

Stephen Tabor  
G-45: Analytical Bibliography  
29 July–3 August 2018

**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. The reading assignments were useful. I can't think of any suggestions offhand.
2. Pre-course reading list was excellent. Gaskell is essential preparation. Tanselle gives a very good idea of the kind of topics and techniques that are addressed in the course. Perhaps one or two case studies (recent articles) could be added.
3. Very useful, especially the video on format.
4. Pre-course readings were very useful. More readings from the "addendum to Tanselle" (included in the course pack) could be listed online as optional advance reading.
5. Yes. Yes. I'd prefer some more videos since reading about early printing was difficult to digest, especially when you don't have any formal background.
6. These readings were quite helpful. The Blayne booklet on the first folio was especially useful in illustrating the process and results of type analysis.
7. The pre-course reading was very helpful for preparing to attend the class.
8. Readings were very useful—I took pictures of Gaskell to have with me on my phone during activities.
9. Yes. Very useful—will read again.
10. Useful.

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. Good text book—more exercises rather than reference oriented. It seems to be changed every year. Perhaps because of that, I felt that the table of contents labeling could have been better. I think the references will be very useful in the future. Well-labeled, too.
2. The course workbook contained lots of photocopies that were needed for the in-class exercises and obviously took much effort to prepare and assemble. The five-page supplement to Tanselle's reading list will be useful after the course.
3. Workbook was useful in class.
4. The content was well-organized, and all of it was used in detail. More handouts summarizing actual instructions for various kinds of analysis could be included (perhaps taken from instructor's slides/notes).
5. Yes. Yes. They were useful and well-organized. I'd like to see an hourly schedule as well.
6. The workbook materials, were mostly photocopies for specific in-class exercises. To that extent they were appropriate and useful. Perhaps add a more extensive bibliography of works on the topics covered.

7. The workbook was a little confusing when it came to the more complex tables.
8. Examples were very useful and I will refer to them later. I would love digital copies as well as hard copies to cross-reference with my notes.
9. Appropriate content.
10. {no response}

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

1. Right behind my favorite. {private response} I'd recommend it.
2. Less structured, more concerned with technical minutiae, and not as comprehensive.
3. Challenging.
4. N/A
5. N/A
6. This one was excellent, like all I've taken.
7. This class was on par with other classes.
8. Built on "DesBib"—excellent!
9. Same speed, but wildly different material. I feel that I could complete the work independently after this course.
10. {no response}

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 practical aspects and exercises were my favorite.
2. Most interesting was accessing the present state of analytical bibliography as a field of scholarship—its potential, its limitations, and its development (as discussed by Tanselle, and illustrated in the course).
3. I understand now the purpose behind analytical bibliography.
4. The final unit of analyzing early modern drama was most relevant to me based on my own research focus. I have new ideas or a project analyzing dramatic paratexts.
5. Hands-on experience on early printing was great!
6. I'm still absorbing all the details, but I'm certain what I learned about paper and type analysis will, along with "DesBib," improve the quality of my rare book cataloging.
7. I learned a lot of techniques for comparing various editions, states, &c.
8. The practical work of composing and making decisions in the press bed.
9. Yes—I want to evaluate our incunabula!
10. {no response}

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 believe so; I feel satisfied with the course.
2. Content was as announced in the course description. Some topics were just touched upon and not really covered. I was left with many unanswered questions, which may be typical of analytical bibliography as a discipline and pursuit (a lot of mystery, conjecture, and uncertainty).

3. Could have used more instruction on inner/outer form priority printing—I'm not quite comfortable with this concept yet.
4. Yes, the course was exactly as promised.
5. Yes. I would like to see how we could adopt these bibliographical methods to our own fields.
6. Yes, all was completely developed. I learned what I hoped to.
7. Yes! No! Yes!
8. ST was excellent and open to questions.
9. I learned what I was looking for.
10. {no response}

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

1. I believe it will be of help when cataloging sometime in the indeterminate future and to acquisitions tasks.
2. I will go back to grappling with my own bibliographical puzzles and continue to read recent scholarship in the field.
3. Research.
4. I will use these skills in my doctoral research and in future projects.
5. I plan to use them in my dissertation, as well as for the future research, and teaching.
6. Better quality rare book cataloging.
7. I will use these skills to further develop my personal research.
8. Article, book project, and funding grant for our printing lab.
9. I will be a better instructor in print history classes.
10. {no response}

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

1. Very approachable. Just right! Some background in descriptive bibliography or willingness to review some basic literature before class is suggested.
2. Level was variable. The course would probably be most useful for someone who already has good familiarity with old books, and bibliographical fundamentals.
3. Highly analytical. Requires ability to reason logically.
4. The course would be most useful for those who have some prior knowledge of descriptive bibliography.
5. I guess while it was initially designed for librarians, someone who is working for a graduate degree can benefit from it, too.
6. High: scholars with background in book history, experienced rare book catalogers, or any with a background in printing/book arts.
7. Graduate students and professionals.
8. Master's degree, plus. Very rigorous and assumed prior experience.
9. I didn't take "DesBib" and was worried that I would be behind, but I think the readings caught me up.
10. {no response}

