

MINIMUM STANDARDS PROCESSING AND PHOTOGRAPH COLLECTIONS

BY ANNE L. FOSTER

ABSTRACT: Photograph collections and photos in collections have long posed particular challenges for archivists. Archival institutions have employed a variety of arrangement and description techniques to ensure the preservation and access of photographic images. Many of these solutions, however, require item-level attention. With the advent of minimum standards, or “MPLP” (More Product, Less Process), processing, archivists are beginning to question such practices. This paper offers a case study of implementing MPLP for collections that comprise or include photographs. A variety of photographic collections are examined and different levels of minimum standards discussed. Also examined is the potential conflict between MPLP and another recent trend in archives—digitization of photographs.

As do many institutions of a certain age, the University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF) Archives, founded in 1966, approached collection processing in a variety of ways over the course of its existence. Photographs posed a particular problem for the archives. The history of the United States’ involvement with Alaska coincides neatly with the development of photography, so much of the state’s modern history is well documented graphically. This large volume of potential historical materials, combined with an extremely aggressive collecting program during the flush years of the Trans-Alaska (oil) Pipeline System’s construction and early operation (1975–1989), resulted in a photograph collection of at least one million images. Over the years, numerous attempts had been made to make these images available to researchers, but none has been entirely successful. All the while, the backlog of unprocessed collections has grown. By 2005, a new solution was desperately needed, and the introduction of Mark Greene and Dennis Meissner’s minimum standards processing technique seemed like it might provide the answer.¹

UAF’s struggles in managing its photograph collections are probably not unique. Photographs have long occupied a gray area in archival theory and practice, sometimes being handled as simply another series of documentary materials, but at other times or other institutions, considered more akin to a rare book or museum artifact. Advice in the archival literature varies widely on the issue. T. R. Schellenberg offers a substantial discussion, devoting the final chapter of *Management of Archives* to the arrangement and description of pictorial records. Here, he notes, “The methods

of arranging and describing pictorial records have not been fully defined, much less standardized.”² His own suggestions for arrangement offer three different schemes, depending upon the nature and provenance of the images and the repository. For all collections, Schellenberg suggests dividing pictorial records by format as well as size.³ In *Modern Manuscripts: A Practical Manual for Their Management, Care, and Use*, Kenneth W. Duckett describes seven different arrangement schemes, used by five repositories. Both item- and group-level arrangement are included in the examples, as well as a half dozen variations of description.⁴ Fredric M. Miller’s *Arranging and Describing Archives and Manuscripts*, part of the Society of American Archivist’s (SAA) Archival Fundamentals Series, only acknowledges that “other specialized equipment will be required for dealing with nontextual records such as photographs. . . .”⁵ Whether Miller’s basic techniques for archival arrangement and description include (or exclude) photographs is never mentioned.

In their literature review, Greene and Meissner found that “[f]rom the mid-1960s to the present, archival authors have dismissed arrangement at the item level as having little utility and being thoroughly impractical for modern collections.”⁶ Despite the literature, their repository and grant proposal surveys found that a large proportion of archivists have adhered to the ideal of an item-level arrangement. The same discrepancy between literature and practice appears to be true for photographs. Schellenberg, Duckett, and most recently, Mary Lynn Ritzenthaler and others all agree that group arrangement and description are both necessary and acceptable for large photograph collections or when resources are limited.⁷ Thomas D. Norris goes further in his case study of two very large photograph processing projects, arguing that “something is better than nothing”⁸ as the rationale for retaining original order and describing at the group or collection level. Yet very large backlogs remain.

