Agreed Guidelines Governing Taxonomy Development

A. **Guiding principle:** Taxonomy is designed for the everyday user of the system, and therefore it must be meaningful and transparent to the user.

   We recommend, when a term (document group types or document types) is not intuitive to all users (experienced and inexperienced) then we will use the vernacular of the profession.

B. **What taxonomies do:**
   1. Structure and organize
   2. Establish common ground
   3. Help span boundaries between distinct groups
   4. Help in sense making out of chaos
   5. Aid in discovery of risk and opportunity

   We recommend that the taxonomy will:
   1. Structure and organize
   2. Establish common ground
   3. Help span boundaries between distinct groups
   4. Aid in discovery

C. **7 Forms for Taxonomies** See Appendix A for when to use and issues to watch.
   1. List
   2. Tree
   3. Hierarchy
   4. Poly-hierarchy
   5. Matrix
   6. Facets
   7. System Map

   We recommend Tree and Facets - fit more the forms of taxonomy for OnBase
   a. Tree = two automatic levels for browsing
   b. Facet = browsing after a search has been initiated

D. **Nine Key Criteria for Taxonomy Validation**
   1. **Intuitive:** easy to navigate and use.
   2. **Unambiguous:** does not offer alternates
   3. **Hospitable:** can accommodate all content
   4. **Consistent and predictable:** provides context. The principle of subordination at any level should be the same across the whole level (is a part of; is a kind of, is arranged by date).
   5. **Relevant:** reflects user perspectives.
   6. **Parsimonious:** no redundancy/repetition
   7. **Meaningful:** provides context. Category, sub-category and topic terms enable users to successfully predict the kind of content to be found in them.
   8. **Durable:** will not need frequent change
   9. **Balanced:** even levels of detail/depth; even quantities of content across the taxonomy categories.

   *Terms (document group types or document types) must pass core criteria; all others remain part of the test but the more the term passes each of the non-core the better the score.

E. **Taxonomy Design Options:**
a. By department – what if departments merge or split
b. Subjects – documentation/will not pass the balance test, catch all like miscellaneous; not meaningful, too hospitable, unambiguous
c. Business Activity – operational/services
d. Product – more for web pages
*We recommend a Business Activity Taxonomy Design per ISO/TR 15489-2 Section 4.2
• It follows an existing corporate language
• Transfers across CUC and colleges
• Business activities are durable; can expand or contract without disruption to the taxonomy
• Provide fewer numbers of group types and document types that would promotes memory and consistency in filing documents.

F. Following ISO/TR 15489-2 Section 4.2.1 Section 2 B, we will create a glossary that articulates the definition of each document group types and document types.

G. We will define additional metadata terms (facets) based on a review and consolidation of recordkeeping metadata outlined in the following:

   b. DOD 5015.2 Standard for Metadata for Records Management Version 1.0 June 2002
   e. New Zealand Archives Electronic Recordkeeping Metadata Standard S8 June 2008
   f. Record Keeping Metadata Requirements for the Government of Canada January 2001