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Introduction

Archival processing, or the process of arranging, describing and housing “archival materials for storage and use by patrons”\(^1\) in an effort to “protect the material’s context and to achieve physical and intellectual control”\(^2\) over them, is an essential and prominent activity within archival institutions. In recent years, much attention has been placed on this activity due to studies focusing on the amount of unprocessed materials present at many archival institutions and how this backlog poses a serious obstacle to accessing archival materials on behalf of researchers or patrons. The Association of Research Libraries (ARL) has been at the forefront of studying the problem of backlog. In 1998 the ARL conducted a survey of ninety-nine member libraries, which found that “27 percent of manuscripts, 35 percent of video holdings, 36 percent of graphic materials, and 37 percent of materials in audio format” were unknown or unavailable to researchers or patrons.\(^3\) In response to this plaguing problem of backlog, Mark A. Greene and Dennis Meissner published an article in 2005 entitled “More Product Less Process: Revamping Tradition Archival Processing.”\(^4\)

In the article, Greene and Meissner argue that the backlog that exists at so many archival institutions is a direct result of what they call traditional archival processing practices.\(^5\) In an effort to ameliorate the deluge of backlog present at many repositories, Greene and Meissner make a series of suggestions in the form of heuristic guidelines, which they claim will decrease backlogs and increase access. Seven years have passed since this paper was published, and

---


\(^5\) Greene and Meissner never explicitly define these practices.
institutions and archivists have either jumped on the bandwagon and instituted More Product Less Product (MPLP) or have written scathing articles that challenge Greene and Meissner’s arguments on a theoretical basis. What exist then, within the milieu of archival literature regarding these guidelines either take the form of either opinion pieces taking a theoretical stance (either for or against MPLP) or case studies that provide no empirical evidence to support their claims that MPLP is having a positive or negative impact on their institution. Therefore, there is little to nothing known about the larger impact that these processing guidelines are having on archival institutions as a whole. In order to fill this gap, an evaluation framework needs to be developed that collects data that can be used to assess the extent to which MPLP is affecting archival institutions, and how. This is easier said than done, due to the fact that the archival field lacks a widely accepted, systematic methodological framework for evaluation of its programs. Given the above, this thesis will investigate the following questions:

1. What factors have made it difficult to assess the impact of MPLP?

2. What methods could be employed to measure the impact that MPLP is having on archival institutions? What aspects of impact should be investigated?

To establish context, the literature review outlines how evaluation has been addressed in archival literature since the 1970s. Following the literature review is a more general discussion regarding what factors have made it difficult to assess the impact of MPLP. Next, the methodology section explains how Collaborative Program Evaluation can be used to develop a methodological framework for evaluating the impact of MPLP on archival institutions. Using the larger framework of Collaborative Program Evaluation, four data collection strategies or evaluation tools were developed to evaluate to what extent reference services are impacted by the implementation of MPLP. This thesis concludes with a more general discussion of Greene and
Meissner’s heuristic guidelines, what factors have made it difficult to assess, and possible solutions for evaluation.

Literature Review

Within archival literature, Program Evaluation (PE), which can be defined as the “systematic collection of information about the activities, characteristics, and outcomes of programs to make judgments about the program, improve program effectiveness, and/or inform decisions about future programming”\(^6\) first began generating interest in the late 1970s with the Society of American Archivists (SAA). Nearly thirty years after Program Evaluation began to be explored in the archival realm, not much has changed. The archival field is still lacking a widely accepted, systematic framework for evaluation of its programs. This gap becomes apparent when reviewing archival literature on the subject. There are three categories of literature within the archival field that address evaluation. There are single author or edited monographs on the managing and keeping of archives, literature published by professional organizations that take the form of monographs on management or more interactive evaluation guides, and scholarly articles.

Evaluation within and amongst these three categories is addressed in four different ways. The majority of authors addressing evaluation refer to or reference some type of methodology or loose concept that can be used to collect data about an archive, but fail to explain the specifics of how it can be employed at an institution. Other authors address evaluation by explaining its importance briefly; they simply state that it is a necessary component of archival management or refer readers to other literature written on the subject. For authors who do develop or provide readers with a framework for evaluation, the methods employed do not produce reliable

---

statistics. The last prominent way in which evaluation is addressed is detailed or specific, targeting certain aspects of the archive to evaluate. Addressing evaluation of different aspects of an archive, more specifically targeting and evaluating different aspects of archival reference services, is most commonly found in periodical literature.

Authors who present concepts not methods

Most archival monographs on the management and keeping of archives that address evaluation present readers with evaluative concepts, not methods. In other words, authors address thoughts or ideas of how to execute an evaluation, but often what is left out or not included is procedure, a proscribed set of particular actions or ways of executing an evaluation, in an effort to produce reliable statistics. This phenomenon is not something of the past, rather it can be found in literature that spans a twenty-year period from 1991 to 2010. The concepts regarding evaluation that have been expressed by authors within the past twenty years fall into two categories: as categories, historic and direct analysis/evaluation are both predicated on the fact that archivists/record managers have either been collecting useable statistics about their programs or know how to collect reliable statics about their programs.

Both Michael Kurtz, author of chapter 18 in *Managing Archives and Archival Institutions* and Wilsted and Nolte, in *Managing Archival and Manuscript Repositories* articulate that the evaluation of archival programs is possible through retrospective analysis. Kurtz refers to this concept as “historical data analysis,” which he describes as individuals within an archive can using data that has been already collected to execute “statistical summaries…that

---

7 Reliable statistics within the context of this paper refers to the precision of measurements. In other words, a study that collects and/or measures data in a way that is reproducible or that produces statistics that are comparable across institutions, for example.
show estimated time and costs for each category of activity.” Wilsted and Nolte refer to the concept of retrospective analysis as “institutional analysis,” articulating the necessity of including “all aspects of the program: legal authority, governance, financial support, physical facilities, personnel, appraisal and records management, arrangement and description, reference and access, outreach, and preservation.” Both texts present concepts that are predicated on the idea that archival institutions have been collecting useable statistics about their programs. However, they do not provide any criteria or standards regarding statistics to ensure that archival institutions are collecting reliable data that can be used for institutional evaluation. Instead these authors assume that archivists or record managers are collecting sound usable statistics regarding archives and their programs.

The other category of evaluation concepts that are articulated in archival monographs is direct analysis. Kurtz, in the same chapter in which he presents historical data analysis, also presents another method that he calls “direct measurement.” He explains direct measurement briefly as a concept that involves time and motion studies to collect statistics surrounding work. Kurtz briefly fleshes out the concept. However, he does not describe the procedure for collecting the kind of information that he suggests is helpful for evaluation. Maher, in his book, *The Management of College and University Archives*, articulates a similar concept, which he refers to as “internal evaluation and reporting mechanisms.” He states that record managers are known for collecting many statistical measurements; however, he argues, the majority of statistics that are collected are unnecessary. Maher instead suggests that record managers should limit their evaluations to “the number of offices and series scheduled, the annual volume

---

13 Ibid.
scheduled for archival transfer or destruction, and the number of surveys conducted each year.”\textsuperscript{15} He provides no framework or methodology to inform readers how to collect statistics in the departments he suggests. Millar in \textit{Archives: Principles and Practices}\textsuperscript{16} and Williams in \textit{Managing Archives: Foundations, Principles, and Practice}\textsuperscript{17} suggest direct analysis through the collection of data in three different categories: inputs, outputs, and outcomes. What constitutes an input, output, and outcome is clearly defined by neither Millar nor Williams. Both authors also fail to provide an overall framework or a methodology for collecting data within the three categories that may result in reliable statistics. Kurtz, in a later publication, presents readers with a direct analysis concept called an “operating plan statistical report” that essentially involves entering in specific data into a chart provided in the text. He does a poor job of explaining how to use the chart, but asserts that this chart “enables the manager to determine if goals and objectives are being met and if there are any trends, problematic or otherwise, that are developing.”\textsuperscript{18} However, with no explanation as to how to fill out this chart, the potency of his explanation of its uses is diminished. The last piece of literature that falls within the direct measurement evaluation concept category is Shepherd and Yeo’s book \textit{Managing Records: A Handbook of Principle and Practice}. Shepherd and Yeo devote chapter two to “Analyzing the Context for Records Management.” This chapter is composed of two evaluation concepts that fall within the direct measurement camp. The authors address briefly SWOT analysis, which involves identifying the “strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats” of an archival institutions programs and PEST analysis, “which seeks to identify the different influences that currently affect the organization in

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{15} Ibid., 299–300.
  \item \textsuperscript{16} Laura A. Millar, \textit{Archives: Principles and Practice} (New York: Neal-Schuman Publishers, Inc., 2010).
\end{itemize}
the present…and refers to the political, social and technological environment within which the organization functions.”

