

John Kristensen & Katherin McCanless Ruffin  
T-60: The History of 19th- & 20th-Century Typography & Printing  
14–19 June 2015

**Narrative Course Evaluations**

1) *Were the pre-course reading assignments useful? Did you do any additional preparation for your course? Are there any books or articles that you would like to see included in future years? Any that you might suggest removing?*

1. Pre-course readings were useful, especially for those with no typography background. I did go to my library and got a few standard typography survey books to peruse beforehand. During the week, we were introduced to many more “must-reads,” and the right time to do them is after the course’s introduction to the field.
2. Yes, I thought the pre-course readings were very helpful in preparing me for the course with background information about printing and typography, so that I would not be overwhelmed by all the new terminology and names. I really enjoyed reading Bringhurst, and plan to read the rest of the book upon returning home.
3. Yes, the readings were helpful.
4. Readings were very suitable—they offered a solid background to material covered in class. I particularly liked the Bringhurst—keep this one on the list!
5. The readings were great and very useful. No extra preparation for the course. While I don’t regret doing a comprehensive reading of all the materials, they were not really needed to do well in the course and follow the lectures. I read every book on the list, and this was completely over the top.
6. Very useful, but some are more technical than others. A suggested introductory text or reading order would be nice. The only other preparation I had was from previous courses.
7. The reading was a great preparation, especially the Bringhurst and the Updike.
8. Yes. Reviewed my own research.
9. Most of the pre-course reading was helpful, but some if it was too technical and I couldn’t picture what the author was describing. It is all described in the class.
10. Yes, they were. I read all of the pre-course assignments and read more widely than was assigned (but only in the books assigned). I think the readings were appropriate given varied backgrounds of RBS attendees.
11. Too many, if not all, of the pre-course readings came from an early-twentieth-century antiquarian perspective, and also on balance focused more on typography than on printing. While informative, more variety in approach or production contexts might be appreciated.

2) *What are your thoughts on the course workbook and/or other teaching materials distributed during class? Was the content appropriate and useful? Will it continue to be useful for you after the course?*

1. Excellent! The articles were very helpful and just the right length; type-identification handouts were perfect tools in class, and will be useful in the future. Just the right balance of teaching materials or theory/philosophy/historical

- development of typefaces and hands-on type identification and printing.
2. The workbook is extremely helpful, and I used it quite frequently during our in-class type-description exercise, and in preparing for my typeface presentation. {private response} I will definitely be using my workbook when looking at typefaces in the library.
  3. The workbook is extremely useful, and will continue to be a valued resource.
  4. The workbook was very useful for discussions and type-identification exercises in class, and for the assignments. I will likely refer to it in the future. The type-identification aid charts were especially good.
  5. Excellent.
  6. The content was helpful and well organized—I will absolutely refer to it many more times.
  7. Great selection of texts in workbook, especially helpful images. It would have been nice to have had some discussion of the shorter texts we read during the week.
  8. Excellent, appropriate, and useful. Glad to have a bibliography of reference material and books viewed at SC. Will definitely use in my own research and teaching.
  9. Yes, it was useful. The trips to SC were enlightening and very valuable.
  10. Content was great, and will continue to be a useful reference.
  11. The workbook thoughtfully assembles so many useful reference points for class. It will continue in usefulness for a long time.

3) *If you've taken previous RBS courses, how did this one compare?*

1. This course was more lively, both in presentation of materials in lecture, and in the hands-on learning in the print shop. This combo is an ideal way to teach this topic!
2. {no response}
3. N/A
4. {no response}
5. First course.
6. {no response}
7. N/A
8. Better. Very interactive and well organized.
9. {no response}
10. This class was more interesting {private response} to me because of my specific interest in typography/design.
11. N/A

4) *Which aspects of the course were most interesting and relevant for you as an individual? Did you walk away with any new insights, ideas, or project plans?*

1. As a bookbinder, I entered the course most interested in learning how to do letterpress, and I loved every second in the print shop learning this new skill. But I was equally fascinated by the “academic” content of the lectures and the type-identification exercises, and will use this new knowledge in doing book descriptions in my work, and in my collecting.
2. I really enjoyed the hands-on work with the press; it gave me a whole new understanding of the processes and complexity of book production throughout