So, if processing photographs at something other than strict item level has long been acceptable—and even put into practice by numerous institutions—why is the current article necessary? Because the concept of minimum standards, or “More Product, Less Process” (MPLP) processing,⁹ seems to have suddenly moved to the forefront of our professional discussion. As Greene and Meissner have stated, the idea of processing materials in larger groupings has been with the profession since at least the 1960s. They also acknowledge that many institutions were already implementing “truly creative and cost effective processing approaches”¹⁰ when the “More Product, Less Process” article was written. Still, the publication of the MPLP article in 2005 and the accompanying professional presentations seem to have struck a chord with a wide proportion of the profession. This article seeks to continue the current discussion by extending MPLP concepts to include photographs.¹¹ It may not be exactly new, but it is apparently now time.

Past Processing

Photograph processing at UAF has endured a variety of methods and attempts to address the challenges of item-level access, needed by many of our researchers, in the face of overwhelming numbers of photographs. One or more of these attempts may

appear familiar to readers; the fact that a variety of approaches was tried—and failed, at least in reducing the backlog—may resonate even more.

Our first phase (1966–ca. 1980) was the giant vertical file. Originated at our University Museum sometime in the 1940s or 1950s, this process meant all photographs were separated from their original collections and filed under predetermined subject headings in a bank of file cabinets. This concept had some benefits: it nearly eliminated time needed for description and provided a level of consistency to cataloging key local concepts and events, which were not represented in national authorities. However, provenance was effectively destroyed; researchers of manuscript collections had little chance of identifying the photographs that had originally been part of a particular collection. Sometimes images could be located by guessing logical vertical file categories after viewing item-level inventories of accessions, but this process was difficult at best and usually only partially successful—when such inventories existed.

Phase two (ca. 1980–ca. 1990) attempted to correct provenance issues while retaining the cataloging ease of the standard vertical file categories. This process left the photographs with the individual collections, but filed them separately and organized them under the same categories as the still-extant vertical file. While this technique, initiated not long after professional staff was first hired for the Archives, preserved the context of the materials, it still proved unworkable over the long term. As with its vertical file predecessor, this method's use of the standard subject categories required physically arranging the images into predetermined groupings. Although the process saved time with the standardization of description, photographs were still arranged and preserved at the item level, always a time-consuming task. Finally, both the vertical file and the standard categories processes failed to allow for the multiplicity of subjects depicted in a single image. It was at this point that computers appeared on the horizon.

Our next phase of photograph processing, phase three (ca. 1990–2003), turned our arrangement and description practices 180 degrees. The “All Photo Database” was conceived during a time when many still held the optimistic opinion that “computers will save us.” Archivists stopped arranging images and focused instead on the descriptive component. The database attempted to address the issue of multiple subjects pertinent to one image, as well as the variety of subjects found in an unarranged folder. Two factors, however, doomed this plan. First, truly massive collections began to be acquired, including half a dozen congressional collections containing as many as 10,000 photographs each. Second, swamped by the huge collections and still laboring under earlier processing notions, archivists failed to appraise the photographs before students were assigned to number them. The result was the retention of thousands of duplicate, blurry, unidentified, or otherwise generic images that then had to be described in the database. Soon, a second database titled “Needs Attention” was created to queue collections awaiting description. Before long, the Needs Attention Database outpaced additions to the All Photo Database.

The Turning Point

UAF reached a crisis point in 2003 with the William O. Field Papers. Donated in 1993, the nearly three hundred linear-foot collection of a well-known glaciologist contained approximately 40,000 photographic images spanning 1890s glass plates through early twentieth-century nitrate negatives to 1960s color prints and slides. Sporadic attempts to process the collection had occurred over nearly a decade, at a cost of almost \$40,000, but the collection remained undescribed and unusable. A donor-relations crisis was pending. It was at this point that I was hired as the new archivist for UAF. Not long after, I attended SAA's 2004 annual meeting where I attended a number of sessions on collections management and processing, but it was Mark Greene and Dennis Meissner's session introducing the minimum standards concepts that seemed to offer the best solutions. They proposed reframing how much arrangement and description is acceptable to consider a collection fully processed, and recommended that the new standard be the minimum necessary to make a collection stable and usable.

