

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 very helpful, but don't feel too badly if you can't get through them.
 2. I found the readings to be germane. I was not able to complete them all prior to attending because of other scholarly projects underway during the summer. I know there are some new approaches to scholarly editing, popular in Europe, but I do not know them well—see Sally Bushell's book on editing Wordsworth to Tennyson.
 3. Considering the scope and goals of the course, the six recommended readings were a good primer—and, of course, the instructor had excellent recommendations for further resources throughout the class and for “exit reading.”
 4. The group of Tanselle articles proved invaluable during the course. However, a brief preface about their importance as well as context of production would inform the non-literary attendee.
 5. Pre-course reading was perfect amount and necessary prep. I wish I could see the full semester version! Just to see how it ticks.
 6. The readings were useful. I did find myself wanting to know more about recent scholarship in the field, so I read some of Bryant's *The Fluid Text* and *The Cambridge Companion to Textual Scholarship*.
 7. The reading assignments were a very thorough introduction to the topic. Tanselle's syllabus might have made more sense to be mentioned at the end of the course as those readings were extensive (though not required) and more easily understood after completing the course.
 8. I have to confess the course came too early in the summer for me to get too far in the book. That said—or perhaps because of that—some preparatory questions/considerations/guidance would have helped. But, I'm grateful for the resource in the future and consider this my fault.
 9. Absolutely! I was very glad to have a deep dive into Tanselle before the course. I think it was smart to keep the readings limited to a single author. DVM amply fills in the gaps during the week. Tanselle provided us a common vocabulary to begin with.
 10. The reading was very useful. Also as an introduction to concepts. Other additional preparation was in using the reading to frame my own project which was also helpful and practical throughout the week.

- 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. This was the most organized course I've ever taken in terms of handouts. All were useful and relevant and many will continue to be useful post-RBS.
2. I love the course workbook/handouts—very appropriate and useful. I most certainly will use it later.
3. I love how much of the material is in the form of practical examples, painstakingly compiled through the years. The collection of handouts I've collected will be invaluable to my future learning, and will also aid in teaching—they serve as great guidance for how to effectively teach this sort of subject, and what resources will help students be able to learn in a hands-on way.
4. The class material proved deep and broad. Pertinent portions inform class discussions and provide resources for reflection and consultation for the foreseeable future.
5. Worthwhile—everything was richly useful, now and going forward. Binder of material reflective of long experience.
6. The binder will be greatly helpful to me in my teaching as well as in planning my editing project—or projects.
7. The workbook was very useful as it contained all relevant readings and handouts. The content, and field trips across the UVA campus, were very useful. I intend to reread many of the readings on the trip home as I found them so intriguing and applicable.
8. Very useful and dynamic, but an overwhelming quantity. I'm glad for it though—a great combination of resources, articles, and exercises I might steal in my own classes.
9. What a wonderfully rich set of handouts—I'm not sure the binder will fit in my suitcase! Especially valuable are DVM's chronicle of examples, which I can now use in my own teaching, and highlights of scholarship in the field which will be reference materials for my own work.
10. Yes, context was very appropriate and useful and also a great resource. I will be using this material after the course; definitely.

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

1. Every time I take an RBS course I think it's the best. No difference here.
2. N/A
3. N/A
4. N/A
5. One of the best groups assembled ever, with a generous master teacher.
6. N/A
7. This course was the most engaging RBS class I've ever taken. Though I'm not specifically preparing a scholarly edition, the information was still so useful and engaging. DVM is an incredible resource and warm personality.
8. N/A
9. I've taken three RBS courses before. They have all been wonderful, but in terms of camaraderie and esprit de corps, I think this outshines the others. DVM was an extraordinarily generous instructor and my classmates were a really brilliant bunch. He brought out the best in us.
10. One of the great aspects of this course was the sharing of editing projects from which I learned tremendously in regard to editing issues. Practical solutions, &c.. It also added a great social dimension. A lot of fun.

