## Approaches to Selecting Material for Off-Site Storage and Retrieval*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Description</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Tisch Context Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Use Level**     | Lesser used items are sent off-site. Circulation records used as primary selection criteria. | - Fewer Retrievals (low demand for off-site items)  
- Keeps previously used materials browsable & available same day  
- Ability to use reporting for much of selection | - Hard to predict academic use  
- Materials used on-site (but not checked-out) may get sent off-site  
- Once retrieved, do off-site items switch to on-site? Usually cost-prohibitive.  
- Same day delivery is expensive. | See circulation tables. This model might target sending Language (P), Science (Q), and Social Science (H) off-site. |
| **Digital Delivery** | Journals and multi-author works are sent off-site and able to be scanned for article and chapter document delivery. | - Same day digital delivery may be possible for some/many items  
- Little to no fossil fuels  
- Easy selection of journals to clear shelves quickly. | - May be higher retrievals  
- Harder to select multi-author works for inclusion.  
- Limited indexing of older materials may inhibit discovery  
- Some vendors do not offer scanning | Scan & Deliver has been well received and could be a model for this service. |
| **New Materials** | As new items are purchased, they are sent to off-site storage. | - Easy to implement; no selection  
- Eliminate shifting of stacks  
- New publications often have a lot of online information to aid discovery | - Users may expect new items to be visible  
- High use items may be sent off-site  
- Will this doom new scholarship to obscurity?  
- May disadvantage fields dependent on new publications | If we renovate, this method will not suffice for us to reduce on-site shelves. |
| **Conservation Considerations** | Off-site storage may provide better temperature & relative humidity controls. Select materials based on condition & conservation need. | - Option to improve conditions for materials needing care.  
- Desire for fragile items to circulate less anyway.  
- Special Collections shelving is full | - Retrieval may damage materials  
- Digitization may be too costly (as retrieval alternative)  
- Ideal environmental conditions may be more expensive or unavailable. | Tisch collections needing higher environmental standards may not be large enough to merit this approach. |
| **Publication Date** | Date of publication used for primary selection criteria | - Ability to use reporting for much of selection  
- In general, newer materials circulate more frequently | - May disadvantage fields dependent on historic texts  
- Sends much primary source material off-site  
- Limited indexing of older materials may inhibit discovery | |
| **Subject Based** | Discipline by discipline, bibliographers select materials based on knowledge of research methods. | - Highly customized  
- Greatest ability to involve faculty input  
- May be better used for exceptions, than for primary selection mode | - Highly subjective  
- Time consuming (and therefore slow and costly) | |
| **Shared Retention** | Coordinate regionally to reduce duplication | - Preserve scholarship proactively  
- Reduce total footprint needed | - Challenge to create agreements that endure  
- Will delivery model be adequate? | Tufts is well located for this approach and participating in a current study of issues. |

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