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. As the course went along I felt I understood its organization better; it felt scattered in the beginning. Everything jelled together in the last exercise.
2. Day one printing practicum was enjoyable.
3. {no response}
4. Learning how to set type (by doing it) vastly improved my understanding of the process.
5. Hands-on experience on the first day, I began to see how difficult it was to print in the early modern era.
6. No—more of a slow absorption of a lot of compelling material.
7. {no response}
8. Proofing in the press bed, and setting formes!
9. EVERY TIME a distinct piece of type jumped out at me. And actually composing lines of type was wonderful.
10. {no response}

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

1. Less apologies about time management, and introductions prior to first activity, not after, perhaps.
2. Better time management and lesson planning. Clearer explanation of course structure, so that students know when to expect discussion of certain topics. Less time spent on individual activities (some of which can be assigned as homework), and more time for follow-up discussion, as well as essential definitions and distinctions.
3. {private response}
4. More time spent summing up ideas at the end of each day might have helped with retaining knowledge.
5. Maybe a more general introduction for non-specialists on the usage of bibliography for their research.
6. N/A
7. {no response}
8. RBS in general needs pronouns on name tags.
9. I wish we'd had more hands-on time with texts.
10. {no response}

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

1. Yes.
2. I'd recommend as second or third RBS course for those who can afford it and are obsessed with bibliographical minutiae.
3. Definitely, yes.
4. Yes!
5. Yes.
6. Yes, and yes!
7. Yes, I feel that I learned exactly what I had hoped to in this course.
8. Yes! Yes!

9. I absolutely would.
  10. {no response}
- 11) *If your course made any trips outside of the classroom, do you feel that they were time well spent?*
1. They were all time well spent, but please fix the Hinman collator.
  2. Day in printing office (and print demo in SC) was worthwhile. Other trips to SC were not essential.
  3. {no response}
  4. Trips to SC were time well-spent.
  5. Yes.
  6. N/A
  7. Yes, it was very helpful to work hands-on with printing technology and bibliographies.
  8. {no response}
  9. SC time was great.
  10. {no response}
- 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. I attended both talks and Booksellers' Night. All great.
  2. I attended the Monday lecture and Tuesday "museum" (both on paper), and enjoyed them.
  3. All lectures and events were exceptional.
  4. Yes—a good use of time.
  5. Yes. Yes. No.
  6. N/A
  7. {no response}
  8. More lectures by diverse scholars.
  9. N/A
  10. Brian Cassidy's lecture was outstanding.
- 13) *Do you have any additional thoughts or advice for anyone considering taking this course in a future year?*
1. If you did the pre-course reading well before the class, do try to {illegible} or at least read some literature to situate yourself in the scholarly application context (unless you do work in the field). It took me a while to get a feel for the course.
  2. {no response}
  3. Watch video for prep.
  4. Nope.
  5. Come and take it if you want to have an intense training in bibliography!
  6. No.
  7. {no response}
  8. {no response}
  9. {no response}

10. {no response}

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

1. Bookish and rightly so.
2. Ars longa, vita brevis.
3. {no response}
4. Thoroughly brilliant.
5. BLAST!
6. Printing rules!
7. Love.
8. Amira Hegazy was the best at answering questions!
9. Aun Aprendo!
10. Thank you.

### **Student Data**

*Number of respondents:* 10 (of 11)

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

My institution/employer gave me professional leave time: 3 (30%)

I am self-employed, and can arrange my own schedule: 1 (10%)

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

I am retired, and can arrange my own schedule: 1 (10%)

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

*Who paid your RBS tuition costs?*

I paid 100% myself: 2 (20%)

My institution/employer paid 100%: 1 (10%)

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

I used a scholarship/fellowship to pay/waive 100%: 5 (50%)

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

*Who paid your RBS housing expenses?*

I paid 100% myself: 8 (80%)

My institution/employer paid 100%: 1 (10%)

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

*Who paid your RBS travel expenses?*

I paid 100% myself: 7 (70%)

My institution/employer paid 100%: 2 (20%)

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

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

**Library disciplines:**

Special collections librarian: 2 (20%)

Other: 1 (10%)

**Student working toward a/n:**

Ph.D./D.Phil: 2 (20%)

**Professional educator:**

Assistant professor: 1 (10%)

Associate professor: 1 (10%)

Full professor: 1 (10%)

Other: 1 (10%)

**Other occupations/vocations:**

Independent scholar: 1 (10%)