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• Library and Information Science
  – 300 MLIS
  – 300 Information Technology & Informatics (Undergrad)
• Communication
• Journalism and Media Studies
Organizing Information In RU Context

- MLIS has a set of distribution requirements
  - 520 fulfills a distribution requirement
  - No pre-reqs

- Other courses:
  - Cataloguing and Classification; Metadata; Knowledge Management; Archives; Digital Librarie; Digital Curation; Digital Preservation

LIS 520

Introduction to the options and methods for creating indexes that provide access to the content of a collection of documents, whether print or electronic, linguistic, audio, visual or graphical. Comparison of different kinds of indexes, including traditional and emerging approaches, with respect to characteristics such as classification, methods for identifying index terms, techniques for vocabulary control and search interface. Rationale for evaluation of organizational schemas in context. Students apply theory by designing an index for a collection of their choice.
Readings


• Other readings are available either in eCollege, the Rutgers University Libraries or on the public web.

Attractions of TDO

• Organizing systems beyond libraries
• Information access
• Classification (eg semantic relations)
• Describing resources
• Information architecture
• XML
Main Projects

• Analysis Project: Pick an index with displayed index terms and analyze it

• Design Project: Design an organizational system for a collection of your choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>TDO Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Intro &amp; Overview</td>
<td>1.1 The Discipline of Organizing, 1-6; Sec 1.2, The “Organizing System” Concept, 6-18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Organizational Systems, User Info Needs &amp; Subj Scope</td>
<td>3.1-3.2.5.4 Resources in organizing systems, 95-109; 4.4 Describing Non-text resources, 173-177.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Collection Scope &amp; Collection Domain</td>
<td>1.3.2 Design Decisions in Organizing Systems, 18-33; 2.2, Selecting Resources, 51-53; 4.3-4.3.5 The process of describing resources, 148-168.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Representing Aboutness</td>
<td>Glushko (2013), 3.4.2.1-3.4.1.2 The vocabulary problem, 116-117; 4.3.4-4.3.5 Designing the description vocabulary, 164-168.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Categorization &amp; Classification (1)</td>
<td>5.1 Introduction, 189-190; 5.2 Describing relationships; an overview, 192-193; 5.3 – 5.3.3 The semantic perspective, 192-201; Ch. 6 Categorization, 235-260.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Categorization &amp; Classification (2)</td>
<td>Glushko (2013), Ch. 7 Classification, 273-306.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Vocabulary Management</td>
<td>3.4- 3.4.3.5 Naming Resources, 117-123; 5.4 The Lexical Perspective, 203-207.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Evaluating Indexes</td>
<td>9.5 Evaluating interactions, 388-392.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Information Architecture (1)</td>
<td>9.1 Introduction, 363-365); 9.2 Determining Interactions, 366-371.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Information Architecture (2)</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Resource Description with XML</td>
<td>5.5 The structural perspective, 208-213; 5.6 The architectural perspective, 217-219; 5.7 The implementation perspective, 219-222; Ch. 8 The forms of resource description, 317-362.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Metadata Schemas</td>
<td>5.8 Relationships in organizing systems, 222-225.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Looking to the future</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Design Project Presentations</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Responses (8 students)

Thoughts, comments about the appropriateness of Glushko for this class.

- Readability was quite varied, especially in the latter sections we read. This had much to do with the high degree of technicality, so I’m not sure it could be avoided. However, I’m not convinced those sections were particularly helpful to my understanding at this point.
- As I have a copy of the text previously used for this class, and I found the Glushko text to me much better at explaining the various concepts. It is actually one of the textbooks I’m NOT going to try to sell back! Student Response #Number3
- Nothing to compare the textbook to, except for Wellisch (which was very readable and easy to understand)
- When I started the book I found the language very abstract and had a hard time warming up to it, but as I read it more and the class progressed I got used to it. Although it seems a bit sophomoric, I think we could have gone over it in the corresponding class. It was also a little disconcerting jumping around. Because of the tech component, Glushko seems very appropriate to the class.
- Glushko’s real strength was the breaking down of concepts into easy to understand examples. It made some of the harder to understand concepts easier to grasp.
- I thought the Glushko textbook was appropriate for the course. The examples in the book were extremely helpful in grasping concepts. The book was organized well and made note-taking easy.
- The Glushko book is a great textbook for this course. It supplements the course material very well and is easy to read and understand.
- What I appreciated most about the Glushko textbook was his examples. I think using pop culture references like the Simpsons (which I remember vividly from the chapters on relationships between terms), and providing a simple example for nearly every theory or situation discussed helps to contextualize the information and gives the reader an idea of how to put it into practice.
Desiderata

• Alternatives to case studies
• Assignments and class discussions
• Flexible reconfiguration of book
• Don’t lose emphasis on intersection of disciplines