

Detailed Course Evaluation

- 1) *How useful were the pre-course readings? Did you do any additional preparations in advance of the course?*
 1. The readings were scaled appropriately so that I could read them before class each day. They combined theoretical matter with some big-picture pronouncements, and were not especially technical. Reading discussion did not occupy a significant amount of course time.
 2. Very useful, relevant, and the right length. I appreciate not being given ten-plus articles.
 3. I found the pre-course readings to be helpful in providing me with context for the course. We did not engage the readings explicitly as much as I thought, but they provided the class with a useful language on which to draw as a group throughout the week.
 4. The readings were helpful. I read material off last year's syllabus before I knew that this year's readings varied from last year's. I appreciated the effort to gather all the pre-course readings into a single PDF that I could take to a printer to print out.
 5. Most were useful, though some were given short shrift in the course itself (at least three). I read all and did PDF annotation of all in the days leading up to the course (and in retrospect, I realize this was overkill).
 6. Pre-course readings were very useful and led me to investigate several other sources that had been cited. However, I did not find the in-class discussion of these materials useful. I think there was about a full day, all told, scheduled in discussion of the readings, and I feel as though that time would have been better spent in hands-on digitization activities (as with the NeatLine demo). As a more general comment, I think the emphasis in the course should shift a little (not completely) from theoretical to pragmatic concerns; I (and other students I talked to) found Wednesday and Thursday the most helpful by far. Squeezing one more day in after Thursday (by consolidating Monday/Tuesday) would be ideal.
 7. The readings were highly relevant and thought-provoking. When I was first accepted into the course, I started doing the readings that were posted at that time—which honestly seemed a bit outdated for a course on digitizing the historical record. The readings were updated about a month before the class met with much more relevant and timely information.
 8. Very useful to the start of class. Possibly have more readings on the technical materials that were presented on Thursday to get a heads-up in difficult areas.
 9. They were very helpful. We didn't really discuss the last two on the list extensively, but they were nice as preparation for the ideas we discussed in class.
 10. Very useful for context and gave me a hint of what to expect, overall themes of course.
 11. The readings were relevant and provided good context, especially for those coming to the course with less information-science theory to contextualize what they'd be learning in class.

12. They were useful; in fact, I would have liked to spend more time discussing them.
13. The range of readings offered a sense of the range of possibilities, problems, and issues related to digital humanities work. The SCI report was especially useful, and I would have enjoyed more readings (at least a source list) on digital humanities “theory” and issues confronting professionalization.
14. The readings provided good context for discussion.
15. Useful to frame discussions.
16. The course readings were, for the most part, institution-oriented and not particularly useful to me (a collector).

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. {No response—RBS staff}
2. I barely used the workbook. A few pages for the sketching, but in the end I plan to take photos of the sketches and recycle the book before I leave.
3. I will use the course workbook, particularly the storyboard we created, as I continue to develop my own project.
4. The sketchbook is a great idea. I will copy the unused pages so that I can keep using a sketchbook.
5. {No response—RBS staff}
6. Yes.
7. Yes—the articles were easy to access and the consolidated packet provided on Dropbox before the course met was helpful (though I imagine most everyone completed the reading before that was distributed on Dropbox).
8. Yes. Course workbook was useful. I project I will use the formats discussed in class.
9. They were useful. The exercises we sketched in the workbooks will definitely be helpful in the future and I am sure I will consult with them when I return home.
10. Course materials were very abbreviated to save paper. That was fine with me.
11. Yes.
12. Yes, though I didn’t receive the PDF until I arrived on campus.
13. The storyboard spaces were especially helpful, and forced me to think more concretely and creatively about my ideas and concerns for digitizing materials.
14. Yes.
15. The workbook holds my project, so it will be quite important.
16. Yes. A page of website listings that are relevant would be nice. Some of these were given in class.

3) *Have you taken one or more RBS courses before? If so, how did this course compare with your previous coursework?*

1. No, this is my very first course.
2. No, this is my very first course.
3. No, this is my very first course.
4. No, this is my very first course.
5. No, this is my very first course.
6. No, this is my very first course.
7. No, this is my very first course.

8. No, this is my very first course.
9. No, this is my very first course.
10. Yes. The composition of this course was nice, different interests, but we were all at a similar level.
11. No, this is my very first course.
12. No, this is my very first course.
13. Yes. On par with the excellence of the first course I took (with Jim Green).
Enjoyed the team-taught format.
14. No, this is my very first course.
15. N/A.
16. Comparable in quality and scope.

