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http://www.wode.div.ed.ac.uk/

http://www.churchservicesociety.org/wode
Creators: Valuing contributions

By Testbirds GmbH [CC BY-SA 4.0], from Wikimedia Commons
Topics: Challenging the canon
Content: Effects of canon

Of 3,864 individual performances by 98 American Symphonies, 3,058 were by Beethoven, Mozart, Brahms, Tchaikovsky, Ravel, Dvořák, Sibelius, Strauss, Stravinsky (Baltimore Symphony Orchestra, 2016)

Only 1.7% were composed by women, and all were living
A digital opportunity

[In the pre-digital era] ‘There really was no way for one person to know thousands or tens of thousands of musical pieces at least at the level of detail that allowed near-infallible knowledge of what happens in each passage in perceptible detail.’ – (Cuthbert, 2018)

‘Recent developments in computational musicology present a significant opportunity for renewal...there is potential for musicology to be pursued as a more data-rich discipline than has generally been the case up to now’ (Cook, 2004)

‘If we continue to exclude works by women, people of color, and non-canonical composers, then how useful will our data be and for whom?’ (Kijas, 2018)
Formats: Beyond typewriters

Courtesy of Jorge Royan [CC BY-SA 3.0], from Wikimedia Commons
Multimodal interdisciplinarity

Digital audio
Digital imaging
Digital video
Dynamic ‘recordings’
Dynamic scores
GIS-enabled data
Multimedia annotation
Visualisation
Music Scholarship Online (MuSO)

2015-16 – National Endowment for the Humanities Start-up Grant

2016 – Joined the Advanced Research Consortium (ARC)

2017 – Europeana Research Grant

- Maristella Feustle, University of North Texas
- Francesca Giannetti, Rutgers University
MuSO & digital preservation

1. Promote discovery and preservation of born-digital content
2. Data integration through aggregation
3. Discovery-level metadata
Digital review

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?

Projects will be reviewed by both technical and subject experts.
Practice in aggregation

1. Digital scholarly outputs
   - Multimodal, multidisciplinary content
   - Scholarly recasting of primary materials

2. Digitised content from cultural heritage institutions (as approved by the editorial board)
The MuSO metadata schema

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RDF tag</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>muso:iiif</td>
<td>IIIF manifest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muso:rism</td>
<td>Répertoire International des Sources Musicales Sigla Catalog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muso:other_id</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muso:created</td>
<td>(date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muso:autograph</td>
<td>(boolean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muso:surrogate</td>
<td>(boolean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muso:annotated</td>
<td>(boolean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muso:uniform_title</td>
<td>Library of Congress Authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muso:medium</td>
<td>Library of Congress Medium of Performance Thesaurus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muso:subgenre</td>
<td>Library of Congress Music Genre/Form Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dc:subject</td>
<td>Library of Congress Genre/Form Terms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also available at: muso.arts.gla.ac.uk/metadata-standards.html
# Future Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovate</th>
<th>Aggregate</th>
<th>Build</th>
<th>Promote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Innovate workflows for interdisciplinary review and curation | • Identify new digital collections and archives  
  • Aggregate new and existing digital collections and archives | • Build a MuSO virtual research environment | • Promote multimodal, multidisciplinary scholarly outputs  
  • Promote best practices for digital curation |
Join the Community!

http://muso.arts.gla.ac.uk
@muso_digital
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