They offer no examples or case studies to illustrate how each concept can be implemented effectively. By examining single author and/or edited monographs that address evaluation by suggesting evaluative concepts that involve direct or historical measurement of archival programs, it becomes apparent that the majority of authors write with the assumption that archivists/record managers know the methodology behind collecting reliable statistics. By only briefly touching on concepts of evaluation and neglecting any methodological framework for archivists, these authors do practicing archivists a disservice.

**Stating the importance of evaluation or referring readers to other texts**

Aside from archival literature that addresses evaluation by presenting readers with concepts that are explained in a cursory manner, many authors do not even go into that much detail regarding evaluation. Another trend that is evident within the archival literature can be characterized as authors who address evaluation simply by asserting its importance. One of the first instances in which the importance of archival evaluation was articulated in the archival literature was in 1979’s *Guidelines for College and University Archives*, edited by Jon Reynolds. In the guidelines under Records Management, evaluation is regarded as essential in providing “improvement in the quality of records.”

Thirteen years later, Cox articulates a similar sentiment. Cox, in a three hundred-page book, only devotes a few sentences to the importance of archival program evaluation. He explains, “The necessary context of financial monitoring and evaluation is an appropriate, realistic mission statement.”

Cox goes on to explain later, in a section entitled “Looking Toward the Future,” that there is a definite need in the archival field

---

for evaluation guides that institutions can use to learn how to collect reliable statistics about their programs. Dearstyne, who writes about government records specifically, also articulates the importance of evaluation but fails to provide readers with a framework to collect statistics. He does, however, call for more development of evaluation techniques in a list that he calls “examples of areas for development of performance measures.”\textsuperscript{22} Yakel, in a 2008 essay, addresses evaluation by drawing attention to the fact that the archival profession has not fully embraced it. She explains, “overall, archivists have not embraced evaluation and in cases where archival programs are utilizing techniques (e.g. surveys), they have not often shared the tools or the results with the wider archival community.”\textsuperscript{23}

Some authors go a step further by stating the importance of evaluation as well as referring readers to supplementary texts. Instead of developing new ways of evaluating archival programs or more effective frameworks for evaluation, these authors fall back on frameworks that do not produce reliable statistics, and that, one can argue, require improvement. Dearstyne, in a technical leaflet entitled \textit{Planning for Archival Programs: An Introduction}, addresses how to begin the planning process: the third step in the process involves carrying “out a self analysis of program resources and services.”\textsuperscript{24} Instead of developing a new and improved evaluation method, Dearstyne refers readers to other texts, namely, \textit{Evaluation of Archival Institutions: Services, Principles, A Guide to Self Study},\textsuperscript{25} which was published seven years prior. Yakel does the same thing as Dearstyne. In her book entitled \textit{Starting an Archive}, Yakel explains that self-

\textsuperscript{22} Bruce W. Dearstyne, \textit{Managing Government Records and Information} (Prairie Village, Kansas: ARMA International, 1999), 77.
\textsuperscript{24} Bruce W. Dearstyne, \textit{Planning for Archival Programs: An Introduction} (Mid-Atlantic Regional Archives Conference, 1989), 4.
evaluation and program assessment should “periodically” be executed within an archive. She then goes on to outline previously published “tools” to assist archivists in the act or task of evaluation. They are as follows (1) McCarthy’s *Archives Assessment and Planning Workbook* and (2) *Strengthening New York’s Historical Records* both published in 1989. Yakel relies on evaluation tools that, at the time she was writing her book, were already five years old.

By simply emphasizing the necessity of evaluation within an archive or by referring readers or practitioners to outdated and largely ineffective evaluation tools or frameworks, authors within the archival field are stunting its growth. Today, nearly thirty years after program evaluation began generating interest in the archival field, there has yet to be any real strides. Individuals have relied, and continue to rely, on frameworks that were developed in the late 1980s, and no effort has been made by academics or practitioners to improve upon what has been executed in the past. It could also be the case that effective frameworks for evaluation have been developed within archival institutions but not published or shared among the larger archival community, as Yakel suggests in *College and University Archives: Readings in Theory and Practice*.

Frameworks that do not produce reliable statistics

Three prominent evaluation frameworks, or guides, are frequently cited in archival literature. They include the SAA’s *Evaluation of Archival Institutions: Services, Principles and Guide to Self Study*, McCarthy’s *Archives Assessment and Planning Workbook*, and the New York Historical Records Program, *Strengthening New York’s Historical Records Program: A Self-Study Guide*.

---

York Historical Society’s *Strengthening New York’s Historical Records Program: A Self Study Guide*.\(^{32}\) These frameworks provide practitioners with a basic structure within which to collect data about an archive and its programs. The ways in which these frameworks are designed are problematic because they rely predominately on the opinion of the evaluator rather than on concrete data that is collected in a reliable manner.

All three evaluation guides are composed primarily of self-reporting questions on aspects of the archive. Responses either take the form of open-ended questions or a simple check under the “yes,” “no,” or “not applicable (n/a)” field. Questions range from “How are access restrictions determined and administered?” (answered in the form of an open-ended text field)\(^ {33}\) to “Does the archive have a document or documents that authorize its establishments and continued existence?” (answered by a check in the “yes,” “no,” or “n/a” field) \(^ {34}\) to “Does the program have sufficient resources to support its activities and care for its historical records?” (answered by a check in the “yes,” “no,” or “n/a” field).\(^ {35}\) Here answers are based not on evidence but on the opinion of the individual who is filling out this evaluation guide. Complex questions are oversimplified with limited response choices. Thus, the information produced is lackluster, not especially telling or informative.

The only evaluation guide that involves data-based questions is McCarthy’s *Archives Assessment and Planning Workbook* in a section entitled “Resource Data Sheet.”\(^ {36}\) Within this section there is no explanation as to how to get particular required figures. For example, there is

---

31 McCarthy, *Archives Assessment and Planning Workbook*.
34 McCarthy, *Archives Assessment and Planning Workbook*, 16.
a question that requires the evaluator to report the “Total number of users” with no further directions.\(^\text{37}\) This expression is unclear because it can be interpreted in different ways. Is this question referring to the number of users who physically visited the archive? What do they mean by “users”? These terms should be operationally defined so that the data collected can be accurate and also reliably comparable with other institutions’ data.

As can be seen from the above analysis, what exists in the archival realm in terms of evaluation guides falls short, due to the way in which data, both qualitative and quantitative, is collected. Questions are posed in such a way that responses are opinion-based, whether the questions are qualitative or quantitative in nature. Evaluators answer questions with a check in the “yes,” “no,” or “n/a” field, provide a free-form responses, or are required to provide data with no guidance or specificity on how to collect it.

**Periodical literature that evaluates specific aspects of an archive**

Periodical literature that addresses archival evaluation usually takes the form of articles that do not look at the archive as a whole, but rather focus on different aspects of the archive. The most common aspect of an archive that is examined from an evaluation standpoint is reference service (more specifically user groups and reference correspondence). Archival literature that touches on the evaluation of reference services in very specific terms can be divided into two major categories: the evaluation or analysis of the information seeking behaviors of user groups, and the analysis of reference correspondence.

**User groups**

The subject of evaluation or analysis of the information seeking behaviors of user groups manifests primarily in two ways: articles about the information seeking behaviors of specific user groups, and articles about how individuals find online finding aids. Paul Conway’s 1986

\(^{37}\) Ibid.
article, “Facts and Frameworks: An Approach to Studying the Users of Archives”\(^{38}\) which was published in 1986, to date is one of the only pieces of archival literature to date to create a methodological framework for evaluating all the user groups within an archival institution. Aside from Conway’s article, the majority of archival literature focuses on specific user groups within different archival institutions. Wendy Duff and Catherine Johnson together have published many articles, primarily on the subject of the information seeking behaviors of historians and genealogists.\(^{39}\) Their most recent articles on the subject, “Where is the List with All the Names? Information-Seeking Behavior of Genealogists”\(^{40}\) and “Chatting Up the Archivist: Social Capital and the Archival Researcher,”\(^{41}\) employ in-depth and semi-structured interviews, respectively, to investigate how historians and genealogists search and find primary source material. These studies are largely exploratory, are not replicable, and are certainly not generalizable due to small sample size, nature of the population, and the institution therein.

**Finding aids**

Academic articles within archival literature evaluate finding aids primarily by investigating how users are accessing finding aids, as well as the search terms that are being employed by users to find archival collections and materials on the Web. Academics within the field investigate these questions using a variety of different research methodologies. Some of the


\(^{40}\) Duff and Johnson, “Where Is the List with All the Names? Information-Seeking Behavior of Genealogists.”

\(^{41}\) Johnson and Duff, “Chatting Up the Archivist: Social Capital and the Archival Researcher.”
most prominent methodologies employed are as follows: content analysis, search engine “search methodologies,”42 surveys, observation, interviews, and, most recently, web analytic tools.