- 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. The whole world of scholarly editing and textual criticism was illuminated. I've honed my critical eye, and will be applying it to everything from books to street signs for the rest of my life.
 2. I enjoyed learning about other people's projects. Most of this material I already know, but I taught myself—I'm grateful though to learn that I actually did know what I'm doing as an editor. It was reaffirming.
 3. This course is centered around student interest and projects. We were encouraged to apply what we learned to our own situations and the resulting discussions were rich and helpful. The examples we saw in RBS/SC volumes were a great way to visualize difficult concepts.
 4. The course allowed for formulating a plan of attack for an edition. Colleagues in my cohort and the instructor were supportive and instructive in wide-ranging conversations.
 5. So many—as a teacher of period (eighteenth-century), teacher of bibliography/book history, scholar doing textual criticism, and editor imagining scale of project.
 6. Learning the steps of creating an edition was especially helpful, and learning digital and mechanical collation tools (especially Juxta) was revelatory. I managed to hit on an initial plan for my editing project by the week's end, thanks to the presentation assignment.
 7. The theoretical readings, especially Tanselle, gave me a great fundamental knowledge of the course material that was supplemented by in-class examples. I now have so many new project and article ideas that I don't even know where to begin.
 8. The exposure to different techniques and methods—both the traditional practices of collating and the emerging digital databases—was invaluable. I appreciated some of the hands-on exercises and would have appreciated more, perhaps geared to more of the stages of editing.
 9. See Q2.
 10. The insights were through DVM's method to teach and reinforce by practical application. This helped greatly to understand method, but also practically in applying and thinking about my own project. The examples DVM shared and has collected were very insightful. And, yes, there are now several more project plans.
- 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. DVM is fantastic, just the best. I learned things I didn't know I needed or wanted to learn, but are essential to understanding life itself.
 2. Yes, promises fulfilled—we did as much as we could do in only five days.
 3. I feel I came away with a practical plan for starting my project, as well as with reams of resources and options for extending my study of bibliography and the process of textual editing.
 4. The course exceeded my expectations. It moved my project from a "someday, maybe" to an achievable product.

5. Absolutely. This course pairs beautifully with more digitally-driven approaches, to remind practitioners of the fundamental choices/habits we all perform.
6. I learned everything I expected to learn, and then some.
7. Nothing was left out or underdeveloped. I learned even more than I expected, and am leaving the course with a comprehensive introductory knowledge of scholarly editing. DVM made sure that readings, lectures, and classroom activities all made this possible.
8. I am so utterly satisfied I have difficulty coming up with anything more descriptive.
9. The course helped to consolidate knowledge and training I've had previously, while also giving me a very clear sense of the states of modern bibliography and editing (not my field)—exactly what I was hoping for.
10. Yes, I definitely learned what I hoped to learn and am on the path to complete the projects. Resources are great in continuing the existing projects and planning new ones.

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

1. The skills learned will be immediately applicable to current and future projects.
2. In my scholarship and in my teaching.
3. I will use what I have learned in this course not just in making my edition, but in other areas of research—the issues involved in textual editing have so many applications—but also in teaching. DVM is not just an effective teacher of this course, but a model of great pedagogy.
4. The course will provide the skills and knowledge—in the parlance of the class, the “apparatus”—to succeed in producing an edition.
5. Immediately. Preparing to complete an edition, adding reading/exercises to classes.
6. I plan to edit a collection of hymn texts for classroom use, and I also have ideas for at least two new courses using editing practices.
7. These skills apply directly and theoretically to my own editing work and will eventually become even more practical when I begin conceptualizing an edition of my own.
8. Most immediately for my own editorial project(s), but I am also hoping to apply it pedagogically in an undergrad course on history of the book and editing.
9. I hope to produce a scholarly edition someday, and will absolutely draw on the training I received this week to do so.
10. Several ways. First, I aim to continue with the project I started, but now have a more complete and confident path on how to proceed. Secondly, another editing project emerged during the course, and I look forward to developing the principles and applying them. The course opened a good perspective for this.

