have a responsibility to make accessible what is purchased. Without further, dedicated research on electronic access from the users’ perspective, best practices will be slow to emerge. Experience so far suggests that users likely are quite willing to search content on Websites (either library or vendors’ Websites), rather than sifting through an OPAC for digital resources. Yet that approach works well only if all eBooks are accessible through one vendor platform or are locally loaded on an institutional server. Once available through a common interface or platform the potential for federated searching of digital books becomes a reality, and access to this resource through the OPAC. At this point there are significant limitations to federated searching but technological innovations are sure to overcome these problems in the foreseeable future. The alternative, namely to encourage users to search the OPAC and link out to specific titles of interest, clearly is not adequate either. When purchasing content in packages one or both options are possible. Purchasing on a title-by-title basis necessitates integration into the catalog. In the short term, both methods will be options that will have to be considered adequate. In the long term, the role and function of our catalog need to be agreed upon. Clarity on this is missing and doesn’t appear to be on the horizon in the near future. Controversies over the design of next generation catalogs are equally divisive to some in the profession who worry that control and access is being sacrificed to expedience. Meanwhile our users Google and never think of searching a library catalog.

Sub-standard approaches are sub-standard only if users cannot find what they want and need. Technology should provide the capability to scoop relevant metadata from which to create digital records in an automated way; a task that could be automated if the item. Combine this with digital Table of Contents (TOC) and the user has something to work with. Traditionally we have paid for TOC services as a catalog enrichment service, but why would we do so when the data is already available and doesn’t cost anything? What we are asking for is for the library to change what we currently do.

From Dempsey’s Weblog page it is possible to link to the DEPP Strategy Discussion Paper, which referenced the OCLC Pattern Recognition Scan from 2003. While neither source specifically deals with the issue of access to eBooks, the overall conclusions are relevant: shift the focus to the user and shift service from “what you see is what you get” to “what you need is what you get.” Librarians continue to learn what our users both want and need but the bottom line is that students see eBooks as must-haves. Libraries already are competing with free eBooks from Google and other search engines on the Internet; it behooves us to take a lesson from these digital leaders by adopting the obvious approaches available and modifying these approaches as users respond to them.

How can electronic book access be expedited compared to earlier efforts with journal Web pages? My biggest fear is that librarians will treat these resources as monographic series — a futile attempt to equate the serial-like nature of electronic content with the marketing and packaging of the content as a “book.” While there may have been legitimate reasons to manage these entities in the convoluted world of series, let’s not digitally replicate the confusion.

Despite the slow introduction to electronic books, the current proliferation of purchasing options is waiting to be embraced while progress in managing these resources has stagnated. Since staff comprises the largest component of operating budgets, good business practices suggest that designating workflow processes, which allocate minimal staff and time in handling resources, is to be desired provided that there is no negative impact on identification and access for users. It is up to library staff to ensure eBook access to users is successful to the extent that it matches users’ wants and needs. Expedient access options within, and outside of, the catalog must be widely shared and adopted with faith that the longer-term access issues can, and will, be resolved. So, let’s work together to set reasonable standards, focus on effective access, reduce the preoccupation with control, and better serve our users.

---

**Rumors from page 22**

at UNC-Chapel Hill about archiving print and e-content. We are hoping to have Michael write a regular column for ATG and perhaps speak during the 2007 Charleston Conference. Can you believe it’s been 37 years since Bruce and Michael were in Oxford as colleagues?

Endnotes
5. Dinkelman, Andrea et al. Ibid., p 47.

More visitors. Pam Cenzer <pam.cenzer@gmail.com> and her husband, Doug, were recently in Charleston enjoying the cool weather that we aren’t used to. Pam is visiting Melinda Scharstein and her mother, Terry, and we hope to get a minute together to brainstorm about Pam’s and Susan Campbell’s mentoring roles at the 2007 Charleston Conference. Should be fun, right?

---

**Future Dates for Charleston Conferences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preconferences and Vendor Showcase</th>
<th>Main Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007 Conference</td>
<td>7 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Conference</td>
<td>5 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Conference</td>
<td>4 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Conference</td>
<td>3 November</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32 Against the Grain / April 2007 <http://www.against-the-grain.com>