A number of important and influential studies have been conducted on this topic. One of the first articles to make its way into publication was Rita Czeck’s 1998 article “Archival MARC Records and Finding Aids in the Context of End-User Subject Access to Archival Collections.”43 In the same year, the Online Archive of California was formally integrated into the California Digital Library, which made archival finding aids from multiple California institutions viewable online. In her article, Czeck examines the extent to which archival MARC records represent the information (such as chronological information, geographical information, personal information, and corporate information) present in finding aids. Through a content analysis of twenty finding aids and their corresponding MARC records, Czeck found that the level of representation in archival MARC records varied depending on the content category. She found that geographical terms found in finding aids were most likely represented in MARC records then were personal names, chronological terms, and lastly corporate names. Czeck argues that, since a significant amount of subject information tends to be present in findings aids and not in their corresponding MARC records, archivists should provide end users with online searchable finding aids.

Although this study is limited in the claims it can make due to the small sample size, it does, however, suggest the importance of searchable finding aids and the shortcomings of MARC records in terms of representing an institution’s archival collections.

Three years later, another study that employed content analysis of finding aids was published. In “Finding Finding Aids on the World Wide Web,” Tibbo and Meho conducted a study that explored how well six popular Web search engines performed in retrieving specific online searchable finding aids. Although this study holds less relevance today, since some of the Web search engines used in the study no longer exist or are no longer as frequently used, it illustrates to the ease of locating finding aids on the Web, from a user’s perspective. A study that built upon Tibbo and Meho’s methodology was Christopher J. Prom’s article “Users Interactions with Electronic Finding Aids in a Controlled Setting.” Instead of conducting queries on search engines to find specific finding aids himself, Prom selected a sample of undergraduate students, graduate students, campus faculty, and archivists to complete a short questionnaire, search for specific pieces of information on nine Web sites, and, when feasible, take part in a short interview. All of this, except for the interview, was administered through a website. From the raw quantitative data as well as coded qualitative data of 89 respondents, Prom found that finding aids currently available online are most efficiently used by either individuals who are very familiar with archival research and/or computers. Non-experts in Prom’s study needed over ninety seconds on average to find the content for which they were searching. Prom calls for a simplification of display elements as well as a limitation of search choices in an effort to help make searching for online finding aids more efficient for users. Results could vary considerably if this were to be conducted in real life and not in a controlled environment. Therefore, Prom’s study is not necessarily generalizable.

The most recent study of user interactions with online searchable finding aids did what Prom did not do, which is study user interactions in a setting that is not controlled. In October

2011, Mark O’English published an article entitled “Applying Web Analytics to Online Finding Aids: Page Views, Pathways, and Learning about Users.” To date, this is one of the most applicable user studies that can be incorporated into a comprehensive program evaluation of reference services of an archival institution. O’English used a free service offered by Google called Google Analytics to track website use and access to online searchable finding aids on the Manuscript, Archives and Special Collections at Washington State University Libraries’ (MASC) website for a period of eighteen months. Using Google Analytics, O’English wanted to investigate the paths that patrons follow to locate finding aids. His goal was to improve access as well as to gain patron-derived information that would help inform the repository as to which collections from their backlog should be a priority to process. While the information he found is not necessarily generalizable to other academic universities, this study could be replicated at other academic archives and special collections to assess their users’ behaviors and to see which collections should be a priority to process, based on demand.

Reference Correspondence

Research on remote reference correspondence began in the 1990s. Articles on remote reference began focusing on all types of reference, i.e. “snail mail,” phone calls, and email. Progressing into the 2000s, research within the archival realm began focusing solely on remote email correspondence, due to the advent of the online searchable finding aids and databases such as the Online Archive of California. There have been three key recent studies that have deconstructed the reference question to investigate more about the reference correspondence process that can be applied to developing a methodological framework for comprehensively evaluating reference services: David Bearman’s article “User Presentation Language in

---

Bearman, in his 1990 study, examines the “presentation language” of archival users in order to gain insight into how the reference archivist responded, how the answer was then used, and the institution’s criteria for success. From eighteen participating repositories, Bearman collected 1,559 inquiry forms, which had questions that staff and the general public recorded from their interactions (via email and personal interactions) with patrons at the archive. The questions from the inquiry forms were delineated into three major categories: procedural questions, research-based questions, and finally questions that could not be answered by any database because they had to do with requests for permission, among other things. This study is exploratory in nature; however, it does provide an interesting framework that can be used in future studies to execute an in-depth analysis of reference correspondence.

Another key recent article published on the topic of reference correspondence reported on Martin’s 2001 study, which consisted of an analysis of 595 letter, phone, facsimile, and e-mail reference correspondence conducted at the Southern Historical Collection and General Literacy Manuscript (SHC). A systematic sample of every third correspondence unit was taken between the years 1995 and 1999. All of the reference correspondence was contained in files that were housed within the archival repository. Through a content analysis of the correspondence units, Martin investigated the following: purpose of research, types of requests, objects of inquiry and

---

51 Martin defines a “unit” as one exchange between a researcher and the archivist.
types of responses from archival staff. She kept a running tally of researchers who actually came into the repository. Although this study might not be replicable, since archival institutions might not keep all the reference correspondence they have ever received, this article does provide a useful framework that delineates important topics for investigation that an archival institution might want to execute internally in an effort to evaluate their reference services. As email reference became more prevalent as the primary mode of remote reference correspondence, this became the sole focus within the majority of academic articles.

In 2001, Duff and Johnson published an article entitled “A Virtual Expression of Need: An Analysis of E-mail Reference Questions.”\(^5\) This paper investigates a total of 375 email reference questions submitted to federal, provincial, university, city, and special archives. Although the results of this survey are not necessarily generalizable to other archival institutions, the analysis framework is helpful and could be used by an archival institution to better understand how their patrons describe their information needs and to delineate whether or not the description practices they are employing adequate.

**Bigger Picture: what factors make it difficult to evaluate MPLP**

There are three major factors that complicate the ability to assess the impact of MPLP on archival institutions. These factors include the relative recency of the MPLP guidelines, that the heuristic guidelines constructed by Greene and Meissner are subject to interpretation, and the arbitrariness of the way in which processing rates/metrics are calculated. These three factors make it difficult to construct a systematic methodological framework to evaluate the impact of MPLP on an archival institution, because they introduce a considerable amount of variation.

---

\(^5\) Duff and Johnson, “A Virtual Expression of Need: An Analysis of E-mail Reference Questions.”
Greene and Meissner’s premier article on MPLP entitled “More Product, Less Process: Revamping Traditional Archival Processing”\textsuperscript{53} was published in *The American Archivist* in 2005, meaning the processing guidelines are only seven years old. Given this, is it too early to be able to decipher the long-term implications? Since MPLP has only been around for seven years, archival institutions that have implemented it have a hybrid situation, i.e. some collections were processed according to MPLP and some collections were not. The question then arises as to how an institution can truly measure the impact of MPLP if only some and not all of the collections have been minimally processed. If this is the case, how can an evaluation be developed that can definitively examine the impact both short and long-term of the MPLP guidelines? And, is this even possible?

*Heuristic guidelines are up for interpretation*

MPLP is being interpreted and implemented in various ways due to the heuristic nature of the processing guidelines Greene and Meissner present in their article. This fact becomes apparent when examining Greene and Meissner’s subsequent article entitled “More Application While Less Appreciation: The Adopters and Antagonists of MPLP,”\textsuperscript{54} as well as case studies written by institutions that have implemented MPLP. Greene and Meissner in their follow-up article articulate:

In the five years since “More Product, Less Process” (MPLP) was published, the MPLP research findings have elicited similarly diverse interpretations of its meaning and implications for archivists. While most responses in the published literature, on blogs, in conference papers and audience comments, on listservs, and by survey respondents have been strongly positive, some have been as dark and foreboding…Some of these interpretive shots have been to our eyes, right on the bull’s-eye, while others have landed


well…a little wide of the mark. This article is the MPLP authors’ first attempt…to try to clear up what we find to be some rather serious misinterpretations.55

The authors go onto discuss what they deem to be the most serious misinterpretation, which is treating MPLP as a “cookie-cutter” approach.56 Greene and Meissner articulate that MPLP is not about a set of processing rules or a step-by-step dogmatic approach to processing but rather general advice regarding “prioritizing institution goals, about achieving high-level program objectives, about maximizing return on investment (ROI), and about adopting practical approaches rather than millennial ones” when processing archival collections.57 Greene and Meissner came to this conclusion from reviewing literature published about MPLP, namely case studies.