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

1. DVM does a great job of ensuring the course is relevant to all levels. Everyone. But it helps to have a project in mind.
2. I thought it was a good introduction to scholarly editing. I think I was in a particularly savvy group, but I could imagine some students being a bit baffled at

- first. Everyone in this course was on the same page.
3. Bibliographical basics were refreshed, but this course might be most helpful to someone with at least some knowledge of bibliography/history of the book.
 4. The course benefits the active, engaged participant. It is akin to a graduate/doctoral course, not for the slough, but rewards the hard worker.
 5. Very high. Best recommended for people with an editorial project in mind that they apply the readings to. Wide range of preparations/perspectives added a lot.
 6. This course worked at a highly accessible graduate level. A scholar of book history would get a lot out of it, as would someone new to book studies.
 7. Though the material was not incredibly challenging, most people taking the course were academics of some kind. Have a thorough knowledge of the parts of the book before this course.
 8. The high intellectual level of the course was partially fueled by a class full of people with a wide variety of editorial projects in mind. I might make that a necessary part of the application.
 9. Extremely high, and wonderfully so. It was a room full of thoughtful, knowledgeable people who are or will be leaders in their fields.
 10. Scholars, teachers, librarians, &c. Should have a project in mind and have thought or have some experiences with editing. I think due to some problems, concerns, or questions, the course was able to address these so succinctly and supply practical answers.
- 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. DVM's ability to place scholarly editing in its wider context was one long "aha" moment!
 2. I think it was reaffirming—I was glad to know I was on the right track.
 3. DVM's own collection of examples, in particular the newspapers and books he has saved!
 4. Too many illuminating moments to share one. Instead, my class notes are peppered with "apply this," "explore that," and "why didn't I think of that."
 5. Final critiques were amazing—wish we were given ten minutes so we'd use the remaining five for critique/further discussion.
 6. Juxta! The in-class exercises were very good, and the class presentations were fascinating.
 7. Our conversations in class and final presentations (not intimidating at all) were so impactful. I loved learning from DVM and everyone else in the room.
 8. DVM's transcription practices, viewed right after we had struggled through transcription ourselves.
 9. Using the collator and comparator.
 10. Yes, the aspect of an edition to define your goals clearly and follow them, but also to engage with ongoing discussion for understanding. This really helped frame things well.
- 9) *How could the course have been improved?*
1. I wouldn't have minded shortening the George Washington Papers field trip for

- more class time with DVM.
2. Only with some treatment of more recent editorial principles.
 3. I can't think of anything!
 4. Three-ring binders with tighter rings.
 5. Ten years longer?
 6. A little more recent scholarship.
 7. N/A
 8. I might have made it geared to work through our projects all week at various stages, rather than only at the end, since it's such a short time.
 9. N/A
 10. I enjoyed the computer lab and would not have minded spending a bit more time there, but only so much you can do in a week.
- 10) *Do you feel that you got your money's worth? Would you recommend the course to others?*
1. Yes, I definitely will recommend this course to others. Well worth the tuition.
 2. Yes, and yes.
 3. Yes, definitely.
 4. My granting scholarship got their money's worth. Highly recommended.
 5. Highly, highly recommended.
 6. Yes, and yes!
 7. Yes! Yes!
 8. Absolutely (though my institution paid).
 9. Yes, and yes!
 10. Yes, definitely.
- 11) *If your course made any trips outside of the classroom, do you feel that they were time well spent?*
1. Using the Hinman Collator was an experience, and the visit to the George Washington Papers was a good exercise in seeing how a large editorial project actually happens.
 2. I did not find the visit to the George Washington Papers office to be valuable, although the project certainly is!
 3. Yes, these were valuable and broke up the days nicely.
 4. Time spent with the collators underscored their usefulness and challenging natures. The Washington Papers visit provided a breadth of editing outside of a literary modality.
 5. Yes—though GW Papers needs to address personnel/workflow in their presentation.
 6. The work with the collation machines was very valuable. The trip to the Washington Papers was a bit long, but a rare look at a great project.
 7. Hell yes!
 8. Yes, though I might give the folks with the Washington Papers more direction—it was long-winded and felt more like an advertisement for their (wonderful) project, rather than a tour into how they did it, which is what we cared about. Loved the collation trip, too! And of course the dinner at DVM's home.
 9. {private response}

