

[“Engaging the Space Between Minimal Processing and Inclusive Description to Create More Sustainable and Ethical Workflows”](#) article discussion with Alexandra deGraffenreid

Monday, February 9, 2026, 1:00-2:00 pm EST

Please register here:

<https://us06web.zoom.us/meeting/register/RedDk-8RSoaY1jBRbPqEgA#/registration>

Community Discussion Questions (questions can either be signed or left anonymously)

- A few years ago, it was shared on another webinar that Princeton processing staff allocated a certain percentage of their time working on reparative description. Is that still the case? How does that fit with staff prioritizing what gets (and doesn't get) processed (to any degree)?

-

-We are currently having this exact same discussion in our collection management/processing unit. What factors did you find most important or useful when developing your minimal guidelines or tracking processing level of effort?

-

-

-Have there been any quantitative surveys describing current practices of MPLP and actual issues with researchers complaining because items have not been accessible?

-

-

- How do you acknowledge the labor of the staff (both FT and PT/temp) within the finding aids and to stakeholders/administration? Especially when advocating for the hiring of FT over project-based temp workers.

I appreciate that the article is system agnostic, but can you speak to methods of documenting and sharing inclusive description work as archival responsibilities move from accessioning archivists to processing archivists? For example, spreadsheets or, if using ASpace, assessment modules...**ADDING** a comment/answer to this: we put the General Assessment (based on Coll Mgmt module in ASpace, done at Accessioning or a later time if it's a hidden or partially processed coll) into Airtable which really helps us tie assessments into our processing queue, which is also in Airtable.

Are the descriptive flags you mentioned as part of the assessment of the Accessioning Archivist built into your data collection tools and forms? Both from donors and for the accessioning process itself? And do you have a curatorial-level reassessment of legacy backlogs that uses the same flags?

I appreciate your discussion of being flexible with “professional judgement.” However, as the only professionally trained archivist who has ever been employed at my institution, my predecessors and current colleagues think—or even expect—that “processing” is at the item level. Do you have suggestions for working with nonarchivists and not adding to “archival debt”?

{no answers, just a second voice chiming in to say that I am interested in this conversation!}

One strategy I’ve already used is to not to start from scratch by creating our own step-by-step processing manual but instead point to the resources I use to conduct processing, such as the Accessioning Best Practices or other institutions’ extensible processing guidelines.

I recently processed a small collection that included racist material. However, I wasn’t sure about “calling out” this portion of the collection because I thought it could be “targeted” or the rest of the collection might be ignored. What strategies might be available to make this content accessible without downplaying the collection as a whole? Maybe a “harmful content statement,” noting that researchers may encounter derogatory content, is enough?