

Music Scholarship Online Workshop  
January 28 & 29, 2016  
Texas A&M University

Sederunt:

Timothy Duguid, Texas A&M  
Maristella Feustle, University of North Texas  
Richard Freedman, Haverford College  
Giuseppe Gerbino, Columbia University  
Francesca Giannetti, Rutgers University  
Liz Grumbach, Texas A&M  
Johannes Kepper, Detmold/Paderborn  
Mark McKnight, University of North Texas  
Laurent Pugin, RISM  
Perry Roland, University of Virginia  
Craig Sapp, CCARH, Stanford University  
Carl Stahmer, UC Davis  
Joanna Swafford, State University of New York, New Paltz  
Raffaele Viglianti, MITH, University of Maryland

**1. Breakout Session 1** – “What do music scholars need from a digital curator and search mechanism?”

Participants were asked to list some music aggregators and then to identify the critical characteristics of a music scholarship aggregator.

The group identified the following aggregators:

- ArchiveGrid ([www.oclc.org/research/themes/research-collections/archivegrid.html](http://www.oclc.org/research/themes/research-collections/archivegrid.html))
- Digital Resources for Musicology ([drm.ccarh.org](http://drm.ccarh.org))
- DoReMus ([www.doremus.org](http://www.doremus.org))
- Europeana Sounds ([www.europeanasonsounds.eu](http://www.europeanasonsounds.eu))
- Isidore ([www.rechercheisidore.fr](http://www.rechercheisidore.fr))
- Music Treasures Consortium ([memory.loc.gov/diglib/ihas/html/treasures/treasures-home.html](http://memory.loc.gov/diglib/ihas/html/treasures/treasures-home.html))
- Opera and Ballet Primary Sources ([sites.lib.byu.edu/obps](http://sites.lib.byu.edu/obps))
- Portal to Texas History ([texashistory.unt.edu/](http://texashistory.unt.edu/))
- NINES ([www.nines.org](http://www.nines.org))

It was discussed that good aggregators should:

- Include short descriptions of the projects as a whole
- The descriptions should be uniform and use metadata
- They should be flexible to allow for some variability based on individual project needs
- Allow user submissions

- Allow easy searching
- Offer outreach and training for metadata standards
- Acquire a constant funding source

## 2. Breakout Session 2 – “What can current digital projects tell us about essential metadata for music scholars?”

Participants were asked to list some digital projects in music and to take a look at their descriptive metadata. They were then asked to compare this with ARC’s RDF.

The list of digital projects included:

- Augmented Notes ([www.augmentednotes.com](http://www.augmentednotes.com))
- Beethoven’s Werkstatt ([beethovens-werkstatt.de](http://beethovens-werkstatt.de))
- Centre for the History and Analysis of Recorded Music ([www.charm.rhul.ac.uk/sound/sound.html](http://www.charm.rhul.ac.uk/sound/sound.html))
- Chopin First Editions Online ([www.chopinonline.ac.uk/cfeo](http://www.chopinonline.ac.uk/cfeo))
- Documenting Teresa Carreño ([documentingcarreno.org](http://documentingcarreno.org))
- English Broadside Ballad Archive ([ebba.english.ucsb.edu](http://ebba.english.ucsb.edu))
- Enhancing Music Notation Addressability ([mith.umd.edu/research/enhancing-music-notation-addressability/](http://mith.umd.edu/research/enhancing-music-notation-addressability/))
- Freischütz Digital ([www.freischuetz-digital.de](http://www.freischuetz-digital.de))
- John Cage Unbound ([exhibitions.nypl.org/johncage](http://exhibitions.nypl.org/johncage))
- Linked Jazz ([linkedjazz.org](http://linkedjazz.org))
- Lost Voices: The Chansons of Nicolas du Chemin ([digitalduchemin.org](http://digitalduchemin.org))
- Marenzio Online Digital Edition ([www.marenzio.org](http://www.marenzio.org))
- Networked Environment for Musical Analysis ([cirss.lis.illinois.edu/Project/project-details.php?id=20](http://cirss.lis.illinois.edu/Project/project-details.php?id=20))
- New York Philharmonic Digital Archives ([archives.nyphil.org](http://archives.nyphil.org))
- Online Chopin Variorum Edition ([www.chopinonline.ac.uk/ocve](http://www.chopinonline.ac.uk/ocve))
- Schenker Documents Online ([www.schenkerdocumentsonline.org](http://www.schenkerdocumentsonline.org))
- Songs of the Victorians ([www.songsofthevictorians.com](http://www.songsofthevictorians.com))
- Structural Analysis of Large Amounts of Music Information [SALAMI] ([cirss.lis.illinois.edu/Project/project-details.php?id=14](http://cirss.lis.illinois.edu/Project/project-details.php?id=14))
- Virginia Woolf Online ([www.woolfonline.com](http://www.woolfonline.com))