To explore clear and concrete examples of how MPLP is in fact being interpreted and implemented in different ways, four case studies will be examined. The four articles are as follows: Christine Weideman’s “Accessioning as Processing,”58 Michael Stom’s “Texas-Sized Progress: Applying Minimum-Standards Processing Guidelines to the Jim Wright Papers,”59 Anne L. Foster’s “Minimum Standards Processing and Photograph Collections,”60 and finally Donna E. McCrea’s “Getting More for Less: Testing a New Processing Model at the University of Montana.”61 These articles address minimal processing practices executed on a variety of different types of collections, which include, respectively: a large collection of family papers, a large collection of congressional papers, a photographic collection of approximately one million

---

55 Ibid., 174–175.
56 Ibid., 176.
57 Ibid.
images, and general university records and manuscript collections that were considered backlog. The different types of preservation measures and description and arrangement practices executed on these different collections are outlined below.

**Preservation**

There are two different categories that institutions featured in the case studies selected fall into, in terms of preservation. The two categories are: no preservation measures taken on backlogged collections, and preservation measures taken on a case-by-case basis when there is a desperate need. In an article entitled, “Getting More for Less: Testing a New Processing Model at the University of Montana,” McCrea articulates that processors at her institution have stopped re-foldering altogether and rely on the assumption that the environment in which the collections are stored does not fluctuate significantly.62 Strom articulates a similar standpoint in his article entitled, “Texas-sized Progress: Applying Minimum-Standards Processing Guidelines to the Jim Wright Papers.” In a case study that involved a large collection of congressional papers, no preservation measures were taken. Processors working on this particular collection did not arrange, re-house, re-folder or re-label material.63

At the other end of the spectrum, there are institutions that instruct their processors to implement preservation measures on a case-by-case basis. Foster, in the article she wrote about minimally processing photograph collections at the University of Alaska Fairbanks, articulates that the preservation measures taken on collections are situationally-bound, based on condition. If a folder is falling apart, it is replaced. If a photograph is showing signs of significant degradation, it is placed in a Mylar sleeve. Weideman reflects this sentiment in her article

---

62 Ibid., 286.
“Accessioning as Processing.” During the course of processing, processors at Yale are instructed to replace folders only when they are showing signs of degradation.64

Description and Arrangement

There are four different levels of arrangement and description reflected in the case studies examined. Some institutions impose no arrangement and provide patrons with a container list.65 Others provide minimal arrangement and description for all collections; if the collections are then deemed high use66 processors would then arrange and describe the collection in more detail.67 Some institutions arrange and describe collections at the series level.68 Other institutions assess all collections on a case-by-case basis, flagging collections that merit more detailed arrangement and description.69 Examining the arrangement and description practices recounted in the case studies examined above illustrates the different ways in which the processing guidelines created by Greene and Meissner are interpreted and implemented. This in turn makes evaluating how institutions interpret and implement MPLP almost an impossible task.

Arbitrariness of processing metrics

The study of processing rates, or the rate at which a collection is arranged and described by an archival processor within the archival realm began in the 1970s. As Ericksen and Shuster articulate, the late development of literature surrounding metrics can be attributed in part to the fact that it is difficult to track the time an employee spends processing, because many staff members within an archival repository rarely work on one collection simultaneously.70

Additionally, when collections are thought of as unique entities as they frequently are,

65 McCrea, “Getting More for Less: Testing a New Processing Model at the University of Montana.”
66 This term was never defined.
67 Foster, “Minimum Standards Processing and Photograph Collections.”
68 Weideman, “Accessioning as Processing.”
69 Ibid.
individuals believe they are too distinct to compare within the archival community.\textsuperscript{71} From the 1970s and into the 1990s, more scholarly literature began to be published, although it was never voluminous. Scholarly literature took the form of theoretical pieces and case studies. For the purpose of this paper, case studies will be examined to illustrate how arbitrary processing rates are due to the lack of standards surrounding (1) the way extent of a collection is measured, (2) how time spent processing is tracked, and (3) how format of materials present in a collection factors into the equation.

There are six primary case studies surrounding processing rates or metrics that have been published since the 1970s. They are as follows: William J. Maher's “The Importance of Financial Analysis of Archival Programs,”\textsuperscript{72} W.N. Davis Jr.'s “Budgeting for Archival Processing,”\textsuperscript{73} Lynch and Lynch's “Rates of Processing Manuscripts and Archives,”\textsuperscript{74} Arbraham et. al's “What is Backlog Is Prologue: A Measurement of Archival Processing,”\textsuperscript{75} Uli Haller's “Variation in the Processing Rates on the Manson and Jackson Senatorial Papers,”\textsuperscript{76} and Ericksen and Shuster's “Beneficial Shocks: The Place of Processing-Cost Analysis in Archival Administration.”\textsuperscript{77} Amongst the six case studies named above, processing rates were calculated either retrospectively or in real time. Extent is measured either in linear feet or cubic feet. No study takes into consideration

\textsuperscript{71} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{77} Ericksen and Shuster, “Beneficial Shocks: The Place of Processing-Cost Analysis in Archival Administration.”
format of materials present and findings range from 1 linear foot per 20 hours\textsuperscript{78} to 72.5 linear feet per processor per week.\textsuperscript{79}

Given the disparity of findings and the way these findings were calculated or found within the case studies, how can institutions compare processing rates? Taking this further, how can Greene and Meissner simply state that institutions should strive to process twentieth-century archival collections at an average rate of four hours per cubic feet\textsuperscript{80} and fail to include how institutions should track processing time, measure extent, and ultimately calculate processing rates?

Take, for example, two collections: collection X, which is composed of two oversize flat storage boxes (total of 0.8 linear feet) and collection Y, which is composed of two doc boxes (total of 0.8 linear feet). Collection X is composed of 4 architectural drawings (two drawings per box) while Collection Y is composed of personal papers, which take the form of correspondence. Collections X and Y have the same extent, which is 0.8 linear feet, but processing four architectural drawings takes a shorter amount of time than does processing two document boxes of personal papers. Say collection X takes 20 minutes to process (arrange and describe) and collection Y takes 2 hours. The rate at which collection X was processed would be calculated by taking 20 minutes and dividing it by 0.8, which is the linear footage or extent, yielding 25 minutes per linear foot. The rate at which collection Y was processed would be calculated by taking 2 hours or 120 minutes and dividing it by 0.8, which is the linear footage or extent, yielding 150 minutes per linear foot, a significant difference. This example illustrates how format of material is an essential component of processing metrics; however, it has been left out of the equation in archival literature surrounding processing rates or metrics. Therefore, a

standard needs to be developed concerning how to gather statistics regarding processing rates/metrics, one that takes into consideration the format of materials.

Since MPLP is relatively new and is interpreted and implemented in different ways, and there is no accepted standard for measuring extent and calculating processing rates, how can one develop a comprehensive methodological evaluation framework that can work to determine the extent to which MPLP is effecting the institution as a whole? The next section will explore how a methodological framework for evaluating MPLP can be developed.

Methodology

In order to develop a methodological framework for evaluating the impact of MPLP on archival institutions, this study employed a Collaborative Program Evaluation (CPE) approach. CPE is a participatory evaluation method.\textsuperscript{81} It can be characterized by the importance it places on conducting an evaluation that involves essential stakeholders, or the people whom a particular program affects, during all stages of the evaluation.\textsuperscript{82} In the case of MPLP, this involves including the staff and users of the archive during all of the various stages of the evaluation process. The framework for designing a CPE involves six elements: a program background statement, evaluation purpose, evaluation questions with proposed information-gathering activities, timeline of evaluation activities, qualifications statement, and budget.\textsuperscript{83} Elements one through five were executed in order to develop an objective-oriented\textsuperscript{84} summative\textsuperscript{85} methodological framework that evaluates the objectives of MPLP (access and processing time).

\textsuperscript{81} According to Worthen et al. in \textit{Educational evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines} there are six different categories of evaluation approaches. They are as follows: Objectives, Management, Consumer, Expertise, Adversary, and Participant.


\textsuperscript{83} Ibid., 54.

\textsuperscript{84} An objectives oriented evaluation approach is a type of evaluation approach that works to determine the extent to which the program has achieved its intended outcomes.