Several MPLP concepts seemed well suited to the Field materials. First, accepting that doing "as little as necessary" for a particular collection—and ultimately as your standard processing baseline—was almost instantly calming. Second, allowing factors such as use to drive the determination for how much processing is "necessary" reminded us to view the collection in terms of the potential use and users. What struck us most, however, was the flexibility that an MPLP approach created—whether a collection could be considered "ideally processed" varied depending upon the individual collection, researchers, and the institution.

For the Field papers, applying MPLP concepts meant looking at the collection as a resource created by a scientist, with projected scientific users. In this light, it became clear that the donor's original arrangement of the materials was appropriate for his use and, arguably, for that of his current and future scientific peers. There was no need to create item-level descriptions for these materials. A scientist would want to see an entire body of materials, and a long list of vaguely listed individual images (i.e., "Glacier Bay, 1939," "Glacier Bay, 1940," etc.) would only cause confusion. Our general public researchers would likely not be interested in most of these scientific views, which focused on technical recall and scientific measurement rather than landscapes, historic events, or people. They would have opportunities to find more graphically appealing glacier views in other, much smaller, and easily cataloged, tourist-oriented collections. With this realization, we were able to stop all the item-level processing and focus on getting a workable finding aid written.

In one year, with one part-time processor and a student funded by \$18,000, we were able to complete processing on this sizeable collection. With the MPLP processing, we preserved the scientific context of the materials and saved staff time. Although there were some preservation issues with the photographs, including a quantity of glass plate and nitrate negatives, fortunately prints already existed, and we were able to simply store the fragile negatives in our cold-storage vault. These items will, of course, require monitoring over time, but storing them in an optimum environment was the single biggest contribution to preservation that we could make. This sudden whirlwind of

activity, resulting successfully in a written finding aid, restored donor confidence in our program. The collection was immediately and frequently used and we have heard not one complaint about the level of description, nor of the state of preservation. Instead, we receive comments about how happy the researchers are to have the collection open for research and how timely its availability during the International Polar Year is.

The New Normal: Minimum Processing Standards at UAF

UAF's positive experience with minimum standards processing of the Field Papers led us to propose using similar techniques in our portion of a consortium grant proposal to the National Historical Publications and Records Committee (NHPRC). After the initial submission in the fall of 2004, peer reviewers spotted the fact that processing rates varied significantly throughout the proposal and asked for consensus. During the rewrite in the spring of 2005, the consortium, comprising eight archives and manuscript repositories in Alaska, Oregon, and Washington, realized that being the first to test Greene and Meissner's MPLP proposals across a variety of institutions and types of collections would be a strong argument for funding. The NHPRC agreed and in July 2005 funded the grant, called the Northwest Archives Processing Initiative (NWAPI), Phase II, for two years in the amount of \$178,000. With advice and training from Mark Greene and Dennis Meissner, the group tested the standards suggested in the "More Product, Less Process" article for their suitability to a variety of archival collections varying by subject matter, dates, material format, original condition, and order. At its conclusion, NWAPI exceeded our joint goals, maintaining an average rate of processing of less than two hours per linear foot and surpassing our goal of a thousand feet of processed materials not long after the midpoint of the project. The key is determining the *minimum* level of processing necessary to make the collection usable and stable.

The NWAPI grant was chiefly intended to test the MPLP techniques on larger, twentieth-century paper-based collections. The techniques proved so satisfactory (and speedy), however, that once we had satisfied our minimum NHPRC targets, we decided to expand the tests to a variety of smaller, older, or otherwise less traditional collections. Given our previous challenges with photograph collections—and the growing backlog of "needs attention" image collections—it seemed advantageous to try minimum standards with collections containing significant numbers of photographs, as well. Rather than develop an extensive matrix or attempt to define specific levels of processing, we elected to decide on the minimum standard—a baseline—and then allow a variety of added-value processing actions for materials falling into select categories of special needs. The baseline, still in draft form, was tested on a variety of collections containing photographs and continues to be revised as we further develop UAF's concept of a "typical" photograph collection through further processing (see figure 1). The key factor in our new processing mode is use. The vast majority of our photograph collections will receive minimum processing unless or until researchers use them. At the time of use, we will then re-evaluate the collection and determine if added-value processing is warranted based on the degree and type of use the collection has received.

