

Narrative Course Evaluations

- 1) *Were the pre-course reading assignments useful? Are there any readings that you would like to see added or removed in future years?*
 1. Yeah—they gave a useful foundation to course concepts given that Tanselle is frequently referenced.
 2. Yes, because Tanselle was the focus.
 3. Yes—Tanselle’s essays provide a comprehensive (if polemical) introduction to the relevant editorial debates.
 4. The readings were very useful, in that they provided an overview of major developments in Anglo-American textual criticism/scholarly editing in the last 60 years. That said, it was a bit Tanselle-heavy, and I would have appreciated a list of suggested reading on textual criticism in non-Anglo-American traditions.
 5. Useful, yes.
 6. The pre-course readings are very helpful. Even if they are not directly discussed during the week, they provide crucial framing context.
 7. {private response}
 8. Yes. The selection of Tanselle’s works set as core texts were wholly appropriate.
 9. Tanselle’s book on Greg is so petty and mean-spirited that it was sometimes distracting from the underlying arguments. But his principles are sound.
 10. Yes. Tanselle’s scholarly editing and textual criticism book.
 11. More could have been added, I feel.
 12. Yes, very useful; I advise future students to read Tanselle closely.

- 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. Our course binder is remarkable in its scope and expertise. I will continue to refer to it as I work on editing.
 2. {private response}
 3. Yes—incredibly useful; I anticipate that I’ll be referring to and using the workbook in both research and teaching.
 4. So many handouts, but all very useful. I will certainly consult these outside of class.
 5. Helpful and appropriate—yes.
 6. The materials were very well-chosen and will provide food for thought for a long time to come.
 7. {private response}
 8. Lots of incredibly useful context was provided.
 9. Yes and no.
 10. Great notebook/handouts. Will keep for reference.
 11. The binder of handouts is great, very comprehensive, and something I will be

referring to a lot.

12. Very useful, and appropriate: and yes, it will serve me well long after.

3) *How do you plan to use the skills and knowledge acquired during your RBS course? Did you walk away with any “aha!” moments, new ideas, or project plans?*

1. I was given a strong foundation in traditional editorial practices, which will help as I return to what editing means in new contexts.
2. Some of the material was really helpful; it makes me question my project choice because it's something I don't really love, and I think I should be as invested as DVM is in Pope.
3. The “aha!” moment for me was the realization that there is a community of people who are deeply committed to the scholarly problems that I'm concerned with.
4. Certainly! While I am currently not planning any scholarly editions, the knowledge gained in this course will certainly help me support this work through my current position, or with other academic endeavors (e.g.: writing book reviews, reference work, research, &c.)
5. {private response}
6. I likely have one or more editing projects in my future. I will also have lots of this material to get students thinking about the texts they are reading in literature courses.
7. This course gave me a solid grounding in the topic. I should have taken it four years ago. I feel like I can approach new and current projects with confidence.
8. I plan to use the skills I acquired to prepare a proposal for a scholarly edition
9. A lot of ideas! Learned a lot about what not to do and hopefully will avoid a lot of wasted effort because I now have a good grounding in the theory.
10. I have a scholarly edition planned.
11. This will help me a lot in my librarianship role especially in understanding the importance of collecting all editions of a work.
12. To continue writing, reading rare books.

4) *Did the instructors help you to acquire all the skills and information promised in the course description? Did you learn what you had hoped to learn?*

1. Yeah—I was given a solid introduction to scholarly editing.
2. I learned a lot, which was great, but I did expect to have a more nitty-gritty experience about making editorial choices.
3. Absolutely.
4. Yes, I certainly did!
5. Yes.
6. I learned all I hoped and then more!
7. Yes, this course entirely met my expectations.
8. Yes and yes. Prof DVM was incredibly helpful.
9. Way more than I was expecting of theory, a little less of practical implementation, but now having taken the course I'm not sure how a practical implication bit would've worked.
10. Yes.
11. Yes and more!
12. Yes; yes.

5) *Are there other ways in which the course could have been improved?*

1. I would have liked to have more recent scholarship and practices introduced. At times, the concepts—although foundational—felt dated. I also would have liked us to discuss our projects in greater depth the first day.
2. A wider range of examples; perhaps more discussion time.
3. I don't have any ideas for improvements at the moment.
4. None that come to mind at present.
5. {private response}
6. {no response}
7. {private response}
8. I cannot think of any.
9. {no response}
10. No.
11. Perhaps a field trip or other exercise. {private response}
12. Not that I can think of.

6) *Who might benefit the most from taking this RBS course?*

1. One of the good things about the course is that it benefits a wide range of people—students, faculty, librarians, curators (across many fields).
2. It would be most beneficial for eighteenth-century scholars or people who are more interested in the printed book.
3. Potential scholarly editors, scholars of literature or intellectual history, librarians.
4. Anyone working on or planning a scholarly edition will certainly benefit from taking this course the most, but others invested in scholarly editing for other reasons will doubtlessly find it to be valuable as well.
5. {no response}
6. The course is helpful for anyone who needs to think about how editions get made.
7. Anyone looking to understand the basics; the course title says it all.
8. Those who are thinking of tackling an editorial project, or those who wish to further appreciate the way that knowledge is mediated through the decisions and intentions of editors.
9. Literary Criticism/English/History people with specific editing projects in mind and previous experience.
10. Anyone wishing to learn about editing a text.
11. Literature aficionados.
12. Anyone who works on an edition.