\textsuperscript{85} A summative evaluation is one that helps to determine particular programs' accomplishments, in an effort to see if the program has made a significant impact.
to determine the degree of attainment, informing an analysis of whether and to what extent MPLP has effected a particular archival institution (see Figure 1)."\textsuperscript{86}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ |p{20cm}| }
\hline
\textbf{Elements of a Evaluation Proposal} \\
1. \textbf{Program Background Statement}: What is the nature of the program? What mission or purpose does it serve? \\
2. \textbf{Evaluation Purpose}: What needs to be evaluated? What are the intended uses of the evaluation? Why evaluate this now? Why evaluate this as opposed to something else? \\
3. \textbf{Evaluation questions with purposed information gathering activities}: Based on your program and evaluation purpose, what are the broad evaluation questions you would like answered? What information will you gather so that you have a convincing evidence to answer your evaluation questions? Have you made sure that evaluation questions are answered with evidence from more than one source? Have you consulted important stakeholders? \\
4. \textbf{Timeline of evaluation activities}: When will you gather important evidence? Who will be responsible for different evaluation activities? Have you allotted enough time to develop and pilot test instruments and surveys so that you are confident about the quality of the information that you are gathering? Have you allowed sufficient time for summarizing the information you collected and for report writing? \\
5. \textbf{Qualifications statement}: What are the qualifications of personnel who will conduct the evaluation and the organizational resources that will be available? What previous experience is relevant? \\
6. \textbf{Budget}: What will the evaluation cost? What new costs are created by implementing the evaluation? What staff resources in time, clerical, and other necessities will be used to complete the evaluation? \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\textbf{Figure 1 Collaborative Program Evaluation Framework}\textsuperscript{87}

In order to discover which aspects of MPLP needed to be evaluated within the larger framework of CPE (in the opinion of professional archivists and in an effort to make this thesis more relevant and practical), an Evaluation Needs Assessment (ENA) was administered. O’Sullivan explains in her book \textit{Practicing Evaluation: A Collaborative Approach} that the ENA is a key component of Collaborative Program Evaluation, because it highlights what aspects within a program need to be assessed or evaluated for the evaluation team.\textsuperscript{88} An Evaluation Needs Assessment involves gathering data from various stakeholder audiences regarding what they feel are important aspects of the particular program to evaluate. This can be executed in written form, in person, or via the Internet, during individual or group interviews, as well as on

\textsuperscript{86} Element six within the evaluation framework was too difficult to execute due to the theoretical nature of this thesis. \\
\textsuperscript{87} This chart was taken verbatim from O’Sullivan, \textit{Practicing Evaluation: A Collaborative Approach}, 54. \\
\textsuperscript{88} Ibid., 44.
the phone. In the case of MPLP, the ENA would involve soliciting the opinions of individuals who are involved in the appraisal, arrangement, and description of archival collections within an institution, as to what aspects of the processing guidelines should be targeted in an evaluation.

The ENA, which took the form of an online survey created using Google’s free survey tool, was sent to members of the Society of American Archivists (SAA) through their online listserv to the following email discussion lists: SAA Archival History Roundtable Discussion List, Archives & Archivists (A&A) List, SAA Archives Management Roundtable Discussion List, SAA Description Section Discussion List, SAA EAD Roundtable Discussion List, SAA Preservation Section Discussion List, SAA Women Archivists Roundtable Discussion List, and SAA Women’s Collections Roundtable Discussion List. The survey was very brief and consisted of four questions (see Figure 2).

**Evaluation Needs Assessment**

In the space below, please list two aspects of More Product Less Process (MPLP) that you think are the most important to evaluate. For each evaluation priority you list, explain why you think it is important.

* Required

**First Priority**

**Importance?**

**Second Priority**

**Importance?**

Submit

Powered by Google Docs

Report Abuse - Terms of Service - Additional Terms

---

Figure 2 Figure Evaluation Needs Assessment Survey

89 Ibid.

90 Aspect within the context of this paper refers to the various processes or interrelated activities that take place within an archive. These include but are not limited to appraisal, acquisition, arrangement, description, preservation, and reference.
Responses were collected by Google and entered automatically into an excel spreadsheet, which contained the following information: date and time of response, and responses. Therefore, all responses were anonymous (see Figure 3).

![Figure 3 Google Survey Tool Spreadsheet, example of response](image)

The survey was posted for a week, and forty-four individuals participated. The population selected was a sample of convenience, meaning that the results generated are not generalizable. Therefore, the opinions of the respondents who participated in this study do not necessarily reflect the opinion of all archivists within the United States. Manifest content analysis\(^91\) was conducted, meaning that the concrete terms that participants used to answer the first priority and second priority questions were tallied and the top two most frequently cited aspects of evaluation became the basis for the evaluation questions posed, and subsequently the evaluation framework developed.

**Program Background Statement:** “…good processing is done with a shovel, not with tweezers”\(^92\)

More Product Less Process (MPLP) is a set of arrangement, preservation, and descriptive guidelines that: “1) expedites getting collection materials into the hands of users; 2) assures arrangement of materials *adequate* to user needs; 3) takes the *minimal* steps necessary to physically preserve collection materials; and 4) describes materials *sufficient* to promote use.”\(^93\)

The ultimate goal of Greene and Meissner’s MPLP guidelines is twofold: they aim to increase the accessibility of collection materials to users as a result of decreasing the backlog of archival

---


\(^93\) Ibid., 212–213.
material found at many archival institutions. In order to decrease backlog and increase access, Greene and Meissner outline specific practices regarding arrangement, description, preservation, and overall processing rates that they argue will assist archival institutions in reaching the ultimate goal described above.

Arrangement and Description

In terms of arrangement, Greene and Meissner argue that twentieth century archival materials should not be physically arranged below the series level and that not all series and files within a collection need to be arranged at the same level.\(^{94}\) In order to process collections at a faster rate, Greene and Meissner state that description should be executed in a top-down manner, from most general to the most specific. Greene and Meissner go onto say that the description of material should be “at a level appropriate to that level of arrangement,”\(^ {95}\) which ideally is at the series level. All descriptive content for the finding aid, which includes, primarily, the scope and content notes as well as the biographical/historical notes, should be brief and “preferably taken wholesale from the background documents in the collection.”\(^ {96}\) Most importantly, Greene and Meissner articulate that processing archivists should “always prefer the acceptable minimum—within and across collections—and make each new situation argue for an additional investment of time and effort.”\(^ {97}\)

Preservation

Greene and Meissner argue that archivists should primarily rely on the overall storage environment for the preservation of archival materials, and that re-foldering materials, removing metal fasteners, segregating newspaper clippings and/or photographs, and preservation

---

\(^{94}\) Ibid., 243.
\(^{95}\) Ibid., 246.
\(^{96}\) Ibid., 247.
\(^{97}\) Ibid., 247–248.
photocopying should be “exceptions rather than rules,” in other words, only executed if there is a “real need.”98 In order to facilitate greater access to collections on the archives patrons’ behalf, unprocessed collections should be open to researchers with the exception of collections that have legal restrictions, collections that contain extremely valuable materials, or collections that are very fragile. Greene and Meissner, in advocating for increased access to archival collections explain that archivists:

…must get beyond our absurd over-cautiousness that unprocessed collections might harbor embarrassing materials not accounted for in deeds of gift, and we must stop fretting over what users might think about us if given a dirty, disorganized collection— their thoughts will be paeans of praise compared to what they now think about us, after being denied access to so much of our holdings.99

To ensure that backlogs of archival collections are continuously being reduced, Greene and Meissner end their arrangement, description, and preservation guidelines with a discussion of processing rates or metrics. They argue that extensive twentieth-century archival holdings should be processed at an average rate of four hours per cubic foot100 and that this processing rate can be achieved by implementing the guidelines that are outlined above.

In order to visualize how MPLP functions under the environmental conditions of an archival institution, a logic model will be used. The logic model, which has been used within the discipline of practical program evaluation since the 1960s, serves as a tool that assists program evaluators with conceptualizing the program by visually depicting how a program functions under specified or certain environmental conditions. In the context of this paper, the word “program” refers to the “intentional transformation of specific resources (inputs) into certain

---

98 Ibid., 251.
99 Ibid., 252.
100 Ibid., 253.
activities (processes) to produce desired outcomes (results) within a specific context.” The logic model helps to focus on the important elements of a program as well as to identify the appropriate evaluation questions to pose, and it can be used at any point during a program’s “life cycle.” It consists of four main elements: resources, activities, outputs, and outcomes, which exist within the larger framework of program structure, outcomes, structure and context (which consists of antecedent factors and mediating factors) (see Figure 4).