- history. I'm already thinking of ways to incorporate these new ideas into library instruction sessions and design work.
3. The typographical history and identification was especially helpful. The PowerPoint presentations introduced videos that I will use in my future classes. The structure of the course gave me ideas for my college course, and the printing was extremely gratifying.
  4. Better understanding of the way letterforms developed and were reused and readapted.
  5. The lectures were especially great; however, the hands-on experience with using the press was the best part. JK and KMR are both excellent instructors. I took many new insights for my ongoing research and a new and deeper appreciation for letterpress printing and the amount of detail involved.
  6. I really enjoyed learning about Linotype and Monotype processes, as well as how metal type is very different from digital. I also enjoyed learning about how types interact with the texts that they illustrate.
  7. Using the Vandercook was awesome! Great hands-on experience; really cemented a lot of the information. The presentations at the end of the course were also really helpful—I enjoyed the research aspect!
  8. Hands-on experience with printing, workshop experiences identifying type. Outstanding—lots of new ideas for research and teaching.
  9. The most interesting part by far was setting type and making prints with JK and KMR. They are incredibly kind, patient, and knowledgeable.
  10. History of letterforms was very interesting to me. The trip to UVA Printing and Copying Services was relevant to my work {private response}. Definitely came away with new insights and ideas, and personal project plans.
  11. The in-depth explanations of varied techniques were terrific, as was the instructors' ability to field class questions about details or alternate techniques. The hands-on experiences and field trips were also hugely valuable.
- 5) *Did the instructors help you to acquire all the skills and information promised in the course description? Was anything left out or undeveloped? Did you learn what you had hoped to learn?*
1. I learned more than I had ever expected—I'm walking away with a framework for approaching typographical identification, for understanding typeface in its historical context, and with a critical eye to function and beauty. JK and KMR are gifted teachers and printers—I can't praise their talents enough! I'll be the first to sign up for an "Advanced Topics in Typography" class when they give it!
  2. Yes, I liked the combination of practical, hands-on, kinesthetic experiences, while studying the historical type forms and processes. The varieties of activities (lectures, discussions, activities, and printing-lab time) made the week very dynamic. I think JK and KMR make a well-balanced instruction team.
  3. I learned even more than I could have hoped for.
  4. The history of typography and the designers/printers for fine/private press were the focus. I would have liked to discuss more trade/"regular" books, as well. The course also had a very (eastern) U.S. focus; I would have liked to look at Britain a bit more.
  5. Met my general expectations for the course. The hands-on experience grew my understanding of the labor involved in the mechanics of the process. An

understanding of the book as a communicator of information was overlooked. This course really stops at 1930, and does not discuss “cheap print.” Still, considering the restraints for a single week, the course was a success.

6. Yes, and then some! I learned way more than I thought I would, but I did hope to hear more about the practical histories of certain typefaces.
7. Yes—fantastic development of skills in a short period. Would have liked to get a bit more into the cultural implications of typefaces, but all the information presented was wonderful.
8. Yes, absolutely. Yes. Nothing left out that could reasonably be covered in a week!
9. It would be nice to touch on how the spread of information and reading/literacy changed with printing technology. Stretch a bit beyond type and typographers.
10. Yes. I learned what I’d hoped to learn. I think the class could benefit from a guided dissection of letterform/type technology.
11. The course covers an amazing amount of material in its allotted week. I thought that un-special materials and display types got shorter shrift, and we only glancingly touched on graphic design, but I don’t see how the course could do anything more.