4) *What aspects of the course content were of the greatest interest or relevance for your purposes?*

1. I was especially interested in learning about new developments in digital humanities and online exhibitions thinking. I wanted practical and theoretical knowledge about designing digital humanities projects.
2. Thinking about the issues around digitization from a scholarship perspective.
3. I found the storyboards to be really useful, as well as presentations from Scholars' Lab staff members on specific facets of building digital humanities projects. I also really benefited from my conversations with the instructors throughout the week.
4. I liked the going back and forth between material object (rare books) and the digital world.
5. It was a pretty good balance of theoretical big-picture discussion (e.g., the futures of digital humanities and institutional connections) and close focus on individual projects. My goal involved creating specific project plans to initiate planning meetings with my institutional team, so I'm pleased to have first drafts of these in hand by the end of the workshop.
6. The personalized feedback available from BN, AS, and the staff at the Scholars' Lab was most helpful. If you could squeeze in another two blocks of time like that, it would be ideal.
7. {Private comment—RBS staff} The GIS session was presented well, and got everyone thinking about maps (if they weren't already).
8. Connecting the dots, and explanations of what/how of the various software. This course "filled in a lot of gaps" and "filled in the blanks" in a spotty previous knowledge. LOVED the visit to the digital lab, and would have liked more time to learn more about that in detail. Possibly some hands-on experience in a mock work area?
9. The session on "user experience" was the most helpful—the idea that we should formulate our goals and agenda before getting into design or tools helped to cultivate creativity. Also, the session on mapping and GIS was excellent and very informative.
10. Planning for digital spaces, being selective and mindful, technical help.
11. Theories and crosswalks for various library, archival, and tech systems used in digitizing historical documents were the more relevant for me. Seeing real-world, successful applications of current and emerging technologies in digital humanities was wonderful. I was also grateful that our instructors included a daily, lengthy interaction with books, which grounds the theory and allows a more contextual

- route into the material covered (i.e., books are machines, too!); plus, since this is RBS, I would've been disappointed if I didn't get to see any (traditional codex) rare books!
12. One-on-one interactions with the instructors, and feedback from other students.
 13. Discussions of the purposes, consequences, and theory of digital humanities work. Although I did not initially think the technical instruction would be as relevant for me, presentations on Omeka, Neatline, and GIS opened my eyes to resources I may want to use in the future, and helped me think in new ways about both conveying and analyzing information.
 14. Discussion of what to digitize, Neatline/GIS, design.
 15. I appreciated seeing specific projects and how digital humanities theories and practices were applied.
 16. The website design, software, GIS, and talks were particularly useful.
- 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. I leave this week with an exciting array of new tips and suggestions. The guest speakers all offered very useful insights. I was able to develop my web project far beyond what I began with.
 2. Yes. Very good feedback.
 3. I have only great things to say about the instructors. They were generous with their time and knowledge throughout the week.
 4. {No response—RBS staff}
 5. Both instructors were attentive and gave great specific advice. In particular, inviting the guest speakers from various days to circulate during hands-on afternoon workshops was very helpful. (My hope is that ongoing institutional collaboration and/or conversation may continue to be possible after leaving RBS, as well.)
 6. Yes. My highest praise for this course is that it was adaptive and flexible, responding to student's individual projects and needs.
 7. The instructors and instruction helped everyone crystallize their projects and ideas. My original questions are still there, but the instructors helped me narrow the focus and ask the right questions to get where I need to go.
 8. Yes, I think so. Yes, I think there was appropriate intellectual as well as hands-on experience.
 9. The intellectual level of the course was great. The ideas were accessible and well articulated by both AS and BN. Class discussions were also very collaborative, and AS and BN made a lot of effort to connect students with other students who were asking the same questions or had similar goals.
 10. Yes, and yes.
 11. Yes. As a second-year M.S.I.S student with a humanities subject mastery and an intermediate level of coding and digital skills, this was pitched to my interests and capabilities. But I also learned a great deal, and the instructors were so capable that even those areas in which I was a total newcomer were made approachable and exciting.
 12. Yes—the material that was over my head (i.e., the more technical material) I anticipated being so.

13. Absolutely. BN and AS paid careful attention to pace, and slowed down or clarified when necessary. The range of expertise and interest in the course, and the diversity of personalities, made this, I imagine, a challenging course to teach. And they guided our group with grace and efficiency daily.
14. Yes. I have a better understanding of the issues involved in making cultural materials available digitally.
15. I believe so. I certainly leave with a better understanding of the conversations circling digital humanities. Intellectual level was appropriate.
16. Yes, yes.