![Figure 4 MPLP Logic Model](image)

This logic model is based on how MPLP would function within an institutional that has a significant portion of its collections waiting in the processing backlog, and is inaccessible to its patrons, according to Greene and Meissner. Such a scenario is depicted by Greene and Meissner in their 2005 article \(^{103}\) as the status quo, a conclusion they came to after conducting a study in 2003-04. Greene and Meissner’s 2003-04 study was two-pronged. It involved a study of processing metrics conducted by analyzing forty grant applications that were awarded by the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC). The

---

102 Ibid., 55.
majority of the study involved an in-depth email survey of processing archivists. The survey contained one hundred and six data elements and yielded one hundred responses, with the majority of questions relating to backlog and processing practices. The study found that “34% [of institutional archives] have more than half of their holdings unprocessed; 60% of repositories have at least a third of their collections unprocessed.” Since Greene and Meissner’s study and subsequent article, Dooley and Luce, in their 2010 Online Computer Library Center (OCLC) Research Survey of Special Collections and Archives, found that seventy-five percent of respondents or approximately one hundred twenty-six institutions use minimal-level processing techniques “either some or all of the time.” There is little to nothing known about the larger impact that these processing guidelines would have or are having on an archival institution as a whole. This is due to the fact that what exist within the milieu of archival literature are opinion pieces that take a theoretical stance (either for or against MPLP) and case studies that provide little to no empirical evidence to support their claims that MPLP is having a positive impact on their institutions. Further, this can in part be attributed to the fact that the archival field, as illustrated in the literature review portion of this thesis, lacks a widely accepted, systematic methodological framework for evaluation of its programs. Therefore, there is a need for MPLP to be evaluated in a real context rather than a theoretical one. In order to evaluate the impact MPLP is having on an archival institution, a methodological framework needs to be developed. Working within the bounds of Collaborative Program Evaluation in order to develop a methodological framework for evaluation of MPLP, the evaluator’s understanding of the

---

104 Ibid., 228. The survey and summary of results can be found in appendix A of this article.
105 Ibid., 210.
106 On page 17, Dooley and Luce state that 169 institutions responded to their survey. 75% of 169 is 126.75. Therefore approximately 126 institutions are implementing minimal processing techniques all or some of the time.
107 Jackie M. Dooley and Katherine Luce, Taking Our Pulse: The OCLC Research Survey of Special Collections and Archives (Dublin, Ohio: OCLC Research, 2010), 12.
108 Real within the context of this paper, refers to an actual archival institution.
program must come from the individuals who are directly involved, which takes the form of an Evaluation Needs Assessment.

Analysis of the Evaluation Needs Assessment (ENA)

Thematic analysis of results was executed by performing manifest content analysis of the first priority and second priority participant responses. This involved counting how many times participants used concrete terms or visible surface content. For example, if a participant’s response for the first priority was “processing time” and their response for the second priority was “impact on reference,” I coded the first priority as processing time and the second priority as reference. This involved putting tally marks next to the categories that were evolving out of the responses (see figure 5).^{109}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concrete Terms</th>
<th>Number of 1st priority answers</th>
<th>Number of 2nd priority answers</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digitization</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Backlog</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Satisfaction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing Time</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5 Content Analysis Chart- Overall Percentage of Respondents’ 1st and 2nd Priority Answers

^{109} In order to ensure accuracy, the participants’ survey responses were coded three times, and consistent results were yielded.
While considering both “first priority” and “second priority” answers together, it is clear that there were four aspects of MPLP that participants overwhelmingly indicated should be evaluated. They are as follows: processing time, implementation, preservation, and usability of collections processed according to MPLP. Since the survey took the form of open-ended questions, the fact that respondents gravitated towards targeting similar aspects of an archive to evaluate illustrates that practicing archivists share common concerns regarding how MPLP is affecting archival institutions. Of participants, 18.29% thought that processing time should be either a first or a second priority for evaluation, 18.29% indicated that the way in which MPLP is implemented should be either a first or a second priority for evaluation, 12.20% indicated that preservation of materials should be either a first or a second priority for evaluation, and 12.20% of participants indicated that usability of collections processed according to the MPLP guidelines should be either a first or a second priority for evaluation.

![Percentage of Respondents' Evaluation Priorities- Overall](image)

*Figure 6 Percentages of Respondents' Evaluation Priorities Overall*
It is important to note, however, how many of the participants’ responses dealt directly with the reference end of an archival institution. This would include the following concrete terms categories: reference, user satisfaction, access, and usability. These aspects when considered cumulatively constitute 29.28% of responses, illustrating that practicing archivists are significantly concerned with how MPLP is affecting different aspects of the reference end of archival institutions.

When breaking responses up by priority, there are three top first priority aspects or concrete terms that were articulated by respondents. The top two were processing time (23.81%) and implementation (16.67%). Five concrete terms were equally represented in 9.53% of responses. They are as follows: preservation, access, user satisfaction, accuracy, and usability. Four of these five concrete terms dealt with the reference end of an archival institution, in other words with the accessibility and usability of an archival institution’s collections and quality of reference services offered. Access, user satisfaction, accuracy of finding aids, and usability of an archive’s reference services (finding aids and reference archivists) account for 38.08% of first priority responses, which is a larger percentage than that for the response for processing time.\textsuperscript{110} (See figure 7)

\footnote{110 See pie pieces outlined in black.}
When examining responses pertaining to the second priority aspect of evaluation of MPLP, there were four aspects that respondents most frequently cited. They included the following: implementation of MPLP (20.00%), usability (15.00%), preservation (15.00%), and processing time (12.50%). Just as with the analysis of the percentage of respondents’ choice for first evaluation priority, aspects of evaluation dealing with the reference end of an archival institution outweigh all the others when combined. In other words, the concrete terms access, reference, and accuracy combined with usability account for 35% of respondents’ answers (See figure 8).\(^\text{111}\)

\(^{111}\) See pie pieces outlined in black.
Participants articulated the importance for each priority clearly. Several themes recurred in the participants’ “importance” responses regarding the two most frequently cited aspects to evaluate, which were processing time and aspects having to do with the reference end of an archival institution (access, reference, usability, and user satisfaction). The reasoning for choosing aspects relating to access to collections as an area to target for evaluation was consistently mentioned as a result of a concern among participants that less detailed finding aids might possibly compromise patrons’ ability to find what they came to the archive looking for.

One respondent proclaimed:

To explain, MPLP calls for leaving item-level description by the wayside so that finding aids can be produced faster and more collections become available for research. By neglecting item level details, are we inhibiting discovery? The collection may be about Robert E. Lee (for example), but if it happens to contain several letters from various persons, a researcher of those various persons would probably never come across those letters without their names included in the finding aids.
The other commonly articulated concern regarding the reasoning behind citing time or processing rates as an aspect of MPLP to evaluate involved questioning whether or not processing was made faster as a result of implementing MPLP. One participant articulated:

> This is vital if we are to accept that MPLP allows us to more quickly and efficiently make collections available. Just because we ancecdotally perceive it to be faster does not mean it really is, or that the difference is significant.

Since the top two aspects of evaluation have been determined from this ENA, the next step within the CPE framework involves fabricating evaluation questions around the designated aspects.

**Evaluation Questions**

The questions that developed out of the ENA survey are:

1. Does MPLP increase access to archival materials?
   a. To what extent can users find what they are looking for?
   b. To what extent are users satisfied with the reference services\(^\text{112}\) provided to them?
   c. How often are minimally processed collections being paged and/or used? For what purpose are they being paged?

2. Does MPLP decrease arrangement and description time?
   a. How long or what is the average rate a collection is processed when abiding by the MPLP processing guidelines?
   b. What role, if any, does format play in arrangement and description rates? Is there a correlation between format of material and processing rates?

---

\(^{112}\) Reference services, within the context of this question, refers to the services offered by the reference archivist as well as the descriptive materials i.e. finding aids produced by the processing archivists.
Design of Evaluation Tools

Four data collection strategies or data sources have been developed for the purpose of answering the above evaluation questions. They consist of three types of surveys and a retrospective analysis. Using four different types of data collection strategies ensures adequate triangulation of data sources. Triangulation is the process of using more than one data source to verify findings. In order to visualize how the evaluation questions presented above will be answered, an evaluation crosswalk will be used. An evaluation crosswalk “is a technique for demonstrating to clients (or in this case an archival institution) how evaluation questions are linked to data collection strategies.”\(^{113}\) This involves constructing a matrix (see Figure 9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key: Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evaluation Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Does MPLP increase access to archival materials?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. To what extent can users find what they are looking for?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. To what extent are users satisfied with the reference services provided to them?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. How often are minimally processing collections being paged and/or used? For what purpose are they being paged?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Does MPLP decrease arrangement and description time?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. How long or what is the average rate a collection is processed when abiding by the MPLP processing guidelines?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. What role, if any, does format play in arrangement and description rates?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9 Evaluation Crosswalk

As you can see above, the evaluation questions are grouped logically into clusters and organized hierarchically within the matrix. By using the evaluation crosswalk, triangulation of data sources

becomes apparent. Note for each evaluation question there are at least two sources that have been
developed to collect relevant data to answer it.

**Reference Survey**

A reference survey was designed to collect information about how easily patrons can find
the information they are looking for within a particular archive and whether they are satisfied
with the services\(^{114}\) provided (see Figure 10).

**Reference Survey**

The information provided in the following survey will enable the institution to gather information to assess
usability and accessibility of the archive’s collections. Your participation in voluntary, no identifiable
information will be collected.