In particular, the item-level task of numbering photographs will wait until an order for reproduction necessitates such individual attention. At that time, however, we will

Figure 1
UAF Draft Processing Guidelines—Baseline

- Acquisition
 - Donor identification
 - Donor pre-weeding
- Numbering
 - Use numbers provided
 - Wait until used
- Preservation
 - Don't sleeve
 - Refolder only if brittle or absent
 - Interleave only if obvious clippings, organics, or albumens
 - Do store negative collections in vault
- Arrangement
 - Don't separate
 - Don't weed dupes/junk
 - May create a series/may not be complete
 - Rely on donor arrangement
 - Small collections—no arrangement
- Description
 - Types of researchers
 - One specific photo
 - Broad subjects
 - Place names, activities, some people
 - Standardize common subjects
 - May describe in more detail than you arrange

number all photographs in the collection or, for very large collections, within a series, in order to avoid problems of tracking number assignments over a long period of time. Our reasoning is that use of one photograph in a collection indicates a high probability of other images being used from the same collection. As we have a very active reproduction program, we struggled with this issue for some time. In the end, we decided that the use determinant seemed to best balance our goal of spending less time handling individual items with the photo lab's need to uniquely identify images.

Other steps to help minimize time spent arranging photographs include asking donors to assist in our efforts by identifying images as well as weeding out duplicates, generic landscapes, and the ubiquitous blurry husky puppy photos. Once the images arrive, however, we will not weed out duplicates and other images of low informational value (as tempting as it is to reduce our giant stock of poorly produced dog images). We will rely as much as possible on the donor's arrangement, particularly for photograph collections compiled or created in the course of field research or other work. For small collections consisting of one linear foot or less, we may not do any arrangement.

Researchers, we believe, are likely to want to look at the entire collection when they are so small or, in any case, it will not take up too much of their time to do so. We may create a series for photographs in order to appropriately place loose images, but the series may be incomplete in that photographs mixed into folders in other series will not be separated. Explanations of these decisions will, of course, be included in the finding aid. Finally, we will reduce our time spent on item-level preservation actions by not sleeving in Mylar, refolding, or interleaving unless the images meet select categories of special needs. All of these decisions are based upon UAF's particular set of circumstances. Foregoing weeding, for example, may not be an option for some institutions because of space concerns; others may have a large body of volunteers best suited to sleeving images in Mylar. MPLP works precisely because it is flexible enough to allow various definitions of minimum standards based on individual repository needs and resources.

Because of our minimum standards for arrangement, we will spend more time on description. Thorough, though not exhaustive, description at the collection level that identifies key subjects, places, and events will help researchers locate images even in the absence of an item-level index. At the same time, we will streamline our description by using a controlled vocabulary for common subjects and focusing our descriptive efforts on highlighting the elements that make a particular collection unique. Adequately describing photographs is always a challenge. Photograph researchers tend to fall into two types: those who are seeking one very *specific* image, in which case nothing short of an individual catalog record complete with multiple subject headings for each photograph will serve, and those who are conducting *in-depth* research who will want to look at all images, regardless of how well you have described them. In the end, we have decided to focus our initial descriptions for the *in-depth* researchers, with just enough detail for the *specific* researchers to get them pointed to likely collections. More detail will eventually be available through our digitization program, Alaska's Digital Archives, to serve this second category of researcher.

