br&gt; • Harder to select multi-author works for inclusion&lt;br&gt; • Limited indexing of older materials may inhibit discovery&lt;br&gt; • Some vendors do not offer scanning</td>
<td>Scan &amp; Deliver has been well received and could be a model for this service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. New Materials</strong>&lt;br&gt; As new items are purchased, they are sent to off-site storage</td>
<td>• Easy to implement; no selection&lt;br&gt; • Eliminate shifting of stacks&lt;br&gt; • New publications often have a lot of online information to aid discovery</td>
<td>• Users may expect new items to be visible&lt;br&gt; • High use items may be sent off-site&lt;br&gt; • Will this doom new scholarship to obscurity?&lt;br&gt; • May disadvantage fields dependent on new publications</td>
<td>If we renovate, this method will not suffice for us to reduce on-site shelves; unlikely as a primary method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Publication Date</strong>&lt;br&gt; Date of publication used for primary selection criteria</td>
<td>• Ability to use reporting for much of selection&lt;br&gt; • In general, newer materials circulate more frequently</td>
<td>• Sends much primary source material off-site&lt;br&gt; • Limited indexing of older materials may inhibit discovery&lt;br&gt; • May disadvantage fields dependent on historic texts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Shared Retention</strong>&lt;br&gt; Coordinate regionally to reduce duplication</td>
<td>• Preserve scholarship proactively&lt;br&gt; • Reduce total footprint needed</td>
<td>• Challenge to create agreements that endure&lt;br&gt; • Will delivery model be adequate?</td>
<td>Tufts is well located for this approach and participating in a current study of issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Subject Based</strong>&lt;br&gt; Discipline by discipline, bibliographers select materials based on knowledge of research methods</td>
<td>• Highly customized&lt;br&gt; • Greatest ability to involve faculty input&lt;br&gt; • May be better used for exceptions, than for primary selection mode</td>
<td>• Highly subjective&lt;br&gt; • Time consuming (and therefore slow and costly)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. Use Level</strong>&lt;br&gt; Lesser used items are sent off-site; circulation records used as primary selection criteria</td>
<td>• Fewer Retrievals (low demand for off-site items)&lt;br&gt; • Keeps previously used materials browsable &amp; available same day&lt;br&gt; • Ability to use reporting for much of selection</td>
<td>• Hard to predict academic use&lt;br&gt; • Materials used on-site (but not checked-out) may get sent off-site&lt;br&gt; • Once retrieved, do off-site items switch to on-site? Usually cost-prohibitive&lt;br&gt; • Same day delivery is expensive</td>
<td>See circulation tables. This model might target sending Language (P), Science (Q), and Social Science (H) off-site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>