1. What is your reason for using the archive’s holdings and/or services? (circle all that apply)
   a. course assignment
   b. genealogical research
   c. background information for newspapers,
      magazines, advertising
   d. publication (book, article)
   e. exhibition
   f. film, radio, television program
   g. corporate research
   h. legal research
   i. institutional research
   j. government research
   k. professional research (for a group,
      individual or association)
   l. thesis or dissertation
   m. personal interest
   n. other _____________________________

2. Before your visit did you contact the archive? (check the answer that applies)
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No (if you answered no, please skip to question number 4)
   ☐ Other _______________________________________

3. If you answered yes to question 3, how did you contact the archive? (Check answer that applies)
   ☐ Phone
   ☐ Email
   ☐ In person
   ☐ Other _______________________________

4. Did you consult a finding aid/catalog record/specialized index before visiting the archive?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No

5. If you answered yes to question 4, was it helpful in preparing you for your visit to the archi
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ Some what
   ☐ No

6. What would be your ideal way to obtain the information you are seeking: (check the answer that applies)
   ☐ completely online
   ☐ finding aid/catalog record/specialized index online
   ☐ visit archives
   ☐ work with an archivist
   ☐ Other _______________________________
   ☐ Other _______________________________
   please indicate your reasoning:

\(^{114}\) i.e. finding aid and references services provided by the reference archivist
Figure 10 Reference Survey

The first question is designed to collect data regarding the intended use of the archival material that users located or attempted to locate. Questions two through five are tailored to target information that can be used to determine to what extent minimally processed collections are or are not impeding patrons’ access to an institution’s archival materials. Question six is constructed to gather statistics regarding what reference services patrons prefer to rely on most when conducting archival research and why. Question seven investigates how patrons learn about a particular archival institution’s holdings. Questions eight and nine are tailored to collect data regarding how long it takes patrons to locate the materials they came to the archive in search
for and what they found to be the most helpful in the process. Questions ten and eleven are designed to collect information regarding more details about the specific collections used, so that the information collected in survey questions one through nine can be linked to specific archival collections overall. The purpose of questions ten and eleven is then to draw correlations between how the description of a collection affects the reference experience of a patron.

Instructions

Once the survey is piloted and its kinks are worked out, the survey is to be administered either when a patron is registering to use the reading room or after the exit interview.\(^{115}\) It should be returned to the reference desk when the patron has completed his or her research at the archive. Completing the survey after the patrons have finished their research enables them to more effectively reflect on their experiences using the archive’s facilities. This survey can also be posted on the archive’s website under a feedback section. Responses can be deposited into a box with a small opening so that the surveys are secure. The Reference Survey does not include any personally identifiable information, which, if working within a public university, will make it easier to get the study approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) and then subsequently published so that other institutions can implement this survey and the data collected can be compared across institutions.\(^{116}\) After sufficient responses have been collected the data from each survey should be entered into an excel spreadsheet, so that it can be analyzed.

\(^{115}\) An exit interview within the context of this paper refers to “a formal conversation between a reference archivist and a patron that is designed to evaluate the success of the research visit and the effectiveness of the reference services offered to the research”. This definition was taken from the Society of American Archivists Glossary of Archival and Records Terminology http://www.archivists.org/glossary/term_details.asp?DefinitionKey=720

\(^{116}\) The design of this survey is based on Paul Conway’s “Reference Log” a survey framework that he developed within his article entitled Facts and Frameworks: An Approach to Studying the Users of an Archive. As articulated in the literature review portion of this paper, it is one of the only studies that has created a methodological framework for studying users of an archive.
Processing and Usage Statistics Slips

The Processing Rates Tracking Slip and Usage Statistics Slip are designed to fit into a pocket that sits on the outside of an archival storage container,\textsuperscript{117} regardless of the size of the container. Each slip has a front and back (See Figure 11).

\textbf{Processing Rates Tracking Slip Overview}

The front side of the Processing Rates Tracking Slip aims to collect general information about the collection, which includes whether the collection is to be processed using the MPLP guidelines, the box number and type (whether it is an oversized flat box, letter size document box, etc.), collection name and number, and finally the barcode number of the collection (if this element is applicable). This side of the slip also contains a field entitled “Punch Card Data” which is designed to collect data that can then be used to calculate processing rates. The reverse side of the slip is designed to collect data regarding the format of material present in the archival

\textsuperscript{117} In the context of this paper, archival storage container refers to any size or type of storage container used within an archival institution. This can include and is not exclusive of the following: a doc box, shoe box, record container, so on and so forth.
storage container, the pre-existing arrangement of the contents, and the imposed arrangement, description and preservation measures executed on the material (See Figure 12).

![Processing Rates Tracking Slip](image)

**Format of Material Present**
- Audio
  - vinyl disc ___%
  - cassette tape ___%
  - reel to reel tape ___%
  - compact disc ___%
  - other ___%
- Books/Series ___%
- Photographs ___%
- Architectural Plans ___%
- Sketches/Drawings ___%
- Maps ___%
- Video/Moving Images
  - VHS ___%
  - Beta ___%
  - DVD ___%
  - other ___%
  - other ___%
- Electronic Records
  - email or word processing files ___%
  - web content ___%
  - hard drive or external storage device ___%
  - other ___%
  - other ___%
- Other: ___%
- Other: ___%

**Pre-existing**

**Arrangement**
- Item level
  - alphabetical
  - chronological
  - by format
  - by subject
  - other
- Collective
  - alphabetical
  - chronological
  - by format
  - by subject
  - other
- None

**Imposed**

**Arrangement**
- Item level
  - alphabetical
  - chronological
  - by format
  - by subject
  - other
- Collective
  - alphabetical
  - chronological
  - by format
  - by subject
  - other
- None

**Description**
- Item level
  - container level
  - parts
  - sub-series
  - folder
  - other
  - other
- Collective
  - container level
  - parts
  - sub-series
  - folder
  - other
  - other
- None

**Preservation**

**Box**
- Re-boxed
- Kept box

**Contents**
- all contents fully addressed
- minimal treatment to contents
- no treatment

initials: __________

---

**Figure 12 Front and Back Sides, respectively of the Processing Rates Statistics Slip**
Instructions for Processing Rates Tracking Slip

The Processing Rates Tracking Slip is to be filled out during the process of arranging and describing a box that is part of a larger archival collection. In other words, each box that is part of a partially processed or un-processed collection gets one slip, which is filled out when that particular box is being worked on. When a processor gets a new box to process, he or she will remove the Processing Rates Tracking Slip from its pocket and fill out the top portion of the slip, indicating whether he or she is going to minimally process the collection or not, the box number, the collection name to which the box belongs, the collection number, and the barcode number of the box (if applicable). After the above information is entered onto the slip, the processor can begin assessing the box. This first entails indicating the date and current time in the “time in” field within the “Punch Card Data” chart. The “Punch Card Data” chart is designed to collect information regarding how long it took the processor to arrange and describe a particular archival storage container. Each time a processor works on the box he or she is to record the date, the time he or she begins working, and the time that he or she stops working on the container. The “total” column, which is shaded gray, is to be left blank by the processor. This field is intended to be filled out by whoever collects the data from the slips. Once the processor begins to assess the container he or she is to indicate which formats of material are present in the collection by checking the appropriate boxes next to the formats present and indicating the approximate percentage. For example, if a processor has begun working on a doc box filled with a majority of correspondence (on paper), a handful of photographs, a book, five vinyl discs (music albums), and an external hard drive, the “Format of Material Present” field would look like Figure 13.
After the processor has filled out the “Format of Material Present” field, next he or she will fill out the “pre-existing arrangement” field. “Pre-existing,” within the context of this slip, refers to the arrangement of the material prior to having processed it. The processor will either check that the arrangement exists on the item level, on a collective level, or that there is no apparent arrangement present. If the contents in the archival storage container are arranged collectively, the processor should then indicate how. There are four pre-fabricated choices and two spaces where the processor can indicate arrangement, if the contents are arranged in a way that is not indicated on the slip. For example if a processor has a box with a pre-existing arrangement consisting of file folders arranged alphabetically, the processor would check “collective” and then “alphabetical” (See Figure 14).
The last step in completing the Processing Rates Tracking Slip involves indicating what arrangement, description, and preservation measures were taken on the contents of the archival storage container in the “Imposed” field on the backside of the slip. The processor will either check that he or she imposed arrangement on an item level, on a collective level, or did not impose any arrangement on the contents of the container. If the contents in the archival storage container were arranged collectively then the processor should then indicate how. There are four pre-fabricated choices and two spaces where the processor can indicate arrangement if the contents are arranged in a way that is not indicated on the slip. The above directions also apply to the imposed description field. For preservation, the processor is to check whether or not the container was replaced for a new one under the “box” heading and to what extent the contents in the container were treated under the “contents” heading. For contents within the container, there are three options. The first option is “all contents fully addressed.” This means that all contents within the container are re-housed; all the photographs and newsprint are sleeved in Mylar, all acidic file folders are swapped for archival quality file folders, rusty paper-clips or staples are removed, all rolled papers are flattened, and so on and so forth. The second option is “minimal treatment to contents.” This means that some and not all preservation measures were taken to preserve the material. The third option “no treatment” means that no preservation measures were
performed on the contents of the archival storage container. If the processor, for example, did not
impose any arrangement onto the contents of the archival storage container, listed only the
container title in the finding aid, kept the original storage container, and did not re-folder or
perform any other preservation measures on the contents, the “imposed” field on the slip would
look like Figure 15.