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

1. Yes, absolutely.
2. Yes.
3. Yes and yes.
4. Absolutely!
5. Yes—yes.
6. Absolutely. {private response}

7. Yes, especially with the added value of community built. Will recommend, though the topic is not for everyone.
 8. Absolutely, on both counts.
 9. Eighty percent? I learned a ton but parts of it were a stretch. DVM's approach is that he "brings one corner, you bring the other three," but I think I only brought two corners!
 10. Absolutely.
 11. Yes and yes.
 12. Yes; yes!
- 8) *If your course made any trips outside of the classroom, do you feel that they were time well spent?*
1. I appreciated the trip to the George Washington Papers. It was helpful to see what large-scale editorial projects look like in practice.
 2. The Washington Papers was moderate. We just listened to people in their offices; maybe if they did a workshop, it would have been better.
 3. The tour of the George Washington Papers helped me to understand the workflow of an actual long-term editorial project.
 4. Yes! Our trips to SC & the Washington Papers provided unique insights into the practical aspects of making a scholarly edition. I'm happy they were part of the course.
 5. N/A
 6. Yes. The "trip" to the George Washington Papers was quite informative.
 7. Yes.
 8. Yes. Speaking to current editors of large historical projects was thoroughly helpful.
 9. Visits to Washington Papers project and SC were insightful.
 10. Yes.
 11. Fairly— we could have factored in a visit to the Whitman exhibition.
 12. I was less interested in the Washington Papers than in SC.
- 9) *Do you have any additional thoughts or advice for anyone considering taking this course in a future year?*
1. At times the course is a bit dry and might be improved by incorporating more engagement with students' projects.
 2. Bring sweaters and socks. Be well rested before coming.
 3. Read articles of interest from Tanselle's syllabus; think about possible scholarly editing projects you may want to undertake and come with questions!
 4. Really consider what you want out of the course beforehand—it will help you navigate the course a bit better.
 5. {no response}
 6. DVM has thought long and carefully about these issues. I question whether there's anyone anywhere better able to teach them.
 7. Bigger binders or fewer handouts?!
 8. {no response}
 9. If you are looking for more practical demos or hands on editing, or starting from the basics, this class might either be a great way to get on track or overwhelming and less than useful.

10. {no response}
 11. Take it. I knew relatively little about the subject and felt completely at ease with pace and learning involved.
 12. No.
- 10) *If you had to sum up your RBS experience with a single sentence, phrase, or haiku, what would you say?*
1. “Should we collate that?” is a phrase that can apply to almost everything.
 2. A lot of words.
 3. Dave Vander Meulen
With his Hinman Collator
Taught me so much here.
 4. We came, we saw, we collated!
 5. Interesting, informative & provocative.
 6. Extraordinary. As always.
 7. The best!
 8. Collate and dominate! {Rainbow drawing: Rainbow of editorial justice.}
 9. So. Much. Knowledge. Cannot. Brain.
 10. {no response}
 11. It was a fantastic and worthwhile experience.
 12. Close contact with leaders in the field of bibliography and textual study; it’s a great place to fill in any gaps you might have.

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: 5 (41.67%)

My institution/employer did not give me professional leave; I used paid or vacation days: 2 (50%)

I am self-employed, and can arrange my own schedule: 3 (25%)

I am a student or non-year-round employee, with a more flexible summer schedule: 1 (8.33%)

I am retired, and can arrange my own schedule: 1 (8.33%)

Who paid your RBS tuition costs?

I paid 100% myself: 4 (33.33%)

My institution/employer paid 100%: 3 (25%)

I used a scholarship/fellowship to pay/waive 100%: 3 (25%)

I used a scholarship/fellowship to pay/waive part; I paid the rest: 1 (8.33%)

I exchanged goods or services in lieu of tuition: 1 (8.33%)

My situation does not fit any of the options above: 3 (25%)

Who paid your RBS housing expenses?

- I paid 100% myself: 7 (58.33%)
- My institution/employer paid 100%: 2 (16.67%)
- I used a scholarship/fellowship to cover 100%: 1 (8.33%)
- I used a scholarship/fellowship to cover part; I paid the rest: 1 (8.33%)
- 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: 8 (66.67%)
- My institution/employer paid 100%: 1 (8.33%)
- I used a scholarship/fellowship to cover 100%: 1 (8.33%)
- I used a scholarship/fellowship to cover part; I paid the rest: 1 (8.33%)
- 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: 1 (8.33%)
- Conservator/binder/preservation librarian: 1 (8.33%)
- Special collections librarian: 1 (8.33%)
- Other: 1 (8.33%)

Student working toward a/n:

- Ph.D./D.Phil: 2 (16.67%)

Professional educator:

- Lecturer/adjunct: 1 (8.33%)
- Assistant professor: 1 (8.33%)
- Full professor: 2 (16.67%)
- Other: 1 (8.33%)

Other occupations/vocations:

- Independent scholar: 1 (8.33%)