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

1. Working with the team of AS and BN, as well as the scholars from the Scholars' Lab, was the highpoint. Conversations with classmates were also excellent. The instructors shared their ideas with us, which were provocative and exciting.
2. The instructors were great and the commentary was very useful.
3. I liked being part of a cohort of people attempting to envision digital humanities projects into being with varied levels of computer/coding experience. I also really benefited from the perspectives of classmates in professions different from my own.
4. The exchange among students, in and out of the classroom.
5. In addition to the faculty and staff, the other workshop members were also extremely generous in lending their expertise to my specific narrow project, and that's been invaluable.
6. Scholar's Lab/drafting sessions (Wednesday and Thursday).
7. I really enjoyed the readings. I liked that we got to look at books—I was worried that we wouldn't.
8. I liked looking at the wide range of rare materials and the exercises of imagining the processes and various ways they could/should/might be digitized or displayed online. This was extremely useful exercise. I also felt re-examination of the same material at the beginning and end was useful, which is a technique I've used in teaching, but this is the first experience as a student with this. It enforces re-examination of assumptions and ideas, which is excellent in a week's time. I also liked that various experts in all the technologies were brought in. It was very helpful to have different approaches and teaching styles that were good to the technology.
9. The collaborative aspect, and the feeling that we are learning about tools and techniques that will help our own research and projects. The idea that academia is dynamic and that there are alternatives from the traditional career path for scholarship, without sacrificing intellectual integrity.
10. I liked having two professors with varying interests, and it was very nice to have the Scholars' Lab close by with their knowledgeable staff available to guest lecture and offer us feedback on our projects
11. Applicable digital humanities, interdisciplinarity, approachability, and pedagogical skill of instructors.
12. The people, both instructors and students, and the intense time spent studying the topic. I think it was more productive for me than a course spread out over more time would have been.

13. Exposure to new projects and ways of working with information on digital platforms—and the students who brought these projects and visions with them and shared them with the class.
14. The variety of perspectives of the students and instructors.
15. Seeing actual digital humanities projects, presented by both the instructors as well as class members.
16. The GIS software and webpage software talks.

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

1. This was a large class and the time could have been managed better. Instead of going around the room and sharing out one by one we could have done small-group activities that would have allowed for more discussion of the readings and a better use of overall class time.
2. More time to look at interfaces and talk about how people use them. Especially from the different view points of people in the room.
3. I thought the discussion of open source data led by a Scholars' Lab staff member could have been more clear, and know that other classmates were similarly confused by much of it.
4. I am a little concerned about the dependence on Scholars' Lab for guest lectures and expertise. Scholars' Lab has great resources for creating and refining digital projects. When I return to my host institution, which does not have these resources, what do I do? Where can I get help? But now I know what questions to ask, and what is possible. I also think more could have been teased out about changes in technology in the book world, prior to c.1990 and the birth of the e-book and digital scholarship, to normalize the change that we are living through now. AS discussed changes in technology that created the books we explored as artifacts in class. Bring that forward—we, now, are living through a technological change, just as people did *x* years ago with a change in book or print technology.
5. For your non-techie, non-librarian scholar contingent, a glossary handout of definitions and acronyms would be an *excellent* addition to the pre-course reading. This might help bridge the gap between those with prior experience with these terms and those who are engaging them for the first time in the reading. (I would have liked to have had a better grasp on terminology and acronyms *ahead of time* in order to be better prepared to absorb more during certain of the technical conversations/presentations.)
6. See above—more time like Wednesday and Thursday, elimination or consolidation of discussion of readings.
7. A slightly smaller class size. {Private comment—RBS staff}
8. Possibly more examples of the specifics. For example, on the linked open data, maybe more details. Possibly bring in more finer details along with the overview mixed in earlier on and then still have some overview. Having it again at the end was useful as a summary/wrap up, but maybe some step-back big picture for some of the other areas as well. I appreciated the theory (as advertised), but also appreciated the tremendous numbers of resources mentioned in context of the talks. That was quite useful. Maybe some reiteration of some of these made available afterwards to students... dictionary of terms?
9. {Private comment—RBS staff}

10. Overall, the guest speakers were excellent, but they went very quickly over the material. They might want to scale back, or have a light version of their talk. The Neatline demo was useful, but there wasn't enough time to really follow and process it.
11. Less A/C in the classroom! Brrrrrr. I also think a glossary of terms would be helpful, since the course is interdisciplinary and some people did not have prior knowledge of various (especially information science) acronyms.
12. Fewer students would have allowed for more one-on-one time with the instructors, but I was initially on the wait list, so if that were the case I might not have made it in.
13. The Open Data presentation could have been organized better. For those of us unfamiliar with the concept, it was difficult to know the point, or where it was headed. I would have tracked better had I better understood the concrete results (online examples) of this way of thinking about the web and data.
14. I think our class was at the upper limit of what could be accommodated. It worked fine, but smaller would be better.
15. I believe a better discussion regarding LC would have been helpful.
16. The talk about interconnected databases, LinkedIn, Omeka, &c., could be clarified and expanded.