Certain types of photographs and photograph collections automatically fall into special needs categories that will require more individualized attention—what we call added-value processing (see figure 2). Precisely what actions are taken will depend on the type of special need; even in these special cases we will endeavor to do only the

Figure 2
UAF Draft Processing Guidelines—Added Value

- Appraisal
 - Fragility: Glass plates, nitrates, cabin finds
 - Pre-gold rush (1896) in primary date
 - Is accompanied by donation for more detail
 - Hot topics: minorities, ethnotechnology, global warming
- Use
 - Number upon ordering
 - High use = more preservation

minimum necessary. Examples of added-value categories that can be determined during appraisal include very fragile photographic formats such as glass or nitrate negatives. In Alaska, we also occasionally receive materials found in an old cabin somewhere in the bush. These items are generally extremely dirty, often contain mold or mildew damage, and show significant deterioration due to the extremes of temperature and humidity in our region. Such “cabin finds” will also receive more attention due to their fragility and the need to make the items safe for researchers to handle. Photograph collections containing a predominance of pre-gold rush (1896) images of Alaska are very rare and, therefore, also fall into the added-value category, in part because such rare images are heavily used. Other high-use categories that generally can be predicted at the time of appraisal are such rare or “hot” topics as non-Alaska Native minorities, ethnotechnology, and environmental change. Additionally, a collection initially processed using minimum standards, but which receives frequent use may eventually warrant added-value treatments. Finally, we offer the option of added-value processing to donors wishing to contribute to the costs of preservation and access. As with all of the minimum standards concepts, the categories for added value are flexible. Any collection has the potential to receive added-value processing, and the reasons for applying such procedures are not strictly limited to the examples previously described. However, the archivist advocating item-level preservation or arrangement must weigh the decision against the value subtracted from the rest of the historical photograph holdings, rather than solely considering the photographs currently in front of him.

Test Cases

The Archives tested its new procedures on a variety of photograph collections ranging in date from the nineteenth through the late twentieth centuries and in size from one quarter to more than 15 linear feet. The photographs also varied widely in original function, including family mementos, business documentation, and research data. Our arrangement, preservation, and description decisions were all based on the minimum standards concepts. The actions taken were quite different for each collection, however, and are examined in more detail below.

The Hubbell & Waller Records document an architecture and engineering company working in southeast Alaska throughout most of the twentieth century. The original order of the records consisted largely of project files, which grouped paper, photographs, and oversized technical drawings together. There were also some loose photographs and oversized materials. Our arrangement scheme was fairly simple: we left the project files as-is, and created additional series for photographs and technical drawings from the loose materials. Preservation consisted solely of replacing the few folders that fell apart when we handled them. Our main focus for this collection was description. We felt that most researchers would be looking for information about specific construction projects rather than information about the company itself. In addition, private funds had been donated to help fund processing these records. So our finding aid included folder-level descriptions for the project files, despite the considerable size (60 linear feet) of the series.

You will note that I have only briefly mentioned the photographs in this collection. That is because, in this case, we essentially treated the photographs in the same manner that we did the paper files. The photos in project files were not separated, even though a separate photograph series was created to handle the loose images. In terms of access, keeping the project files intact is a benefit to the researcher—no tracking down separated photos, since all materials related to a project are in one place. Preservation may eventually be an issue, but at the moment the silver gelatin prints, having always been kept in the dark of the file folder and now stored in a stable environment, are in good condition. As Greene and Meissner have emphasized, much of the backlog problem can be traced to “excessively cautious” preservation practices when, in fact, providing a stable storage environment contributes most to long-term preservation, even of materials acknowledged to be more fragile than paper.¹²

The Amory Family Papers also contained a mix of photographs and paper. Unlike the Hubbell and Waller Records, however, this collection was primarily from the nineteenth century, documented multiple generations of the family, and was in no discernable order. It was also significantly smaller, comprising about one cubic foot. For this collection, much more time was spent on arrangement than description. All materials were shifted into acid-free folders, since there were no original housings. The photographs included a group of lantern slides, which were separated to our cold-storage vault. Still, we did not individually number or sleeve any of the image materials—this action remains postponed until use indicates otherwise. The collection was arranged in series by a family member and briefly described at the same level. Photograph descriptions were also limited to the brief series descriptions. In general, family image collections such as the Amory Family Papers tend to have a large number of images of a relatively few number of subjects—primarily people and places, and in such cases, description at the series, or even collection level, is usually sufficient.

