

Stephen Tabor
G-45: Analytical Bibliography
9-14 July 2017

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. Reading list—especially Tanselle and Blayney—were right on. It was useful to reread Gaskell.
2. The Tanselle reading was especially informative in considering the history of the field and the types of approaches/uses of analytical bibliography. Blayney was a priority/requirement, a good example of application.
3. The readings were basic to the discipline, but essential.
4. Pre-course readings were informative and relevant.
5. The readings are essential and thoughtfully assembled. I did not do too much additional prep.
6. The readings were applicable, thoughtfully selected, and of manageable volume.
7. The readings were useful to me to refresh my memory on the basics of bibliography, as it has been ten years since I graduated from SILS.
8. Reading was light but crucial, and provided adequate preparation for the course.
9. Readings were useful, though not essential depending on prior coursework (e.g., “DesBib”), with its own reading.
10. Pre-course readings were well chosen and raised very important questions in the field as well as provided a good grounding in bibliographical concepts/terms.
11. Yes.
12. All useful. Tanselle was used as promised. Could’ve gotten by without reading Blayney and being introduced to the information by ST.

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. The workbook showed how much thought and preparation went into the course. I concentrated on what was applicable to my interests and situation.
2. Workbook and materials are thorough examples of mini projects for analysis—and while not a reference book per se—will be a nice work to refer back to when making my own projects.
3. This is so specialized and specific, that without context of the in-class discussion, I’m not sure the workbook will be useful. In class, however, it was great.
4. Yes. Yes. Yes, but indirectly. Great examples, and it has given me ideas about how I can better teach bibliography with rare materials.
5. The workbook was comprehensive and I would definitely continue to consult it as I incorporate concepts in class into my own practice. The articles mentioned during discussions were also notable and appropriate.
6. Perfect practice material—not so useful perhaps for later reference, but also not

- intended to be.
7. The practical exercises in the workbook were useful and fun. I would have liked a preliminary sheet for the materials to sum up what was to be done with them, how and why. The exercise in which we identified the printer of our book is a good example. This would make the exercise easier, and easier to go back and reconstruct what we were doing with a particular exercise.
 8. {no response}
 9. Workbook was one of the most useful—almost all hands-on examples, and activities. Clearer table of contents/more detailed headings/section descriptions might be helpful. Also, the traditional calendar chart on the back!
 10. Course workbook offered us well chosen examples, and useful material to experiment on—it was nice to work with examples that the instructor knew that there was a right answer we could arrive at in some instances.
 11. Workbook was good, but a few other handouts could have been added.
 12. ST, if you're reading this—wow! Terrific. Hard work, detailed. Bound in binder. I will save this.

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

1. Every bit as wonderful as the others.
2. It was a great analytical extension of “DesBib”—having the introduction/vocabulary for collation, imposition, &c., was essential to keeping up with the course.
3. This one dove into the weeds very quickly, and stayed there. To a point, this reflects the course content. I do think slightly more contextualization to balance the focus on method/practice might be useful.
4. I took “DesBib” before. “G-45: Analytical Bibliography” is a logical progression. Both were great.
5. This was a little different from my previous course. There were numerous activities throughout the week in addition to lecture/discussions.
6. This is by far the best course I've taken! The strong focus on practical, hands-on exercises is a great teaching method and also so much fun!
7. N/A
8. N/A
9. It is possible this is my very favorite? That would be saying a lot. Every section was interesting, fun, useful, and well-paced.
10. N/A
11. N/A
12. Top.

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. First day demo on common press was terrific and instructional and made the rest easier to understand. Project plan: figure out how I can apply it to my ornaments database.
2. I especially enjoyed the comparative copies of ST's own analysis project for us to work through and compare copies. It was a good simulation of the task with the unusual access to quick answers.

3. The labs were sensational, but also the in-depth analysis throughout the week was useful.
4. This class was more “nuts and bolts,” whereas “DesBib” was more theory. I understand bibliography in a more practical way, and I’ll be able to use it to greater effect in the classroom.
5. I walked away with a much finer eye; more attuned to certain details I may have otherwise missed. I certainly feel this has broadened my horizons as a researcher.
6. I finally have a sense how one can derive meaningful conclusions from descriptive bibliography. I want to go and do type analysis!
7. The practical, hands-on stuff is always fun. No new projects, but a new appreciation of how tricky and tough analytical bibliography is!
8. I am thinking of project ideas for a labor historical study of an early modern printing shop.
9. Hard to choose one—all fit together so well. Paper may be the most useful (and not un-fun!) because I have had the least practice. Type/woodcut ID and culminating exercise was also great. And the printing practicum.
10. For me, discussions of casting off and divisions of print jobs between printers were especially relevant to my current research.
11. The printing experience was helpful to set up the study of the books we undertook.
12. Bindings, dating and forgeries, paper and watermark search.