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

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Yes.
4. Yes.
5. {No response—RBS staff}
6. Yes.
7. Yes.
8. Yes. Pretty much met my expectations.
9. Yes.
10. Yes.
11. This course was more focused on literary than historical document, which I was not expecting; but, since my background is in literature, it was welcome! And the technologies used are easily transferable to various humanities concepts.
12. Yes.
13. Yes.
14. Yes.
15. Yes.
16. Yes.

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

1. {No response—RBS staff}
2. At my job with a few different projects.
3. I intend to incorporate what I learned here into my own research and its presentation, as well as my teaching.
4. I will develop the case study/project I brought to the class. I will seek other opportunities to workshop digital projects, because I had a good experience here. I

- will maintain my interest in special collections—I am encouraged to explore the dynamic between special collections and the digital humanities.
5. To coordinate a team to build a specific website for my university (e.g., connected to a need I recognized when conducting my own scholarly work).
 6. In my project!
 7. It will inform the next project at my library that involves a specific community and archival collections.
 8. Working on some immediate projects. Hope to become more skilled in digital humanities and hope to continue to use in future jobs. I think this is where things are going.
 9. I would like to continue with my current case study, but I also have about ten other ideas for digital projects. And I plan to continue learning more about digital humanities and attending other workshops and conferences.
 10. Start a project! I'm feeling energized to begin and to share my enthusiasm with my director and media librarian colleague.
 11. Working on a digital archive of street art, initially for a graduate school course project and subsequently as a standalone, crowd-sourced archive. Plus many other digital humanities projects in the future, including an online component for a historical exhibition I will be researching and curating in 2015.
 12. To develop a new course at my university.
 13. I have a new vocabulary for thinking and talking about digital work, a better appreciation for its value, and new ideas for how to integrate it into traditional research and curricula.
 14. To start building sites that make records more available for cultural revitalization.
 15. As a "proof of concept" for future digital humanities activities at my institution.
 16. Download and explore the software mentioned.

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

1. We paid an exciting visit to the SC scan lab.
2. N/A. Our course made no extra trips.
3. I enjoyed seeing the digitization lab. It allowed us to become oriented with technology we did not see in the classroom, and to appreciate how digitized sources are made.
4. N/A. Our course made no extra trips.
5. It was useful to see the digitization department (though I think it could have been halved in terms of time).
6. N/A. Our course made no extra trips.
7. The Digitization Services lab is something to be proud of! And jealous of!!
8. Digital lab was extremely useful. It may have been even more in-depth. Very worthwhile time.
9. The tour of UVA's digitization lab was amazing!
10. Great outing to the digitization lab in SC.
11. Really enjoyed the UVA Digitization Services tour.
12. Yes, the visit to the digitization lab was excellent.
13. The trip to the digital scanning facility in SC blew my mind.
14. Definitely—the tour of the digitization lab was great.
15. Yes.
16. {No response—RBS staff}

- 11) *If you attended the evening events (e.g., RBS Lecture, Video Night, RBS Forum, Booksellers' Night), were they worth attending?*
1. Yes, both lectures that I attended were quite interesting.
 2. Ornament Night and the RBS Lecture were great. Booksellers' Night was mediocre.
 3. I really enjoyed all events. The speakers were phenomenal!
 4. Lectures were fantastic and related to the course. I was too tired to participate in Ornament Night, but I would have liked to. Booksellers' Night was interesting—I went to places I would never have found on my own.
 5. Interesting to see new approaches to the field.
 6. N/A. I attended none.
 7. They were fun, and I didn't have to think about it!
 8. Yes. Worthwhile. Learned a lot. The Ornament Night and typesetting was very fun, and I actually learned a great deal in a very short amount of time.
 9. N/A. I attended none.
 10. Absolutely. Top quality speakers, and wonderful ornament demo. Video was dated, but who cares really, because it was so detailed!
 11. The evening lectures were both excellent; it was a real privilege to hear talks about cutting-edge technologies from Dr. France and Karen Keninger. The SC tour was too short, as it was sandwiched in during the lunch break (har har!), but Ms. Jackson, the tour guide, was wonderful, and I'm so grateful it was offered.
 12. Informative, though at the end of a long day of classes it was difficult to remain alert and take in all the information.
 13. The France lecture was outstanding.
 14. The lectures were worthwhile; Video Night—not so much.
 15. Yes.
 16. Yes.
- 12) *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. {No response—RBS staff}
 2. {No response—RBS staff}
 3. {No response—RBS staff}
 4. {No response—RBS staff}
 5. {No response—RBS staff}
 6. {No response—RBS staff}
 7. {No response—RBS staff}
 8. Possibly have them in an offset area where they can be in the cooler air, but the people are in a bit warmer air?
 9. {No response—RBS staff}
 10. More cradles.
 11. No.
 12. Everything seemed fine.
 13. {No response—RBS staff}