6) *How do you plan to use the skills and knowledge acquired during your time here?*

1. I’ll use my skills in my professional work as a conservator, better understanding the text-creation process! In collecting, my eyes have been opened wide!
2. I plan to talk more about the book as a physical object and production processes in library instruction sessions with undergraduates. I also hope to make more informed typeface decisions in my design work for exhibits.
3. I will be teaching art students at KSU much of what I learned, and I will be sharing the resources with other teaching artists at Atlanta Printmakers Studio.
4. In teaching nineteenth- and twentieth-century history of the book at the library (primarily). Also in my own research regarding book design.
5. Ongoing research, pedagogy, and lectures.
6. I will use these skills in future coursework, and in everyday life.
7. More research!
8. Further my own research on print and typography history. Will use to teach undergraduate and masters-level courses.
9. Mostly in my own projects. I enjoy designing books digitally, and having more insight into type design is very useful.
10. Gives me a greater understanding of background and processes, and a better ability to explain to colleagues why X or Y decision might be important.
11. This course has enriched my sense of the contexts for nineteenth- and twentieth-century writing and textual practice. It will significantly affect what I can credibly research, and it will provoke me to integrate these lessons and hands-on practices into my classes.

7) *Please briefly describe the intellectual level of the course. What sort of person might benefit the most from taking it?*

1. I think it is a course for anyone interested in books as physical objects and/or books in their historical contexts. The combo of excellent lectures—which were intellectually rigorous, but totally accessible, and beautifully delivered—great

- materials, and hands-on learning means a wide range of folks will love it!
2. I think the material is accessible on a variety of levels, and the course has an interdisciplinary approach. It offers information on the development of the book from literary and historical standpoints, but also covers the evolution of design and technology, as well.
  3. This course lends itself well to artists, academics, print novices, &c. It juggles a wide range of knowledge bases well.
  4. Nice balance between academic/historical and craftsman perspectives. JK and KMR complement each other well as teachers. Anyone who wants to get a real sense for what letterpress printing entails should take this course.
  5. This is certainly not an advanced course. While I did all the readings, our hands were held throughout the course and I didn't have to study so much as I expected. I recommend this course to the non-expert who is interested in typography and printing with a working knowledge of the history of the book.
  6. A person who wants to know more about the intricacies of book/graphic design will benefit from this course. The combination of historical and practical aspects really makes this unique!
  7. Someone interested in book studies, layout design, history of the book, and possibly even bibliography.
  8. Graduates and post-graduates. Advanced beginners in type/printing history.
  9. Collectors, librarians, archivists, scholars, or those with a specific interest in type (the course focus is fairly narrow, but it is hard to fit it all into a week).
  10. Appropriate. {private response} I think the course material and the manner in which it was taught was very accessible to students of varying backgrounds.
  11. Because of the balance of expertise among the instructors, anyone interested in textual production or design or history would benefit.
- 8) *If applicable, what were the most original, powerful, or otherwise noteworthy educational moments in the course? Were there any "aha!" moments you'd like to share?*
1. The most powerful moments happened through congeniality—when we students worked our way through an identification exercise under JK and KMR's guidance. I enjoyed and learned from the back and forth of ideas and opinions, and got it right or learned together when we didn't! Our Friday student presentations were amazing, our broadsheet spectacular, and the week too short.
  2. Having grown up in an era with computer word processing and graphic design, the amount of time needed to tweak something in letterpress printing was quite notable. I would be more patient if I had grown up in a different time.
  3. The casting mold JK passed around, getting to see the hand presses upstairs, getting to see the offset set up at the UVA copy center, and having to do presentations all added value to the lectures. I loved the hands-on printing and physical examples.
  4. Finally understanding offset printing!
  5. Hands-on experience in the press, the type, and setting the type at every stage. JK is an excellent instructor who is unapologetic in his stance on printing—it is great to have access to his world of knowledge, and he doesn't hold back. As an instructor, he will stand out as one of the most dynamic and knowledgeable people I have worked with. KMR is incredibly energizing and enthusiastic about

- whatever is it I am interested in. Easily one of the most approachable people I have ever met, and a gifted teacher. The two of them are an excellent team.
6. The first time printing on a Vandercook was really wonderful, and so was looking at all of the typeface examples in the books.
  7. Field trip to UVA printing services was a great experience and visual/live action. Using the Vandercook was also a very powerful experience.
  8. Organization/methods used reinforced my own practice. Generally an area in which I work on my own—amazing to have outside confirmation of my research insights and intuitions.
  9. For me, actually, it was during Russell Maret's lecture in the SC auditorium. His take on typography very much intrigued me, and it enriched my course experience.
  10. Working on the letterpress. So much to take in—the level of necessary attention to detail is astounding.
  11. It was amazing by late in the week to hear my classmates adopting the complex analytical vocabulary of the course. The “aha” moment comes after the fact, a realization that you've learned something hard and initially foreign.