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. Yes. No. Yes.
2. I felt the course met my expectations.
3. Yes!
4. Yes. No. Yes.
5. The class delivered the content promised!
6. Yes, and then some.
7. As much as possible in five days! I enjoyed the class—I came in open to learning new things and I did, so I’m pleased.
8. I gained clarity on the knowledge I had thought I gained from prior reading, which is to say that I learned a lot.
9. Yes—facts, examples, techniques for gathering and recording data, and especially the habits of mind and reasoning ST is so expert in!
10. Yes, I have expanded my ability to analyze the hidden data on the pages of the books I study. I now have materials to revisit to begin to answer some nagging questions about book production.
11. One always wants to learn more, but content was adequate.
12. The methods were explained and detailed analysis was done.

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

1. Concentrate on eighteenth-century type ornaments. Find reliable methods to differentiate between editions.
2. I plan to undertake my own analytical projects, though I hope type recurrence is only a tool, not a primary means of analysis for my future projects.

3. I will immediately apply them to my own analytical practices.
 4. In my teaching and for my own research.
 5. This will help me better understand the primary sources I encounter daily working in an academic library.
 6. Time will tell. This is a very time intensive area of scholarship. But I'll certainly be very mindful now of the little marks of human activity scattered throughout the books I handle.
 7. This was really my summer vacation—for health reasons, I got sidetracked into public librarianship. I'm reorienting myself to academic and research librarianship, so this was a toe back in the water.
 8. I have a prospectus for future reading in the subject, at the very least.
 9. Bibliographical evidence in support of literary research and teaching book history.
 10. I plan to apply them in my scholarly research.
 11. {private response}
 12. Book research, incunables research, selling, writing, &c..
- 7) *Please briefly describe the intellectual level of the course. What sort of person might benefit the most from taking it?*
1. Ph.D. students, special collections librarians, collectors.
 2. As someone pushing towards undertaking a large scale analytical project, comparing volumes and interpreting the evidence soundly is critical. The teaching and peer discussion really helped. It was fairly challenging!
 3. Intellectually, it's quite accessible, but this might not be for students who aren't already librarians, academics, or independent bibliographers.
 4. Abstract, technical, a little on the difficult side, but certainly accessible. People who are working with rare books in a special collection or university setting, people who want a good understanding of hand-press period book production, and people interested in material history would all benefit.
 5. It was quite rigorous. I felt challenged every day. Anyone who wants a deep understanding of how books were produced in the hand-press period would benefit from this class.
 6. Anyone with an interest in material science/cultural history; book history; curators and catalogers alike.
 7. You need to have some graduate background in bibliography!
 8. My impression was that the course was geared toward beginners in the subject of analytical bibliography.
 9. High. Recommend "DesBib" and "G-20: Printed Books to 1800: Description & Analysis" courses or extensive bibliographical experience. I think the more courses you've taken, the greater the benefit here. (But G-45 would help in advance of "G-50: Advanced Descriptive Bibliography." I still recommend finishing with G-45 for most fun and usefulness.)
 10. The course would most benefit those who already have a basic grasp of English or American book history so that they don't get bogged down by vocabulary. It helps if you already have a project of your own on the go, so that you have something you are very familiar with to relate the material to.
 11. I think a few non-academically oriented members seemed less than comfortable, but the level of the course was appropriately high.
 12. Hard by certain standards, though I never felt excluded.

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. Press demo on the first day. All the visual ways of seeing info translated into something understandable.
2. {no response}
3. Observing the methods and approach of a noted expert in the field is for me, as always, the most exciting thing about RBS.
4. Too many to list. The last day alone, on the “Triumph of Peace,” was an endless stream of “aha!” moments.
5. Working in the printing office was very illuminating and a great way to start the week. The class also showed me the value of surrogates and how to read for very subtle clues about how books were set/printed.
6. When ST explained, on the last day, why we were seeing all the italic type re-set—it was a real light bulb moment.
7. {no response}
8. {no response}
9. There were so many it’s hard to remember one alone. The printing practicum on days 1–2 was perfect with ST and Amira Hegazy (and the earlier demonstration by Josef Beery) working in groups on a problem was great.
10. {no response}
11. {private response}
12. Quarto, folding, type-signature analysis, skeletons!!!

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

1. Can’t think of anything right now.
2. A rough outline schedule, at least daily topics, would have been nice, to sort of mentally prepare for the day.
3. A bit more context to balance our practical analysis. Possibly better (color/digital) images to illustrate bibliographical phenomena in situ.
4. Workflow early in the week was a bit uneven. Perhaps a better/clearer structure for the early lectures with discreet lab time or time with several books so people didn’t have to wait in line to see one example would help. But overall it was a solid course and well taught.
5. {no response}
6. Sometimes the course logistics could have been a bit tighter, e.g., less downtime during the collator demo. All slides on handouts would have been nice, too.
7. I would have liked a little more written guidance.
8. {no response}
9. More time! More activities! More examples! More time with all of the above!
10. {private response}
11. Assign a technology aide to help ensure the class moved swiftly and seamlessly from one moment to the next.
12. Louder microphone, see what I wrote before about other building. {Respondent is referring to questions about accommodations not published on the web.—RBS staff} Also more hands-on books themselves.

