

David Whitesell
G-10: Introduction to the Principles of Bibliographical Description
28 July–2 August 2019

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. Yes. No suggestions.
 2. {private response}
 3. Bowers' extensive notes were not useful without physical in-hand examples. I only read the main text body, but that was a great foundation/intro for this course. Gaskell was very useful.
 4. All pre-course readings were essential to arriving ready to do the work of descriptive bibliography.
 5. Yes, very!! Maybe add some scholarship that uses "DesBib" to argue a point. Less Gaskell needed—the museums cover this material.
 6. Yes.
 7. Yes, the pre-course reading assignments were extremely useful and necessary. You should not attempt to take this class without doing the reading.
 8. The pre-course reading was essential.
 9. Yes, useful, but a lot.
 10. {no response}
 11. Yes—the readings were very useful—keep them the same.
 12. I would like to see Sayce added because it provides context on the use of bibliography in a broader context.
 13. The readings were very useful; the advice to start with Belanger and Gaskell and then move to Bowers was also a help. I regret not having a chance to watch *The Making of a Renaissance Book* prior to the course but will seek it out now.
 14. Very appropriate, not too demanding. Perfect.
 15. The reading assignments are a must; with Tansell's "Concept of Format" added to a potential reading list, I'd be happy.
 16. Pre-course reading was absolutely necessary for success in the course.
 17. The pre-course readings were absolutely essential. If anything, I would have liked more reading assigned to help explain situations we encountered during homework, but which were not discussed in-depth during lectures—nineteenth-century printing and imposition schemes not in Gaskell, in particular.
 18. They were incredibly helpful. Though the material was dense and difficult to remember in detail, being familiar with the terms and language was a huge benefit.
 19. I found all of the reading assignments very useful. I'd also suggest Sarah Werner's book, which I believe is titled *The History of the Printed Book*.
 20. Reading helped, but didn't make much sense (classes put everything in perspective).
 21. Yes.
 22. The pre readings were almost too useful—Gaskell and Bowers are so thorough and

- informative that they make a lot of the lectures repetitive and not useful. Most of the information on type, printing, and collations/signatures, &c., was printed explicitly in Bowers/Gaskell. I would encourage RBS to use the lectures to convey more advanced information or more specific bibliographical methods. There is a lot we didn't cover and really should have. For instance: how to measure and record chain lines and water marks in paper—also imposition schemes and folding in a hands-on environment. I would recommend that we read some literature on the evolution of bibliography or the state of bibliography today. I also think it would be smart to have students read some more book history readings, like D.F. McKenzie or Randall McCloud—articles from bibliographers doing the hard line bibliography but extending it into more interdisciplinary (cultural history, &c.) applications or broader meanings. D.F. McKenzie especially (I would recommend “The Book as the Expressive Form”).
23. Very.
 24. Reading Gaskell and Bowers prior to attending the course is essential.
 25. Useful in the end, confusing as I read them, came to clarity as the course progressed.
 26. They were useful; however, all of the information is difficult to remember so maybe recommend to students ahead of time TAKE NOTES while doing readings.
 27. {no response}

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.
2. Outstanding—will make a very useful reference for the future.
3. The workbook was extremely useful, especially during homework sessions. Will be a good reference book for future.
4. Both the course workbook and the museum workbook will be helpful reference texts, on my desk at work.
5. Yes, the content is great. I will continue to use the materials for a long time.
6. It will continue to be helpful.
7. The examples chosen for this course were extremely interesting to work with the workbook and museum book provides tips and suggestions that I anticipate using myself.
8. Excellent.
9. Indispensable; yes, I will continue to use it!
10. The course workbook/teaching materials was one of my two favorite things about RBS—the other, being the quality of instruction. I cannot praise these (both) enough, and I will guard my workbook assiduously moving forward (always).
11. Perhaps integrate note spaces into the workbooks.
12. Very useful; I will use it often.
13. The workbook is clear, well-written, and organized and easy to refer to while making a collation. I wonder, though, if title tabs between each section would not be helpful for ease in finding relevant sections (since the workbook aids students in several different activities, including following lectures and completing homework).