14. Everyone was pretty careful, but maybe students could be encouraged to clear the space of other materials (bags, notebooks, &c.).
 15. {No response—RBS staff}
 16. The handling seemed appropriate to me, but I am not an expert.
- 13) *Did you (or your institution) get your money's worth? Would you recommend this course to others?*
1. Yes.
 2. Yes.
 3. Yes. I highly recommend this class to anyone interested in the digital humanities! This class has the perfect balance of theory and practice to arm its students with both the tools and the training to enter the field.
 4. {No response—RBS staff}
 5. Yes.
 6. Yes.
 7. Yes.
 8. Yes. Still costly for an individual to pay for, but very worthwhile.
 9. Yes.
 10. Yes.
 11. Yes. Very much so, on both counts.
 12. Yes. The tuition is certainly worth it. The costs of traveling here and staying in accommodations might have made it an expensive investment for my institution. I am motivated to make sure they see a return on that investment.
 13. Yes.
 14. Yes, and yes.
 15. I believe so, yes.
 16. Yes, yes.
- 14) *Any final or summary thoughts, or advice for other persons considering taking this course in a future year?*
1. {No response—RBS staff}
 2. {No response—RBS staff}
 3. {No response—RBS staff}
 4. {No response—RBS staff}
 5. {No response—RBS staff}
 6. {No response—RBS staff}
 7. I thought it was great. This course was taught at a high level without intimidation that "I didn't know enough." Very democratic.
 8. I would be interested in coming back as this is opening a door for me that I'd like to pursue further.
 9. {No response—RBS staff}
 10. {No response—RBS staff}
 11. A wonderful first time visit to RBS! I found out about it from Professor Michael Winship, when I took his bibliography and textual studies course at UT-Austin in 2011. Many thanks for such an exciting and informative week.
 12. Everything is great—keep up with the good work you are doing.
 13. {No response—RBS staff}

14. {No response—RBS staff}
15. As a first-time attendee, I wasn't sure what to expect. The friendliness and professionalism of the staff, instructors, and students alike was beyond my hopes. The quality of the class was excellent, and I hope to attend again.
16. If you require a soft mattress, avoid Brown College.

Aggregate Statistics

Number of respondents: 16

Leave

Institution gave me leave: 9 (56.25%)
 N/A: student, retired, summers free: 4 (25%)
 N/A: self-employed or work unrelated to RBS course topic: 1 (6.25%)
 Other, RBS Staff: 1 (6.25%)
 Other: Paid intern: 1 (6.25%)

Tuition

Institution paid tuition: 8 (50%)
 Student paid tuition: 5 (31.25%)
 Exchange or barter: 1 (6.25%)
 Scholarship from RBS: 2 (12.5%)

Housing

Institution paid housing: 8 (50%)
 Institution and student shared cost: 1 (6.25%)
 Student paid housing: 6 (37.5%)
 N/A: stayed with friends or lived at home: 1 (6.25%)

Travel

Institution paid travel: 8 (50%)
 Student paid travel: 7 (43.75%)
 N/A: I had only local travel expenses: 1 (6.25%)

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

Book collector: 1 (6.25%)
 M.L.I.S. student: 1 (6.25%)
 Ph.D. student (humanities): 2 (12.5%)
 Librarian/archivist of digital materials: 1 (6.25%)
 Librarian with some rare book duties: 2 (12.5%)
 Rare book librarian: 1 (6.25%)
 Teacher or professor: University: assistant professor: 3 (18.75%)
 Work in a museum or cultural institution: 3 (18.75%)
 Other, college adjunct professor: 1 (6.25%)
 Other, curator for history at a library: 1 (6.25%)