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

1. Can't think of a thing—what was done most brilliantly was the beautiful pacing of the presentation of material. So much to present, but presented clearly, with the right number of materials from SC and the RBS collection, and then the alternating pace of press work in the press room....
2. Perhaps there could be some videos as part of the pre-course “reading”? Watching the Linotype documentary on Movie Night definitely aided my understanding of the process, more so than the readings.
3. Offer an advanced level for further exploration.
4. See Q5, above: more “regular” or mass-produced books; more non-American examples.
5. Read the books! When at SC, read us a passage! While I understand (now) the beautiful-object aspect, read to us what the words say. Most disappointing to look at the Dove Bible and not hear the words. More on the people of the press, not just the designers would be great. Who were the laborers? What were their daily exercises?
6. I think it's really well structured, but some of the lectures could have been done with some more hands-on stuff to give examples.
7. {no response}
8. {no response}
9. I do not have any background in typography or history, so that may be why I sometimes felt that specific information was presented, but the general context was not. {private response}
10. A touch more introductory grounding.
11. More diversity in the otherwise wonderfully welcome visits to SC. Bibles, Dame{?}, and private-press gems could be complemented with examples from other, less elite domains.

10) *Do you feel that you got your money's worth? Would you recommend the course to others?*

1. Yes, and yes!
2. Yes, I would absolutely recommend the course to anyone interested in printing and typography.
3. Yes.
4. Yes! Absolutely.
5. Very expensive, but I'm glad I came, and will plan on applying again.
6. Yes! Absolutely!
7. Yes!
8. Definitely. More so than previous courses.
9. I would recommend it to people who are quite specifically interested in type. The hands-on experience with printing was wonderful.
10. Yes, yes. Very thought provoking and engaging.
11. You bet. The depth of technical expertise is hard to experience outside of such a class.

11) *If your course made any trips outside of the classroom, do you feel that they were time well spent?*

1. Very well spent. Two trips to SC, where exactly the right number of books were pulled for us; fascinating trip to the UVA printing operations, where we learned so much about modern commercial offset printing.
2. Yes, I enjoyed the visits to see historical printing examples from SC, and I thought the visit to the printing office was a great way to bring the class up to modern processes.
3. Yes, the class ran very efficiently without feeling terribly rushed.
4. Yes—visiting UVA printing services and seeing a high-volume, operating press was an interesting contrast to our work with letterpress.
5. Time well spent, but please read the books.
6. Yes. I was originally skeptical, but ended up learning a lot at printing services.
7. Yes—see Q8, above.
8. Yes. Both SC and field trip to UVA printing office were useful and interesting.
9. Yes! The trip to printing services was fascinating, as were the SC visits.
10. Yes.
11. I was uncertain about the trip to UVA Printing and Copying Services, but it was fantastic. So relevant to see the continuity of historical practice with the present.

12) *If you attended any of our optional evening events, do you feel that they were a good use of your time? Were there any that were particularly important to your RBS experience? Any that you could have done without?*

1. Did them all! (...except Booksellers' Night, downtown.) Studying typography, the Linotype movie, the ornament printing on Tuesday night, and the Russell Maret lecture were perfect complements to class!
2. I enjoyed Ornament Night, but would have appreciated a few more instructions of period examples of their use as inspiration for creating one.
3. Both of the lectures were enlightening and interesting.
4. Both talks were great—Russell Maret in particular really complemented everything we touched on in class.
5. Attended all the nights—they were okay. The receptions were great for socializing.

Ornament Night was the best. The two lectures were very well done, and I'm glad I attended.

6. Some were useful, others not as much—the Chinese paper lecture wasn't what I had hoped for, and I could have done without Booksellers' Night; other than that, everything was great.
7. Yes—good lecture on Wednesday night about artists' books. Ornament Night was also fun.
8. {no response}
9. Yes, already mentioned. The Chinese paper lecture was not relevant to me, although I did attend. Russell Maret's talk was very thought provoking.
10. I attended Ornament Night and Russell Maret's lecture. Both were fantastic.
11. The Russell Maret lecture was particularly interesting for our class—as was the Linotype movie and Ornament Night. A good week for typography!