![Figure 15 Imposed Field of Processing Rates Statistics Slip](image)

Once they are completed, the Processing Rates Tracking Slips should be kept with their
corresponding archival storage containers until the entire collection has been arranged and
described. Once arrangement and description has been completed, slips should be collected from
each archival storage container in the collection and the data present on them should be entered
in an excel spreadsheet, so that processing rates can be calculated and analyzed.
Usage Statistics Slip Overview

The Usage Statistics Slip is designed to collect information regarding how often collections are used/paged and for what purposes (creator/donor use, internal archival use, non-affiliated user/patron use, and a space to provide another “use” that is not present on the slip). (See Figure 16).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Date MM/DD/YYYY</th>
<th>Type of Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>creator/donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>internal archive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>non-affiliated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>users/patrons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>creator/donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>internal archive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>non-affiliated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>users/patrons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>creator/donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>internal archive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>non-affiliated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>users/patrons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>creator/donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>internal archive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>non-affiliated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>users/patrons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 16 Front and Back of Usage Statistics Slip
Instructions for Usage Statistics Slip

Usage Statistics Slips can be placed in a pocket within every archival storage container present in an archive or selected collections within an archive. The choice is up to the institution, but more collections monitored results in better data yielded. At the time that a slip is placed in the archival storage container’s pocket, the box number, and collection name and number should be written onto the slip. Each time an archival storage container is paged, the individual who is retrieving the box is to indicate on the Usage Statistics Slip his or her initials (as a measure of accountability), the date, and the type of use. For example, if a doc box is being paged because the collection needs to be processed in greater detail, the individual would indicate his or her initials, the date, and check “internal archive use” on the slip (See Figure 17).

![Figure 17 Example of how to use Usage Statistics Slip]

The slips can be taken out at any time for data collection and be replaced with new ones. Once a slip is filled and/or data needs to be collected, it can be placed within a secure box. Information contained on slips should be entered into an excel spreadsheet so that the usage statistics can be aggregated and analyzed.

Retrospective Processing Rates Study

A Retrospective Processing Rates Study involves picking collections that have been processed in the past and calculating the rate at which that particular collection was processed.
There are several conditions a collection *must* meet in order to be included and considered a relevant case in the retrospective study. The conditions are as follows:

1. The collection has to be processed by one person who was, at the time, working on that collection only and no other collections or other archival projects simultaneously.

2. There must exist some system whereby the processor logged his or her hours. This can be in a computer system such as UCPunch. If a system is in place that meets these requirements, the records have to be retrievable. For example, if Jane Doe processed a collection five years ago, her work hours logged in the computer system must be retrievable.

If the above conditions can be met for a significant number of collections, a Retrospective Analysis of Processing Rates can be performed. The data that needs to be collected are: extent of collection (this can be measured in linear or cubic feet; whatever measurement is chosen, it must be consistent with how the institution measures extent) and time it took to physically arrange and describe said collection. Once that data is collected, the extent is divided by the time to calculate the rate at which the collection was processed. After the rates are calculated for each collection that is included in the retrospective study, it is necessary to go back to see if there is any correlation between format of materials present in archival collections and the amount of time it takes to process. This data then can be compared to the data collected through the Processing Rates Tracking Slip.

**Evaluation Logistics: Project Timeline and Who Will Be Involved**

Outlining important activities involved in the evaluation process is essential to the success of an evaluation such as this. Two tools are commonly used within the discipline of

---

118 Significant in the context of a retrospective study of processing rates is subjective: over twenty collections would be ideal. More collections examined the bigger the data pool, the more information that can be collected that can help determine a correlation between processing rates and formats.
Collaborative Program Evaluation. The first is a straightforward timeline technique, which consists of a chart wherein time is displayed vertically in increments and the tasks that take place within the time increments are listed alongside. The other type of timeline tool is a Program Evaluation and Review Technique, or PERT chart, which shows the flow of each activity involved in the evaluation over time. Both techniques will be employed to illustrate the steps involved and how they corresponded both to time and to each other (See Figure 18 and 19 respectively).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Month 1              | • Develop and Expand/Edit Evaluation plan  
• Develop Project Timeline  
• Develop Reference Survey and Processing and Usages Statistics Slip |
| Month 2              | • Pilot Reference Survey and Processing and Usages Statistics Slip and fix discrepancies  
• Select which collections get Processing and Usages Statistics Slip  
• Select which collections qualify for Retrospective Processing Rates Study |
| Month 3 and 4        | • Administer Reference Survey and begin gathering data  
• Gather data for Retrospective Processing Rates Study and enter data into an excel spread sheet  
• Gather data from Processing and Usages Statistics |
| Month 5              | • Analyze data collected from Retrospective Processing Rates Study  
• Gather data from Reference Survey by entering data into an excel spread sheet  
• Gather data from Processing and Usages Statistics Slips |
| Month 6 through 11   | • Gather data for Reference Survey and enter data into an excel spread sheet  
• Gather data from Processing and Usages Statistics Slips |
| (time period can     |                                                                                                                                      |
| vary)                |                                                                                                                                      |
| Month 12             | • Analyze data collected from Processing and Usages Statistics Slips  
• Analyze data collected from Reference Survey  
• Finalize analysis of Retrospective Processing Rates Study |
| Month 13             | • Finalize analysis of three data sources and draft report  
• Finalize report and present findings |

Figure 18 Timeline of Evaluation Tasks

120 There can be variations of the time of data collection—depending on an institution’s preference.
Who Will be Involved

An evaluation such as this will affect the archive as a whole. The Reference Survey will involve users/patrons and reference archivists. The Usage Statistics Slip will involve the individuals who are in charge of paging materials for the reading room. The Processing Rates
Statistics slip will involve the archival processors. The Retrospective analysis will involve supervisors who can recount particular collections that would be good candidates, and administrators who can retrieve logged work hours of previous/current employees, and, eventually, the Collections Manager who will aggregate all the data collected from the four data sources.

**Conclusion**

Since MPLP is relatively new and is interpreted and implemented in different ways, and there is no accepted standard for measuring extent and calculating processing rates, how can one develop a comprehensive methodological evaluation framework that can then work to determine the extent to which MPLP is affecting the institution as a whole? One aspect of an archive that can be targeted for evaluation is reference services, in other words, the accessibility and usability of the archive’s collection in the eyes of the institutions’ users. No matter how MPLP is interpreted and implemented in an institution, the evaluation tools developed and detailed in this thesis (Reference Survey, Processing Rates Statistics Slip, Usage Statistics Slip, and Retrospective Study of Processing Rates) will collect data that will enable an institution to determine to what extent and how MPLP, or more generally how the arrangement and descriptive practices of the institution, is affecting the accessibility and usability of its collections. In terms of calculating processing rates and the difficulties outlined in the previous section, the Processing Rates Statistic Slip is not a solution to this problem. However, by collecting statistics regarding time spent processing per box as well as statistics regarding format of materials present in each box or archival storage container, perhaps a correlation can be drawn. The next step in this process would involve piloting the four evaluation tools, fine tuning them, and implementing them on a wide scale with and across archival institutions.
Greene and Meissner, through the publication of “More Product Less Process: Revamping Traditional Archival Processing,” have successfully called a great deal of attention to (1) the problem of backlog, and (2) accepted or traditional archival processing practices. What Greene and Meissner intended to do was to cause archivists to think more critically about their arrangement and descriptive practices. But did they? The question arises as to whether MPLP did cause archivists to take a step back and think more critically, or if it caused them to latch on to Greene and Meissner’s heuristic guidelines as a sort of processing standard which, to date, does not exist in the archival field? Or perhaps a combination of both? As Greene and Meissner articulated in their article which was published in their 2010 article “More Application While Less Appreciation: The Adopters and Antagonists of MPLP,” MPLP was never intended to be a set of processing rules or a step-by-step dogmatic approach. Instead, it was about thinking about or basing processing decisions on an institution’s resources rather than on tradition.\[121\] Since many institutions have incorporated some form of MPLP or minimal processing into their archival processing agenda as time progresses, it will be very interesting to see the larger implications and whether the way archival institutions are implementing the guidelines will decrease backlog and increase access to archival institutions.

---

\[121\] Meissner and Greene, “More Application While Less Appreciation: The Adopters and Antagonists of MPLP,” 176.
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