14. It's all great, but I would have liked to get a PDF of the workbook and museum guide.
15. I believe the museum workbook will be useful later in life, but this week it did not seem overly helpful. Everything else was quite wonderful, and a handy reference.
16. Glad to have the full text of the museum displays—will refer to those in the future for reference. Post-course reading list very helpful too. Course workbook is an excellent distillation of the Bowersian method.
17. The workbook is wonderful as is—it will serve as a valuable resource when I return to my home institution.
18. Yes, everything was relevant and helpful. I would like to see some reading materials that are more inclusive of people who aren't typically considered the authority on bibliography.
19. The binder is full of helpful information and I am sure I will consult it when I am back home at work.
20. The course workbook helped a lot. Many important references. I will continue to use as a reference once I am back home.
21. Was useful, and I'm sure I will continue to consult it. On p. 37, "The Printer's Alphabet," print the alphabet (useful for counting, maybe even add numbers underneath).
22. The coursebook is amazing and is a total mecca of the Bowers methodology. I am a little put-off by how hardline RBS is in sticking to Bowers and really creating its own "RBS cult" of bibliographers with only one methodology, no exceptions. With this in mind, it would have been useful to hear other voices, like Tanselle or . . . other bibliographers so that people can hear multiple approaches, as they will certainly see multiple approaches in scholarship!
23. Excellent, extremely thorough, great resource. Yes, and I anticipate returning and sharing parts of it with my own students.
24. Excellent course workbook and teaching materials. Great demonstrations of interactive and object-focused methodology.
25. Appropriate, useful, helpful—will be passing along to my own students.
26. Yes, yes, and yes!
27. {no response}

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. The skills I have learned and practiced here will be tremendously helpful to me in my personal life. I have wanted this kind of intensive training since grad school and I am elated I was finally able to take the time to take a course.
2. {private response}
3. I catalog rare books so being able to be trained in collation and format will be extremely helpful for my records.
4. The skills I learned in descriptive bibliography will be immediately useful at work on Monday. The "museum" displays in particular provided several aha moments—binding materials identification, paper made wrong.
5. Yes, I want to better understand how printers' errors contribute to textual and digital variations in textual interpretation.
6. {no response}

7. I certainly will walk away from this course with a new understanding of how much is really out there. This course exposes students to a little bit of a lot of bibliographical topics and has given me the foundation to explore new projects in depth.
8. I plan to begin research on a critical edition.
9. I would like to incorporate these skills into cataloging and into a personal project. I had new ideas for my potential future/career path.
10. Yes! Examples of effective teaching strategies, especially. I'll also feel exceedingly more confident in my capacity as a rare books assistant at my institution and more grounded in terms taking my acquired knowledge into future courses of my own, or even into a professional field.
11. Research for my dissertation and also application to two scholarly/collaborative projects. I'm a cultural historian and this will prove essential to my work!
12. I will use this as a way of deepening my understanding of rare books, providing a material basis to underpin literary and historical work.
13. I may start modestly—figuring out the format and collation formula of some of the handpress-era books I write about—but ultimately I'd like to use this knowledge to investigate publishing conventions and change within a particular genre.
14. The course answered a lot of questions I've been carrying around, and it will be immediately useful to several ongoing projects. I will be referring to my notes and the reading list for decades to come (I hope!).
15. Re: project plans—I would be very happy to continue the overview of local printing practices, as I think of that reference was very useful for identifying odd imprints. Otherwise, these skills are directly applicable to my day job as a bookseller.
16. Yes. This course was an excellent starting point for continuing education and work. Contact with the lab instructors and other students was particularly helpful.
17. Curatorial work, augmenting catalog records, reference questions. I wish RBS offered an intermediate bibliography course so I could continue to develop my skills.
18. As a cataloger I will be going back to work with a better understanding of the bibliographies I reference and hopefully will be able to explore some books in greater detail.
19. I learned that I really enjoyed solving the “puzzle” of collating a book! I would never have expected that just from the readings, but getting to try collating myself over and over again (with feedback and answers) made for a great learning experience.
20. Hopefully, convince my “boss” and department to do more collational input within the records. Still thinking about project plans.
21. Will use it and apply it in teaching my own RBS course, in reference, and in my personal research. The idea of printers preparing a “kit” for the book binder never occurred to me.
22. I plan to use the skills in my dissertation to provide succinct and accurate collations of early modern books. To this end, I was really disappointed that many of the lab books were so modern. Collating modern books, though, does teach methodology and approach (which has its own benefits, I know!), does not give me the skills I need to collate early modern books at the level of complexity I will be working at. I did not learn anything new there, and I am fairly disappointed. No new ideas or aha moments as I really didn't learn anything new—I just got live