13) *Do you have any additional thoughts or advice for anyone considering taking this course in a future year?*

1. Don't let lack of typography experience worry you.... This introduction is perfect for all levels of knowledge.
2. {no response}
3. Do your pre-reading; it helps!
4. Be prepared to think about type/letterforms in ways you may not have before!
5. Know that this course focuses almost entirely on the book as object. We don't think about books as something consumed or read—they are art objects that are admired. More attention to the people of the press would make for a more comprehensive course.
6. You will learn much more about typography than you ever thought possible (and will probably become highly critical of every printed card/book/poster you encounter!).
7. The instructors, JK and KMR, were wonderful—they work really well together and really made the class come alive in their own unique, yet mutually beneficial, ways. Team-taught aspect really worked.
8. Take it! The most fun I've had since last year's RBS.
9. {no response}
10. JK and KMR's knowledge of and expertise with the course material were terrific. I think they make a great teaching team; bringing differing viewpoints (sometimes) to the material was refreshing.
11. {no response}

14) *If you had to sum up your RBS experience with a single sentence, phrase, or haiku, what would you say?*

1. Go be smart, and do it with the incredible community of teachers, staff, and participants at RBS!
2. A wonderfully collaborative learning experience with delightfully bookish instructors and classmates.
3. Lovely!
4. Really very enjoyable, all around. An enriching experience that I'm sure I couldn't find anywhere else. Thank you, RBS!

5. “Everyone in the room is a big book history nerd—and it’s wonderful.”
6. A truly incredible intellectual experience.
7. Libri gratia librorum. Do it—so worth it. Thanks!
8. Life changing—you’ll never read a single printed object the same way again!
9. Camaraderie, learning using physical objects, worthwhile.
10. Fantastic—I wish I were doing it again next week.
11. Exhaustive training and fellowship and world-class materials.

## **Student Data**

*Number of respondents:* 11 (of 11)

*How did you arrange for time off to attend this course?*

My institution/employer gave me professional leave time: 6 (54.55%)  
 I am self employed, and can arrange my own schedule: 1 (9.09%)  
 I am a student or non-year-round employee, with a more flexible summer schedule: 4 (36.36%)

*Who paid your RBS tuition costs?*

I paid 100% myself: 3 (27.27%)  
 My institution/employer paid 100%: 3 (27.27%)  
 My institution/employer paid part; I paid the rest: 1 (9.09%)  
 I used a scholarship/fellowship to pay/waive 100%: 4(36.36%)

*Who paid your RBS housing expenses?*

I paid 100% myself: 3 (27.27%)  
 My institution/employer paid 100%: 1 (9.09%)  
 I used a scholarship/fellowship to cover 100%: 2 (18.18%)  
 I used a scholarship/fellowship to cover part; I paid the rest: 1 (9.09%)  
 I stayed with friends/family, or stayed in my own home and commuted: 3 (27.27%)  
 My situation does not fit any of the options above: 1 (9.09%)

*Who paid your RBS travel expenses?*

I paid 100% myself: 2 (18.18%)  
 My institution/employer paid 100%: 1 (9.09%)  
 I used a scholarship/fellowship to cover 100%: 3 (27.27%)  
 I used a scholarship/fellowship to cover part; I paid the rest: 2 (18.18%)  
 I live locally, and had no travel expenses: 3 (27.27%)

*Which of the following best describes your current occupation?*

Library disciplines:  
 Special collections librarian: 1 (9.09%)  
 Other: 2 (18.18%)

**Student working toward a/n:**

B.A./B.S.: 1 (9.09%)

Ph.D./D.Phil: 2 (18.18%)

**Professional educator:**

Assistant professor: 1 (9.09%)

Full professor: 1 (9.09%)

College/university administrator: 1 (9.09%)

**Book trades:**

Book artist, artisan or printer: 2 (18.18%)