The third collection example is the Exxon-Valdez Oil Spill Study Records consisting of an estimated 10,000 slides documenting the long-term impact of the spill on marine life. In the past, a collection of this size would have caused a processing crisis. Either the collection would have remained unprocessed and unavailable or processing would have been attempted in small spurts, becoming more confused and unworkable with each generation of processors. With an appraisal that focused on the potential use, however, this collection was processed in less than a day. This is a collection created by research scientists and most likely will be used by scientists. The slides are labeled and uniquely numbered. While the numbers do not use our usual system based on accession number, they serve the same purpose: to uniquely identify each image. The collection was left in its original order and described at the collection level. The original housing—four slide filing cabinets, each the size of a records file cabinet—was retained. If, in the future, high demand and the nature of scientific research warrant, item-level digitization may be necessary. Fortunately, there is the potential for outside funding with this collection and any added-value processing will have to wait for such an event.

Each of the previously described collections had different types of images, purposes at the time of creation, and arrangement (or lack thereof). The projected use also varied. Thus with MPLP, the minimum standard needed to make each collection accessible also varied. By contrast, with our previous processing methods, each collection would

have been treated similarly, regardless of which method was the current standard. While that approach may have been perfectly appropriate for any one collection, the process failed when applied to all collections. It is the flexibility to change the ideal that makes MPLP so workable across collections.

Apparent Exceptions

The Archives conducts two major programs that, on the surface, appear to be exceptions to our commitment to minimum standards processing. The first is our extensive copying program. Many Alaska photograph collections exist as small parts of more extensive family collections with a non-Alaskan focus. Since we do not wish to split a collection, we often make photographic copies of the images and then return the originals to the donor. Unfortunately, the copying process requires each image to be uniquely numbered. Fortunately, we have found a few ways to reduce processing time even for these collections. A more rigorous appraisal of the images with a goal of reducing the total number of images copied is the first step. At the same time, we sometimes copy less-than-significant images when they are interspersed with more exceptional photographs affixed in an album. Additionally, the photo lab technician now assigns the identification numbers as she scans. Lastly, while description of loaned collections is necessarily more detailed than for collections of donated originals, the description remains the minimum appropriate to the individual collection and the circumstances of acquisition.

The second apparent exception is our digitization project. As with most digital photo archives the on-line images have to date required extensive item-level description. While this detailed cataloging appears to be a contradiction to MPLP, it must be remembered that MPLP's major tenet is the minimum *necessary*, not minimally *always*. Given the immensely positive response to our own digital archives, some version of digitization is clearly necessary for our modern researchers. At the same time, there is little evidence that researchers require the level of cataloging detail we—and many other digitization projects—currently provide. Just as Greene and Meissner discovered for archival researchers as a whole, there have been few user studies of digital archives users, especially as it pertains to quality of cataloging. It seems likely, however, that what was determined in Greene and Meissner's 2003–2004 survey of archival researchers carries over to digital archives as well: researchers would prefer to have more images available to them, despite a reduction in metadata quality, than to have a few perfectly cataloged images and a large backlog.¹³

Toward this end, UAF has begun to look for ways to reduce the time spent per image. First, we again apply a rigorous appraisal to collections selected for digitization. Once we began to focus on use, as we do for our hard-copy appraisals, it became clear that not all photograph collections are suitable for the current on-line archives. We have also modified the commercial software's functions to streamline the cataloging of related images by linking minimally described individual images to more detailed descriptions of the collection as a whole. Even more time savings could be gained with further modifications of the software to allow such actions as combining collection-

level metadata with batch importing of digital images. Unfortunately, these options are not possible with the current version. While software varies from institution to institution, the underlying assumptions and functions of most commercial programs are remarkably similar. If more institutions express their needs for streamlined import, minimal metadata, and the ability to describe collections at various levels, the commercial vendors should respond to customer demand. First, however, we must adjust our own vision of a successful digital archives.

