

### **Detailed Course Evaluation**

- 1) *How useful were the pre-course readings? Did you do any additional preparations in advance of the course?*
  1. I enjoyed them, though we never had a chance to discuss them in class. It would have been nice to have a short discussion about them.
  2. Pre-course readings were thought provoking and good preparation for the course.
  3. Very useful. I would have liked more, or a suggested bibliography. Some discussion of the readings could also have added to the course.
  4. Interesting and useful, though it would have been nice to have a broader class discussion about the readings and their topics.
  5. Useful, introduced me to the state of the field and to the questions being considered in digital humanities. No additional preparation.
  6. Relatively useful; introduced concepts drawn on in the class so that we didn't have to spend time on them specifically.
  7. Very useful!
  8. Very useful in getting me up to speed as to the state of digital medievalism, and for understanding where the instructors were headed.
  9. Moderately; the subjects were well chosen, but I could have used suggestions for additional reading, e.g., in paleography. As this is not a lack for many of our students, a supplementary list of readings for various subjects might serve others well. No.
  10. I would say that, for someone new to the digital humanities, or to social media in general, they could be quite helpful. I was most interested in the descriptions of the manuscripts discussed in the articles.
  11. The pre-course readings were helpful, from the standpoint of a complete novice (regarding manuscripts). I also picked up a primer on manuscript studies, at DP's recommendation. A little more warning about the technology platform would be useful as a developer.
  12. Pre-course readings were very useful. I was reading both for the first time. Otherwise, I've been reading some digital humanities texts on my own, which were also helpful preparation.
  13. Very helpful introduction to the theoretical issues.
  14. They were helpful—they gave me some focus as I prepared for my week at RBS.
  15. They were relatively useful in general, but we did not talk about them or touch on them very much.
  
- 2) *Were the course workbook and other materials distributed in class appropriate and useful (or will they be so in the future, after you return home)?*
  1. We did not have a course workbook. Items were tweeted to us, and DP planned to make a Google Doc with some information on it. Given that it is a course about digital humanities, I think a printed workbook would be inappropriate, but there were a number of helpful readings and links mentioned in class that participants

- were scrambling to get hold of and write down. It would have been nice to have had an online repository/space set up in advance.
2. Yes. I will especially use my new familiarity with Omeka to develop future projects at work.
  3. There was no course workbook.
  4. The course “workbook” was essentially Omeka and other online resources, all of which were extremely interesting and useful.
  5. Yes, all materials I received in class were useful, and I will use many of them again in the future.
  6. The few handouts were and will be very handy; and the materials developed during the course were very helpful.
  7. Very appropriate and useful!
  8. Yes, although there were some glitches, which were resolved sooner than I thought possible.
  9. Yes, and yes.
  10. Not applicable, but sure.
  11. Yes.
  12. Most of the “materials” distributed in class were electronic—websites, instructions for using TEI or Dublin Core, &c. Yes, these will be very helpful in the future.
  13. Materials all distributed digitally, through Twitter and Google Docs. Lots of useful materials, and nice not to have to drag home a lot of heavy paper.
  14. They were definitely useful!
  15. I wish there was a course workbook! I would have used it quite a bit in the future.
- 3) *Have you taken one or more RBS courses before? If so, how did this course compare with your previous coursework?*
1. Yes, I have taken one course. I found this course, probably because it was the first time taught, was a little less well organized. That said, we kept to schedule and covered a lot of territory over the course of the week. I had homework in my last class. I think it might have been good to have us do some practice assignments at home.
  2. Yes. They’re all fabulous courses and indispensable to my work.
  3. Yes. This class did not have the same level of simpatico group energy, but because I commuted home each evening, I did not have the same opportunities for longer conversations out of class.
  4. Yes. Middling.
  5. No, first course.
  6. No, I have not.
  7. No other class.
  8. No.
  9. No.
  10. Yes. This course was, for me, less work, but I think that was due to my being already familiar with Omeka, and with other software/interfaces/media, &c., used. My prior class involved learning descriptive bibliography, so it was labor intensive.
  11. No.
  12. Yes. I took Michael Suarez’s “Teaching the History of the Book” last year. There was more individual-focused work in M-95, whereas Suarez’s course was much more focused on lecture material and collections-based demonstrations.