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

1. Absolutely. I have already recommended it.
2. Absolutely.
3. Yes. Yes.
4. Yes. Yes.
5. Yes, would highly recommend!
6. YES.
7. Yes. Maybe not this course unless they were interested in bibliography—not everyone's cup of tea!
8. This is hard to quantify, but I am happy to have taken the course, and would not hesitate to recommend it to those interested in the topic.
9. Absolutely.
10. {private response}
11. Yes.
12. Yes.

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

1. Collating machine—not so much.
2. I was glad to see the Hinman collator. As an experienced printer, that time was excellent and appreciated, but perhaps shortened to one day only?
3. Yes, visiting the printing office and collators was great.
4. Yes, especially in the press room.
5. Very well spent.
6. Yes. It might have worked even better if the collator demo had been combined with the group collation exercise.
7. Yes.
8. {no response}
9. Yes, printing practicum and collator demo.
10. Our time in typesetting, correcting, and printing was very worthwhile. Not only did I find it fun, it really helps cement certain aspects of the workflow in your mind.
11. Printing on common press and rolling press were great.
12. Yes!

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. The lectures were fine.
2. {no response}
3. The visual quality and sound of the videos on Movie Night were so poor that it kind of ruined it. Too bad—the content itself was good.
4. {no response}
5. The evening lectures were very good; I enjoyed them a great deal.
6. Yes. I especially liked the talks, they really got me out of my rut and thinking about

- exciting new areas. I would love to see more demos (e.g., of a press, collator, lithography, &c.) incorporated into the week. I would gladly trade Movie Night for one.
7. Movie Night was a dud because nobody could hear the voiceovers. The lectures were fun.
 8. {no response}
 9. Lectures and Booksellers' Night are always great. Movie Night was good, too—our class was well represented!
 10. {private response}
 11. Yes. Both lectures were interesting. The film on Lindisfarne and papermaking were instructive.
 12. Yes, Glenn Miranker and Philip Maddock—1000%! Great talks!
- 13) *Do you have any additional thoughts or advice for anyone considering taking this course in a future year?*
1. Be prepared to be overwhelmed.
 2. Prepare well with course readings if unfamiliar with format, typesetting, and imposition. You won't get much without that. An excellent place to discuss/check the logic of how you observe and interpret printed books.
 3. Do not skip the readings, and try to read about the methods of a few different bibliographers, if possible.
 4. Maybe take "DesBib" first.
 5. {no response}
 6. Just do it.
 7. {no response}
 8. {no response}
 9. In addition to the amazing instructor, materials, and curriculum, the group of students seemed particularly well selected—diverse, complementary, experienced, high intellectual level.
 10. {no response}
 11. {no response}
 12. Listen to a lecture from the people ST quotes from (Tanselle, the Spanish lecturer on typeface, TB).
- 14) *If you had to sum up your RBS experience with a single sentence, phrase, or haiku, what would you say?*
1. I am figuring out which course to take next year.
 2. {no response}
 3. Non-stop relevance.
 4. {no response}
 5. {no response}
 6. {no response}
 7. I'm back among my tribe.
 8. {no response}
 9. Type composing;
Light stick shining through paper:
The Triumph of Peace!

10. {no response}
11. {no response}
12. Forceful, energizing.

Student Data

Number of respondents: 12 (of 12)

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

- My institution/employer gave me professional leave time: 4 (33.33%)
- My institution/employer did not give me professional leave; I used paid or vacation days: 2 (16.67%)
- I am self-employed, and can arrange my own schedule: 2 (16.67%)
- I am a student or non-year-round employee, with a more flexible summer schedule: 3 (25%)
- My situation does not fit any of the options above: 1 (8.33%)

Who paid your RBS tuition costs?

- I paid 100% myself: 5 (41.67%)
- My institution/employer paid 100%: 3 (25%)
- I used a scholarship/fellowship to pay/waive 100%: 4 (33.33%)

Who paid your RBS housing expenses?

- I paid 100% myself: 8 (66.67%)
- My institution/employer paid 100%: 3 (25%)
- I stayed with friends/family, or stayed in my own home and commuted: 1 (8.33%)

Who paid your RBS travel expenses?

- I paid 100% myself: 7 (58.33%)
- My institution/employer paid 100%: 4 (33.33%)
- I live locally, and had no travel expenses: 1 (8.33%)

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

Library disciplines:

- Cataloger/metadata librarian: 2 (16.67%)
- Curator: 1 (8.33%)
- Public services librarian: 1 (8.33%)
- Special collections librarian: 2 (16.67%)

Student working toward a/n:

- M.L.I.S./M.L.S.: 1 (8.33%)

Professional educator:

Lecturer/adjunct: 2 (16.67%)

Full professor: 1 (8.33%)

Other occupations/vocations:

Independent scholar: 1 (8.33%)

Other: 1 (8.33%)