Conclusion

Although we are still in the test stage, our experience thus far has been very positive. Our processors have enjoyed the intellectual challenge and variety in arranging and describing more collections more quickly. Researchers have responded to our increasingly available materials by requesting the newly available collections—often within days of our first posting the finding aid or catalog record on-line. Donor relations have improved now that we can assure donors that their collections will soon be available. Finally, administrators have viewed the new cataloging and research use numbers with great enthusiasm (though not yet additional funds).

Photograph collections do test the concepts of minimum standards processing, but the flexibility inherent in the MPLP technique is well suited to the arrangement and preservation needs of such special-format materials. Tailoring processing levels to individual collections, rather than adhering strictly to a frequently unattainable ideal, has been beneficial to the collections as well as the processor. Though we may not be able to achieve the optimum processing rate of one hour per linear foot with many of the photograph collections, our average rate continues to decrease significantly. Minimum standards processing has quickly become our norm—for all collections of any age and in any format.

For more information visit our project blog: <http://library.uaf.edu/blogs/nwapi/>

ABOUT THE AUTHOR: Anne L. Foster is the head of Archives & Manuscripts, Alaska & Polar Regions Collections, University of Alaska Fairbanks. She has worked for archives in Montana, Arizona, Colorado, and Maryland. In 1999, Foster was awarded the NHPRC's Fellowship in Archives Administration and spent a year at the Center of Southwest Studies, Fort Lewis College, Durango, Colorado. A certified archivist, she holds an M.L.S. with an archives concentration from the University of Maryland at College Park and a B.A. in history from Montana State University. Anne would like to acknowledge Susan Grigg, head of the Alaska & Polar Regions Collections, who passed away just days after reviewing a draft of this article.

NOTES

1. Mark A. Greene and Dennis Meissner, "More Product, Less Process: Revamping Traditional Archives Processing," *American Archivist* 68:2 (2005).
2. T. R. Schellenberg, *The Management of Archives* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1965): 322.
3. *Ibid.*, 326–331.
4. Kenneth W. Duckett, *Modern Manuscripts: A Practical Manual for Their Management, Care, and Use* (Nashville: American Association for State and Local History, 1975): 195–198.
5. Fredric M. Miller, *Arranging and Describing Archives and Manuscripts* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1990): 47–48.
6. Greene and Meissner, "More Product," 213.
7. Schellenberg, *Management*; Duckett, *Modern Manuscripts*; Mary Lynn Ritzenthaler, Diane Vogt-O'Connor, Helena Zinkham, and Brett Carnell, *Photographs: Archival Care and Management* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2006).
8. Thomas D. Norris, "Processing Extremely Large Collections of Historical Photographs," *The Midwestern Archivist* 10:2 (1985): 133.
9. Referring to Greene and Meissner's article of the same name, or MPLP for short, has lately become common practice in the archives profession to describe minimum standards processing. In this article, I use minimum standards and MPLP interchangeably.
10. Greene and Meissner, "More Product," 236.
11. This article has been expanded and adapted from a paper presented at the 2006 Midwest Archives Conference symposium, "More Product, Less Process: Reducing Archival Backlog and Rethinking Traditional Collections Processing," Omaha, NE, October 6–7, 2006, http://www.midwestarchives.org/2006_Fall/presentations.html (29 January 2008).
12. Greene and Meissner, "More Product," 250–251.
13. Greene and Meissner, "More Product, Less Process: Pragmatically Revamping Traditional Processing Approaches to Deal with Late 20th Century Collections," endnote 15, <http://ahc.uwyo.edu/documents/faculty/greene/papers/Greene-Meissner.pdf> (accessed 18 February 2008).