13. No.
14. No, this is my first RBS course.
15. N/A.

- 4) *What aspects of the course content were of the greatest interest or relevance for your purposes?*
1. I found the following (in no particular order) most helpful and enlightening: 1) an explanation of the rationale behind The Digital Walters and discussion of the character of a digital archive; 2) introduction to online tools, especially T-PEN and the Mirador viewer; 3) suggestions for bloggers and tweeters to follow (i.e., mapping books, A Material Piers, Eric Kwakkel); 4) ideas for using social media (especially Flickr) for crowd sourcing; 5) using the Apple Terminal; 5) explanation of TEI and Dublin Core; 6) using Omeka; 7) discussions of the future of digital publishing.
  2. New technology tools.
  3. I especially appreciated learning about how to batch-access images from websites and how to use Omeka to create exhibitions. I learned a lot about how to look at and analyze the construction and production of manuscripts.
  4. Pretty much all of it, though I found the work we did with Omeka particularly helpful.
  5. The content related to direct work with manuscripts and online tools for scholarly publication and manuscript studies were the most useful to me. The library-related content was interesting, but not particularly useful for me.
  6. All of it; but I appreciated the discussion on the last day on digital futures and how to prepare for that time and how to bring laggards along.
  7. Trying to build a digital humanities project for some time, I was glad to see that I have been reading and orienting myself on the models that were featured in this class. Of greatest interest were the hands-on task of class where we could use Omeka or learned how to batch download pictures from The Digital Walters or how to use Terminal. Doing this alongside traditional manuscript studies made for a perfect class as it enabled us to present our findings in a much more immediate way.
  8. Digitizing the medieval corpora, the heavy focus on free, open-culture data. Primary to my success was the ability to work with the manuscripts physically and digitally.
  9. The lecture on how to look at manuscripts through collation was especially valuable. Working one-on-one with WN provided priceless insights. The Omeka exhibits were a valuable learning exercise; the program has great potential for use in classes.
  10. DP's lessons on batch data downloading.
  11. The chance to engage scholars and talk about the tools they use, those they want to see, and what the state of technical adoption is within digital humanities.
  12. Learning about digital platforms like Omeka, &c. WN's suggestions for strategies for digitizing manuscripts were very helpful, as were DP's presentations for "reading" metadata and for using Terminal on Mac—though a bit over my head, it helped to demystify some of the tech components.
  13. Issues surrounding digitizing collections, sustainability, and digital scholarship.

14. I loved everything, and found it all to be very helpful. I was not only pleased to be able to handle a fourteenth-/fifteenth-century manuscript, but also to understand, with the excellent information and guidance of DP and WN, how to merge the manuscript with the digital tools we have at our fingertips.
15. General interest.

5) *Did the instructors successfully help you to acquire the information, knowledge, and skills that the course was intended to convey? Was the intellectual level of the course appropriate?*

1. Yes, and yes.
2. Yes. The combination of skill sets was especially important and directly applies to my work.
3. Both of the teachers, WN and DP, were excellent. Both were very prepared, and organized. They made a great team.
4. Yes.
5. Yes.
6. Very much so.
7. The intellectual level was appropriate and the instructors always responded immediately with most satisfactory answers!
8. Yes, the course was challenging, but not frightening.
9. Yes, and yes. The instructors admirably adapted the class to the diverse viewpoints and needs of a student group with varied backgrounds.
10. Absolutely.
11. Absolutely.
12. Yes, though we certainly could have used more time, like a two- or even three-week course. That said, I feel the instructors introduced enough tools for us to move forward to learn on our own and in collaboration with others. The intellectual level was appropriate. Both instructors compelled us to jump into the material, rather than taking things more slowly—this was a good decision. We were really forced to figure things out—perhaps quickly and a little rough around the edges—but I think this is the best strategy for a five-day-long course.
13. Absolutely.
14. Certainly! The intellectual level was definitely appropriate, and both WN and DP were able to answer my questions. They were readily available during every session to guide us through activities or, while we were examining manuscripts and working with Omeka, to let us work intently and answer any questions we had with intelligent and helpful responses.
15. Yes.

6) *What did you like best about the course?*

1. Playing with Terminal and getting a glimpse of how powerful open data can be.
2. Working in a collegial atmosphere designed to share skills and information with others. You can't get that out of an online tutorial.
3. The emphasis on developing and using digital tools both to expand the audience for, and to share knowledge about, manuscripts and resources was A+. I learned so much from DP—her range of expertise is truly amazing. And WN, of course, was always brilliant (and funny).