- feedback on collation formulas.
23. One big thing for me, with an interest in media history more broadly—at times I wondered, “Is all this complex collation stuff really useful for most scholars?”—I think it will be for me, but in the process of the minute description from various kinds of evidence, the course offers a great/thorough introduction also to the book as a media technology.
 24. Yes!
 25. LOTS of cataloging; will apply skills in my own book collecting as well.
 26. I now have a deeper understanding of the book as a physical aspect as the printer intended.
 27. {no response}
- 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. Yes!
 2. {private response}
 3. Yes I did.
 4. Yes!
 5. Yes, yes!
 6. {no response}
 7. Yes, although I feel like there is so much out there to learn. Perhaps why this course is deemed as merely an “Introduction.”
 8. David Whitesell’s love of the topic makes it damn near impossible to go through the course and not gain valuable information on how to analyze descriptive details of a book.
 9. Above and beyond.
 10. Yes, as per the course description.
 11. Yes, and yes!
 12. I learned exactly what I came for and gained some other unexpected insights through informal discussions.
 13. The instructors imparted knowledge and skill with admirable clarity and patience. I learned so much in homework and labs, by problem-solving and re-doing work in creating formulae, signing statements, and paginating statements.
 14. I learned everything I hoped to and a lot more. I hope to return soon to continue my studies in analytical methods.
 15. But of course! They were very helpful and challenging in equal measure, which I think helped push me to invent my own best way of collating these items.
 16. Yes—lectures were informative with entertaining. Lab groups were centered on education with working through bibliographical problems.
 17. Lab instructors—definitely. I did not feel like the lectures were as useful. The lecture on nineteenth-century printing, for example, did not provide much information and came too late in the week to be of much help for homework similarly. I thought the type lecture was very much out of place in the course, an example of trying to do too much in too little time.
 18. Yes, they covered everything as described in the course description.
 19. Yes and yes.
 20. Yes—all was above and beyond my expectations.

21. Yes.
22. No. As I said above I am very disappointed that there was not a larger emphasis on older books. Also, the lab books did not seem to be representative of the myriad of situations Bowers said we would see. For instance, we did not encounter any instances of foliations, replacements; we didn't discuss disjunct vs. conjugate leaves in the formula (with the comma versus period). A lot of the homework was not very useful, only time-consuming because we had to turn each page. We should have spent more of our time figuring out bibliographical puzzles instead of turning pages. I think making us do two days of pagination statements is useless—especially given that all exceptions can be found in Bowers. Our time would have been better spent learning something else. The signature drilling was useful (and conveys and teaches more information about the design and structure of the book); the pagination drilling was not. This is exacerbated by the fact that Friday is pretty much a wasted day. Between the fairly info-light morning lecture, the extended lunch break, and the fluffy afternoon lecture, evaluations, and reception, there was very little learning that took place. I would like to see Friday used more efficiently. Otherwise, that makes an expensive week of learning a very expensive four days.
23. Yes, had previous experience but filled in many holes.
24. Yes.
25. Yes and yes.
26. Yes.
27. {no response}

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

1. I tend to learn by mimicry and would have found it helpful on the first day to just watch an instructor do several collations. Perhaps this could be a video that individuals could watch before taking the course.
2. {private response}
3. For me, the museums were only a little useful. I liked the practical binding sections and the parts from the first museum where we had sheets to practice various folding schemes. But a lot of the rest was too much text to get through, and I lost the plot a bit. If there were more hands-on things I think would be better.
4. I wish we had spent even a little bit of time discussing the relationship between "DesBib" and, say, RDA and MARC records.
5. Maybe more one-on-one time with instructor going over homework; I feel like we needed more time going over homework.
6. {no response}
7. Rotating lab instructors and multiple copies of the same book to compare. More nineteenth-century books. Also, the class appeared to be segregated by discipline.
8. More interactive museums stations—I would love to see how a lithographic print is made, for example.
9. Time was a constant issue for many students, but I can't think of a better way to make use of the hours we had for the course. A wider range of books (period, place) might be useful.
10. Although I felt physically unwell during most of the course due to sleep/exercise deprivation and poor eating habits, I can't imagine running the course