Projects identified generally used the following metadata categories:

- Creator
- Title
- Unique Identifier (URI)
- Scope and content statement
- Repository
- Form/Genre
- Notation types

- Tools/Capabilities
- Typology
- Technical specs for recordings, etc.
- Authorities

The MEI header could be a vehicle for metadata content. In order to promote greater interoperability, the ARC RDF should change <role...> to something like <Persname role = "XXX" xml: id = "Jane Doe">

It was determined that some of the ARC RDF is not consistent and that the categorizations need to be brought to the same level. That is, apples and oranges should not be possibilities in the same metadata field.

For the <dc:type> field, the following should be added:

- Dataset
- Printed text
- Realia
- Notated music
- Encoded content

We also recommended that "full text" should be modified to "searchable content" or something to that effect to allow for searching of encoded media.

### **3. Breakout Session 3** – "What standards should be used to evaluate digital projects in music?"

Objects that can be reviewed:

- Encoded content
- Software tools
- Archives
- Digital editions

Things to consider in a review:

- Motivation of the project (audience, perceived use, goals)
- Documentation of the project
- Integrity of practices, research questions
- Clear and orderly site architecture
- Visibility and Accessibility (Usability)
- Sustainability (a plan must be in place, regardless of whether it is to last or become obsolete)
- Description of the intellectual property and materials that the site offers
- Accreditation of sources and contributors
- Importance and Relevance
- Innovation and Originality (either in presentation or content)

- Interoperability

We determined that MuSO should have two levels of peer review:

1. Aggregation Review – This is a basic review by the editorial board to determine whether a project merits inclusion in the MuSO catalog
2. Traditional Review – This is an academic review of the content and presentation of the resource

We recommend that ARC change its basic peer review questions to:

1. To whom is this content interesting?
2. How does the project make its materials manifest, exposed, and documented?
3. What is the sustainability plan for the project?
4. Does the project achieve its own goals?

### **Next Steps**

It was agreed that MuSO should join the ARC community. A sub-node structure for MuSO could be envisaged that would parallel the current ARC structure. However, MuSO should start as a single node that could then subdivide as things develop in the future.

The initial governance structure of MuSO would consist of an appointed advisory board. After it is established, a more representative system will be established that will include representatives from relevant scholarly societies.

An application will be submitted that will help implement MuSO through an NEH Implementation Grant. That grant will fund:

- Software development
- Metadata creation
- Database curation
- Publicity and PR for metadata creation, aggregation, and digital peer review

### **Remaining Questions:**

- What is MuSO going to aggregate?
- How do you deal with umbrella projects vs. smaller projects (i.e. [SIMSSA](#) vs. its components like [Diva.js](#))?
- Should we aggregate software and how?
- How do we evaluate collaborative work (whitepaper)?
- How should we modify <collex:genre>?
- How should we modify <dc:discipline>?
- Should we use Collex? What are our other options?