4. Learning about Omeka as a practical tool for teaching and outreach. And, of course, getting to spend a substantial amount of time with one of UPenn's manuscripts!
5. Working with a single manuscript for a focused amount of time was a great experience. It was wonderful to gain unrivaled access to the manuscript and to have the opportunity to interact with and receive help from both WN and DP.
6. The time spent with a specific manuscript—concentrated, but also with specialists to consult with in the room with you—that level of access to texts and scholars was outstanding.
7. That I learned many useful things that I had hoped I would learn.
8. Both instructors were thoroughly knowledgeable, but not afraid to learn alongside us whenever the opportunity presented. They were approachable and encouraged us to consider each other for resources as well.
9. WN's lectures. First hand, practical help from WN and DP. Generous allotment of time with our manuscripts. Interactions with other students as we worked with our manuscripts.
10. I liked the interplay between DP and WN and their respective specializations. The format, wherein they took turns, was engaging.
11. I certainly gained a much more significant appreciation for the physical aspect of digitization work and presentation.
12. Learning/thinking about strategies for digital presentation more so than any one technical feature.
13. The mix of presentations by the instructor and having time to work one-on-one with manuscripts. A perfect balance.
14. It is difficult to choose one thing that I most enjoyed, as it was all very intriguing and intellectually stimulating. Perhaps the best part of this course was not only having a manuscript in my hands but simultaneously pulling data from the manuscript and making it immediately digital. I also liked the many discussions we had about merging these technologies.
15. The topic and use of manuscripts.

7) *How could the course have been improved?*

1. Let me first say that I really enjoyed the course and found it useful. The following are fairly minor suggestions. I came in with very little (and antiquated) programming knowledge. The articles we read in advance introduced me to some terms like TEI, which I looked up in advance, but I would have happily read more about XML, &c. Perhaps there is an online source or e-book to which students could be pointed to in advance. It would also have been helpful to look at some things (such as the TEI Manuscript Descriptions) before discussing them. On the flip side, it might have been good to do short assignments on our own after trying a new tool (such as T-PEN). I signed up for Twitter in advance, but then came into the class not knowing how to tweet. Perhaps all the students could do a practice tweet in advance of the class sharing a useful or fun online tool or something about their work. It would also have been good to make a template (shared via Google Docs) for the item fields in Omeka. Finally, students were on hand to help with Latin, which was nice, but it would have been really great to have had more computer scientists in the room. Maybe some young programmers at UPenn would be interested in taking the course, and their tuition could be waved?

2. I would have liked more time to work on our individual projects.
3. More collaboration among class members. A lot of our time was spent on producing our individual online exhibit. I wish we could have sat and listened to each other raise questions and suggest theories about our books before the last afternoon of the class.
4. More discussion-focused sessions on the implications of digital humanities and digital manuscripts, with particular focus on what course attendees are doing, what their ideas might be, and what advantages and limitations there are when thinking about digital humanities applications. Learning from other course participants and their own experiences would be nice.
5. It was challenging to convey some of the technical skills that DP tried to teach us because of varying skill levels and different equipment, but I think this kind of issue is inevitable and it was still worthwhile to attempt to teach us such skills.
6. Only by not having to leave at the end of the five days.
7. We could have used a bit more time with the actual manuscripts.
8. Technology can always be improved, beyond the requisite constant updates, there is nothing lacking.
9. Nothing has occurred to me, and I doubt anything will.
10. Not worth detailing. It is great as is.
11. Depending on the direction of the course, with more developers, it might be possible to create teams, specifically connecting scholars and developers on a project.
12. With so much tech stuff to cover, I think it would help future students to be encouraged to study/become familiar with more materials in advance. I think I would have been able to follow along better had I done some of my own reading about TEI, &c., in advance.
13. Can't think of anything.
14. Everything was great! The course was very well balanced, and DP and WN worked together seamlessly. The only thing I would suggest (and it is a tiny thing) is an earlier heads-up about the presentation. Perhaps I should have assumed this would happen, but it was my first RBS.
15. It could have been more organized. I wish there was more lecture and looking at multiple manuscripts rather than just one. Omeka took out a good portion of time.