- alternatively and achieving the same level of depth, breadth, and skill acquisition. I would, though, reconsider hosting the bibliography museum on the last day, in the last or next-to-last period, before the last homework, when our minds are particularly scrambled.
11. {no response}
 12. I would like to have been shown more examples of ways these methods have been used to better understand its role in my research.
 13. I wish I had heard the final lecture before attending the last museum—both were excellent, but I found that on other days that having DW contextualizing remarks ahead of time helped me better approach the museum exhibits. I wish there were more paper-folding exercises! The ad hoc ones we did were extremely useful to me.
 14. Lower cost, or cost variable depending on income? Not every scholar can equally afford it (students/post-docs).
 15. {unintelligible}
 16. Perhaps a small unit on the use and handling of tools (micrometer, rules, {unintelligible}, &c.) with more in depth explanation of how to gather bibliography evidence (sewing, {unintelligible}, Chainline measurements, &c.).
 17. Ideally, this course would be divided into two week-long sub-courses: one focusing on collation formulas, and one covering other aspects of bibliographical description—binding, type, &c.. In trying to be a comprehensive introduction, this glossed over too many important subjects.
 18. More discussion of work that went into developing bibliographical description methods. I would love to have more suggestions for reading material by women authors or to see more examples of their work.
 19. {no response}
 20. Just thought that day 1 should be more. 1.) Look at books in homework and take notes—not so much collate, &c. 2.) We should learn more and more as week proceeds.
 21. The printing demo ran short of time.
 22. Yes. I found that the museums were really unhelpful. Monday’s museum was the most helpful, but then the museum on paper and especially the one on “DesBib” +Ex was really not helpful at all. We can all walk to a library and examine Greg—to take valuable instruction time to look at materials we can find elsewhere is really not smart. I think that the most valuable resource here is the huge bank of knowledge that David Whitesell and the lab instructors bring. Yet this resource was not maximized, and there was actually very little direct or directed learning from them—really only the morning lecture (which mostly restated Gaskell) and the homework lab, which was great. I would like to see more instructive teaching. The exercise I recommended—one of many possibilities—was to collate a book and then the next day, perhaps, try to fold the sheets for that book so you could see with an instructor actually presenting it to you (unlike during the museums) how a particular book that you collated yourself was actually folded, sewn, and cut. One potential would be commissioning a facsimile at various stages, like RBS did with the Jefferson bindings. Also, cutting apart a book together would be extremely informative. Even a crummy cheap, older book from a donation or library sale. Our time needs to be used much more efficiently though, for learning that we can only get from these brilliant instructors. We don’t need to reread Gaskell, we need to learn hands-on!

23. {no response}
24. No.
25. More diversity among institutional staff—skews too heavily white, male.
26. Longer homework hours; extended.
27. {no response}

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

1. This may already exist, but the establishment of a multicultural scholarship to attract individuals from underrepresented groups might diversify the student body.
2. Anyone who needs to understand how books were printed (especially pre-1800) and glean information about the text from this knowledge.
3. Anyone who needs to be able to differentiate copies of old books.
4. People new (and new-ish) to the special collections world and the antiquarian book trade would benefit greatly from taking this course.
5. Everyone that studies books or studies with books.
6. {no response}
7. Curators, librarians, booksellers. From a book history point of view, this course was not very helpful.
8. I think that humanities scholars who work on book history in the hand-press period to the nineteenth-century would really benefit from this course.
9. Librarians, historians, book historians, booksellers. The English and textual scholars in the course did not seem to find it as valuable or interesting.
10. Probably those in the library profession, whether or not they've dealt often (or not at all) with strict bibliographic description. The course encourages close attention to books (as demonstrated, an increasingly obsolete medium) and enriches any approach to preserving them (as objects and texts).
11. In my field, anyone working in a field adjacent to book history —art history, cultural and intellectual history, political and religious history . . .
12. Every researcher who works with books as a primary source should take this course.
13. Anyone who wants a better understanding of how books are made, lit professors, librarians. Anyone working on sixteenth- to twentieth-century books.
14. I think it might benefit grad students most. I wish I had taken it early in the research stage of my Ph.D., certainly.
15. Rare book librarians, especially for the hand press period, also book dealers of every sort.
16. {no response}
17. Anyone who needs to write collational formulas.
18. Anyone who is interested in the history and context of a book's printing and creation.
19. Booksellers interested in selling to institutions, librarians, historians, really anyone interested in studying the book as an object.
20. Me and patrons seeking info from records.
21. {no response}
22. People who know very little about bibliography but have a decent knowledge of books. Anyone who knows about bibliography will likely be too expert for this

- course and will be disappointed.
23. I think anyone.
 24. Anyone interested in book history and bibliography.
 25. Anyone with regular contact with printed books.
 26. Everyone interested in bibliographical concepts, books as physical objects.
 27. {no response}

