September 2000

Anthony J. Oddo-Team Leader, Arts & Sciences Team, Sterling Memorial Library, New Haven, CT

Barbara Dean
Arlington County Public Library

Jack W. Montgomery
Western Kentucky University, jack.montgomery@wkyu.edu

Allison Mays
Millsaps College, maysap@millsaps.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/atg>

Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Dean, Barbara; Montgomery, Jack W.; and Mays, Allison (2000) "Anthony J. Oddo-Team Leader, Arts & Sciences Team, Sterling Memorial Library, New Haven, CT," *Against the Grain*: Vol. 12: Iss. 4, Article 17.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7771/2380-176X.3259>

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact epubs@purdue.edu for additional information.

easily than ongoing subscription costs. Since there would also be a cost to OUP to provide Web access, a small ongoing access charge would also be reasonable (\$100 per year). The key here is to charge once for the content rather than requiring us to repurchase the same material year after year.

2. Charge for the updates separately from the cost for the main body of the dictionary. Most users are not looking for the revisions—they are looking for the material that was in the first and second editions. Charging an optional subscription fee for those that do want access to the revised entries (\$1000 per year) would give every library the ability to select what parts of the product best fit their users needs.

3. If the product must be sold solely on a subscription basis, charge on the basis of simultaneous rather than potential use. Set up a fee per simultaneous user and let each library subscribe at the level that best meets their needs. On my campus of 17,000 students, I doubt that more than four would ever want to use the *OED* at the same time. If I had the option of buying a subscription for just four users (even at \$500.00 each) instead of 17,000, I would be much more inclined to purchase the Web version.

These pricing problems exist for other products, so why pick on the *OED*? There is no doubt that *OED* is an essential part of any reference collection. It is the only reference source whose longevity is measured in centuries rather than months or years. The editors at the *OED* are motivated more by scholarship than profit, which has become very rare for any publishing house. However, they have not thought through the implications of per capita pricing for this kind of reference work. Oxford has the opportunity to take a leadership role in the pricing of scholarly reference information. Through some creative input, the *OED* can become an example of new pricing mechanisms rather than merely another application of a pricing system developed for different types of products. I am hopeful that the editors of the *OED* will take up this challenge and develop a new method for pricing this priceless information. I really would like to buy the *OED* on the Web, but I cannot afford it in its existing configuration.

(For a more radical solution, see Sidebar 3)

Creating a Greek Approval Plan at Yale

by **Anthony J. Oddo** (Team Leader, Arts & Sciences Team, and Principal Catalog Librarian, Catalog Department, Sterling Memorial Library, High Street, Yale University, New Haven, CT 05620; phone 203-432-7961; fax 203-432-7231) <anthony.oddo@yale.edu>

Upon assuming the title and duties of selector for Greek imprint materials, I was immediately informed that it would be to my benefit to set up an approval plan with a Greek vendor. The overall goal of such a plan was to supply Yale with the newest, most scholarly published offerings at the best possible price. Encouraged by suggestions from other selectors, I thought that such a plan would be a simple task to compile, for the most part copying approval plans for other foreign countries and simply modifying them for Greece. My simple plan turned into a monumental nightmare. No approval plan had existed before I assumed these duties, and it became immediately apparent that before I could realistically ask a vendor to supply something for my final approval, I had to assess Yale's needs.

Historically, the Greek collection development policy at Yale University has been sharply divided between ancient or classical Greek, and modern Greek. The latter begins with the medieval period and extends to the present time. Classical Greek collection development has enjoyed a long tradition of steady financial support and growth. The university has a large classical language department with a long established classics library as well as extensive holdings of classical language materials located in the Sterling Memorial Library. The collection supports the Classics Department's offerings each semester in classical Greek language and literature,

history, art history and archaeology, as well as faculty research and scholarship.

Modern Greek imprint collection development is relatively new to Yale. No formal educational programs exist in modern Greek studies at the university and, as such, collection building had been limited to securing adequate coverage of informally selected topics of modern Greek civilization to supplement research currently in progress in other disciplines. Faculty and student interest is sporadic at best. Approximately 30 years ago, my predecessor, George Vrooman, with the assistance of Mrs. Evro Layton, put together an informal and limited collection development policy to fill in gaps that appeared in the Greek imprint collection. Although not named, this informal policy became Yale's first approval plan for modern Greek imprints, an approval plan which we have attempted to duplicate without success. Evro Layton was the founder of a local co-operative buying service which supplied modern Greek titles to a number of large academic and public libraries in the US. Vrooman's initial design was to limit collection development choices to modern Greek history, literature and literary criticism, economics and economic theory, social conditions, and political science. Individual requests for materials outside the above general categories, as well as any other additional book requests, were sent to Layton directly indicating that the requested items were not to be duplicated by the approval plan. If an item was already supplied or planned for a future shipment, Layton would supply the invoice number and possible shipment date. Layton's highly efficient service also offered cataloging cards for library catalogs and out-of-print searches at a reasonable cost.

Unfortunately, upon her retirement, the program ceased its services, and collection development queries had to be made directly to Greek vendors—an increasingly difficult task. Among the greatest problems that I have experienced dealing with these vendors are their general failure to respond to inquiries and their limited in-stock offerings. Because of this poor service, I have been forced to use many alternate means for book selection, such as publisher flyers, national guides, word of mouth, etc.—in other words, an inefficient means of collection building at a major research library. I also have been forced to contact publishers individually, using e-mail, fax, and the US and Greek postal systems to or-

continued on page 44

Anthony Oddo Profile

Born: Hartford, Connecticut, 1947.

Education: BA, Classical Languages, Iona College; MA, Latin, Fordham University; MLS, South Connecticut State University; Certificate in Russian, Defense Language Institute—West Coast, US Army.

Career: 28 years at Yale University.

Family: Wife Rosaria, and children Anthony, Jr. and Christina.

My other life: Model railroading and coin collecting.

Favorite leisure reading: Ancient history, library history, and historical novels.