8) *Did you learn what the course description/advertisement indicated you would learn?*

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Yes, and much more! The in-depth exposure to scholarly investigations of seventeen manuscripts was great. It was an opportunity of a lifetime, and very fulfilling.
4. Yes.
5. Yes.
6. Yes.
7. Yes.
8. Yes.
9. Yes.
10. Yes.
11. Yes. I'm hooked.

12. Yes, I feel much better primed to move forward with my digital projects.
13. Yes.
14. Yes.
15. Yes.

9) *How do you intend to use or apply the knowledge or skills learned in this course?*

1. My schedule has been jam packed of late. It was hugely productive for me to devote several days to thinking about digital humanities and learning some of the tools and terminology. I think I will use all the tools we discussed (especially Flickr, T-PEN, and Omeka) for my own research and teaching.
2. I will use the technology tools I learned to improve projects at my home institution.
3. I am working on several projects that will be transformed by what I learned from this class.
4. I will take what I've learned home to my own institution and apply it in teaching and outreach, as well as in my own work as a digital humanities scholar.
5. I will use these skills and resources throughout my scholarly work for the rest of my academic career.
6. I plan to continue work on the manuscript I was assigned; to develop presentations on the tools and concepts I've learned about for use by the medievalists at my home institution; to add to my vocabulary and persuasive skills in support of digital humanities and digital scholarship.
7. In my dissertation and in my post-doc project.
8. I intend to continue working with the manuscript to identify scribes, and other paleographic information, as well as utilizing the same skill set to complete my digital-humanities/medieval-text thesis project.
9. I have gained ideas for instruction and for putting our data onto the web.
10. Yes.
11. I fully intend on pushing further into the technology side of digital humanities.
12. In a variety of ways—for teaching, e.g., for students to use Omeka and Flickr to create digital exhibitions; for my own scholarship, to create digital presentations of palimpsestic manuscripts.
13. I will present a lot of this information to the digital services team at my institution. I will also use a lot of what I've learned in teaching.
14. As I continue working toward my dissertation.
15. Future digital projects.

10) *If your course left its classroom, was the time devoted to this purpose well spent?*

1. Yes. It might have been good to have a little more time with the digital photography lab at the library, or to split the group half, so people could get closer to the set up.
2. It was fun, but for me I would have rather had more time to work on our project.
3. Yes, very well spent.
4. Yes.
5. While I enjoyed the visit to LCP and the tour of the Kislak Center, it would have been nice to have an extra afternoon for class time instead on one of those days.
6. Yes.

7. We could have spent this time better working on the manuscript.
8. Yes, although more time/space would have been nice at the LCP/Kislak tours.
9. N/A.
10. Yes.
11. Absolutely. If one of the aims of the course is to stun developers into wanting to work with manuscripts, it was accomplished.
12. The visit to the digitization center in Van Pelt Library was helpful, nice to see behind-the-scenes. The show-and-tells in the Lea Library and in LCP were interesting, but perhaps cut into class time that might have been better used.
13. It was interesting to see LCP, but I think I would have preferred to spend more time working with my manuscript.
14. Yes!
15. Yes! It was amazing.

11) *If you attended the Sunday night dinner, was it worth attending?*

1. Yes. It was nice to arrive in town and have a place to go. I am not sure we needed to share a sit-down meal. Pizza and beers would have been more fun.
2. No. Didn't attend.
3. No. I couldn't attend the dinner. I'm sure it was more than worth attending.
4. Yes.
5. Yes.
6. No, as in I did not attend the Sunday night dinner so I don't know if it was worth it or not.
7. Yes.
8. Yes.
9. Yes.
10. Yes. I did not attend, unfortunately, but I'm sure the scallops were delicious.
11. No, didn't attend.
12. Yes.
13. Yes. I did not attend.
14. Yes. It allowed us all to get to know each other a bit before the week began.
15. Yes. It was great to meet people in the other class who were actually more like me than those in my own class.

12) *Were the afternoon visits to the Kislak Center and LCP worthwhile?*

1. Yes.
2. Yes. I especially was interested in seeing the digitization center.
3. Yes.
4. Yes.
5. Yes.
6. Yes.
7. Yes, but I would have preferred to work on the manuscript.
8. Yes.
9. Yes.
10. Yes.
11. Yes.
12. Yes.