10. Yes. I enjoyed SC, the lab exercises, and the George Washington Papers. These fleshed things out well and provided good perspectives I could not have gained otherwise.

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 papermaking lecture was the only event I attended, and it was fantastic.
2. {no response}
3. Booksellers' Night was great fun, as were the evening lectures.
4. While I found the lecture interesting (I plan to make more handmade paper in the near future), I found Booksellers' Night underwhelming.
5. Rotunda event interesting, but oddly timed.
6. Booksellers' Night was lovely, but I missed the others—too many good people to talk with!
7. N/A
8. Sadly, I missed them all—my loss!
9. N/A
10. Yes. Really enjoyed the visit to DVM's house and seeing the Pope collection.

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

1. If you can, come with a project in mind.
2. Come with a friend. I made friends with my group only towards the end of the week, but that may just be me.
3. Come prepared for a week of work and activities. Take advantage of the great resources and people.
4. Come prepared. Read the Tanselle material. Engage with classmates.
5. The course is what you bring to it (challenges, questions, prep), and what you put in (energy, good will). It all comes back tenfold.
6. Be ready to imagine new projects for yourself.
7. You will not regret a moment of your time in this course.
8. {no response}
9. If you care about texts and how they came into being, do take this course.
10. It is a great benefit to attend with a project in mind, or an editorial problem beforehand.

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

1. I can't believe it's already my third year.
2. RBS does good, important work!
3. Helpful and collegial.
4. Rare Book School is a rare experience that should be fulfilled in any humanist's bucket list.
5. THINK.
6. DVM is the best!

7. Happiness—I always have the most delightful conversations with the other “book nerds” (self-described) at Rare Book School!
8. With books and banter let old wrinkles come,
Encountering timeless leaves with questions young.
9. {no response}
10. A great class with great people. Learned a lot.

Student Data

Number of respondents: 10 (of 10)

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

My institution/employer gave me professional leave time: 6 (60%)

I am a student or non-year-round employee, with a more flexible summer schedule:
4 (40%)

Who paid your RBS tuition costs?

I paid 100% myself: 2 (20%)

My institution/employer paid 100%: 4 (40%)

I used a scholarship/fellowship to pay/waive 100%: 3 (30%)

My situation does not fit any of the options above: 1 (10%)

Who paid your RBS housing expenses?

I paid 100% myself: 4 (40%)

My institution/employer paid 100%: 4 (40%)

I used a scholarship/fellowship to cover 100%: 1 (10%)

My situation does not fit any of the options above: 1 (10%)

Who paid your RBS travel expenses?

I paid 100% myself: 3 (30%)

My institution/employer paid 100%: 3 (30%)

My institution/employer paid part; I paid the rest: 1 (10%)

I used a scholarship/fellowship to cover 100%: 1 (10%)

I used a scholarship/fellowship to cover part; I paid the rest: 1 (10%)

My situation does not fit any of the options above: 1 (10%)

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

Library disciplines:

Archivist: 1 (10%)

Special collections librarian: 1 (10%)

Student working toward a/n:

B.A./B.S.: 1 (10%)

Ph.D./D.Phil: 1 (10%)

Professional educator:

Assistant professor: 1 (10%)

Associate professor: 4 (40%)

Full professor: 1 (10%)