13. No. I would have preferred more time with my manuscript.
14. Yes.
15. Yes.

13) *We are always concerned about the physical well-being both of the RBS teaching collections and of materials owned by UVA's Special Collections. If relevant, what suggestions do you have for the improved classroom handling of such materials used in your course this week?*

1. N/A.
2. Materials were professionally managed.
3. I worried a bit about people's fingers touching illustrations and text, but we were well instructed regarding the handling the materials.
4. Pretty good standards here, I would say.
5. Materials were handled carefully and responsibly.
6. None.
7. I have no suggestions to make.
8. None.
9. N/A.
10. No suggestions.
11. Not enough background to comment.
12. None. All were handled well.
13. Proper procedures were followed.
14. None at this time.
15. None.

14) *Did you (or your institution) get your money's worth? Would you recommend this course to others?*

1. Yes, especially because I imagine that a lot of the kinks will be worked out for the next session.
2. Absolutely, yes.
3. Yes, yes.
4. Yes!
5. Yes, and yes.
6. YES, and YES!!!!
7. I most certainly will!
8. YES, will recommend highly—frequently, and soon!
9. Yes, and yes.
10. Yes.
11. Absolutely.
12. Yes, and yes.
13. Yes, on both counts.
14. Certainly, and certainly. Without a doubt.
15. Maybe.

15) *Any final or summary thoughts, or advice for other persons considering taking this course in a future year?*

1. Nope.
2. M-95 is a great course, and meets the needs of keeping up with the demands of managing rare manuscript materials in the digital age.
3. Incredible, wonderful, great. Very grateful to have had the privilege to attend.
4. None.
5. Expect to spend a fruitful week learning about digital applications for the study of medieval manuscripts. In order to make the most of the course and to learn as much as possible, it is probably necessary to spend an hour or two outside of class each day working on your project.
6. Take advantage of this class. You will learn from the faculty and staff and other RBS attendees. Very, very useful.
7. DP and WN are teaching this class perfectly together. I imagine that this class would work very well when hosted by different institutions and not just at UPenn. This is a class that should be taken by every rare book librarian who is developing digital collections based on rare book material. Changing the host institution could help spread the expert knowledge made available in this class.
8. Looking forward to earning the certificate at RBS.
9. N/A.
10. No comment.
11. If the course can be promoted more widely in technology circles, I think it could draw additional technology professionals.
12. I would recommend this course for anyone interested in digital presentations, digital humanities, &c. You absolutely do not need to know very much about the technical side to follow along. I certainly did not!
13. None.
14. This course was not only interesting and informative, but, I would argue, also essential for any scholar interested in studying manuscripts and printed books of the past. It is inevitable that technology will continue to grow, and it is important that scholars both be aware of the changes and new tools but also continue, in a collaborative effort, to work toward new knowledge.
15. I wish it had been a bit more organized and also had a booklet. There were a lot of medievalists—I wish there had been a wider variety of people from different parts of their career or education.

### **Aggregate Statistics**

*Number of respondents: 15*

#### **Leave**

Institution gave me leave: 5 (33.33%)

I took vacation time or unpaid leave: 2 (13.33%)

N/A: student, retired, or had summers off: 8 (53.33%)

**Tuition**

Institution paid tuition: 7 (46.67%)

Student paid tuition: 3 (20%)

Institution and student shared cost: 3 (20%)

Fellowship from RBS: 2 (13.33%)

**Housing**

Institution paid housing: 6 (40%)

Student paid housing: 4 (26.67%)

Institution and student shared cost: 1 (6.67%)

Fellowship from RBS: 2 (13.33%)

N/A: stayed with friends or lived at home: 2 (13.33%)

**Travel**

Institution paid travel: 7 (46.67%)

Student paid travel: 5 (33.33%)

Institution and student shared cost: 1 (6.67%)

Fellowship from RBS: 2 (13.33%)

*Which one category most closely defines what you do for a living, or why you are at RBS?*

M.A. student (humanities): 1 (6.67%)

M.L.I.S. student: 1 (6.67%)

Ph.D. student (humanities): 4 (26.67%)

Other full-time student: 1 (6.67%)

Librarian with no rare book duties: 1 (6.67%)

Librarian with some rare book duties: 1 (6.67%)

Library assistant/clerk: 1 (6.67%)

Rare book librarian: 2 (13.33%)

Assistant professor (college): 1 (6.67%)

Full or associate professor (university): 1 (6.67%)

Work in a museum or cultural institution: 1 (6.67%)