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

1. Yes and yes.
2. Since I paid for it myself, it seems a bit indulgent. If an institution or scholarship had paid for it, then it would definitely be a "yes."
3. Yes and yes.
4. I do, and I absolutely would.
5. Yes! Yes!
6. {no response}
7. I do feel that I got my money's worth because of the level and extent of the instruction.
8. Yes.
9. Yes, and yes 100%.
10. I did get my money's worth, and I would recommend the course to those undaunted by a heavy work schedule and deeply invested in book studies.
11. Yes, and yes.
12. Yes and yes.
13. I came with a course scholarship; I am glad I used it on this course. I would indeed recommend it to others. It's a LOT of work, but you feel your brain {unintelligible}—you learn.
14. I must confess it was very expensive but I don't regret it. I would probably recommend it, with that one warning.
15. I would definitely recommend the course to others.
16. Yes, yes.
17. Absolutely.
18. Yes, I would highly recommend the class. I feel like I am coming away with more evidence I can use to back up any claim I make about a book.
19. Yes, and yes.
20. Yes and yes.
21. Yes and yes.
22. No, I don't. I would recommend it to novices in bibliography but not anyone who has ever taken any sort of formal course or read Bowers. This is really an introductory-level course. The RBS staff told me the course would be more advanced, and I was disappointed to find that it was not.
23. Definitely.
24. Yes, I would definitely recommend this course. It is one of the best courses I've taken in my life in terms of how much I have learned.
25. Yes, and yes, if they are willing to work their butts off.
26. Yes.
27. {no response}

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

1. Yes and yes. The printing demonstrations were great.
2. N/A
3. The trip to the printing press was great and really helped me conceptualize how the process worked.
4. The museum periods were trips to a different classroom, but were a huge part of the learning process for me this week.
5. Yes, I liked the printmaking workshop!
6. {no response}
7. N/A
8. I feel like we could have done more of these—perhaps shorten the “DesBib.” Museum (day 4) or just cover it primarily in a lecture and expand the printing or paper museums to include demos.
9. Yes, printing museum!
10. {no response}
11. {no response}
12. The printing demonstration helped to give context to some otherwise abstract ideas but took perhaps more time than necessary.
13. We made one trip —but just to next door, to use the replica printing press! This was indeed time well spent; again, hands-on experiences add a crucial dimension to students sense of book manufacture.
14. Yes, the printing demos mentioned above especially.
15. Yes.
16. {no response}
17. N/A
18. Printing press demonstration was very valuable.
19. N/A
20. N/A
21. Yes, the printing demo was excellent.
22. No. The printing demo was very basic and a waste of time. I would not recommend doing it again. I was surprised we didn't go to SC too. Maybe, if anything, having people set a line of type and impose it/lock up the chase would be somewhat useful, but not enormously so.
23. N/A
24. Yes. We learned about the different types of printing processes.
25. Printing demonstration worked WELL on Monday.
26. Yes.
27. {no response}

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

1. I don't have additions to advice I was given. It prepared me well.
2. The “DesBib” experience here is amazing—the collection of teaching tools is one of

- a kind and the knowledgeable instructors provide tremendous assistance.
3. Don't be intimidated by the whole "boot camp" idea. Just try your best and ask lots of questions. Even the instructors can get it wrong sometimes!
 4. {no response}
 5. Have groups of likeminded scholars (lit or history) together to discuss specific concepts to the field.
 6. {no response}
 7. Prepare for the course long in advance not only by reading but also by examining many copies of hand press books.
 8. I think it's valuable to remind yourself throughout that the instructors are trying to expose you to all of the different textual anomalies that you are likely to encounter when examining a book on your own and be aware that some failures on your part are necessary to learning these.
 9. Be prepared to have 14-hour days doing the most exciting detective work with books. Be willing to do the work. Don't come if you don't want to learn by doing.
 10. If you're on the fence about whether all the effort—and all the bootcamp rumors are true—is "worth it," consider that you are unlikely to apply the extent and depth of your learning in "DesBib" outside of class, and ask yourself whether you believe enough in indirect learning and professional scholastic enrichment to dedicate all of your day (i.e., 8.5 hours or longer with intervals of rest/distraction in between—not counting the organized breaks), to painstaking, incompletely transferable skill development. If you do, and/or have a solid enough interest in the book/bibliographic/bibliophilic field (and if you can afford RBS!) take the class.
 11. Do the readings in two passes, don't dwell too much on Bowers. Get to know it, don't simply read it, per se.
 12. Do the readings and come with a specific use for the methods in mind.
 13. Be prepared to work steadily, methodically, and sometimes late into the evening. Know that the days will be well organized and will facilitate the learning necessary to do the homework. Ask for help when you are stuck!
 14. Bring a camera (I did) to document the materials for later reference. Definitely bring a sweater; dress is casual.
 15. Read Gaskell, Bowers, Mckerrows, and whatever else, but you may also want to bring a copy of Bowers to reference (and Gaskell pp. 88–107).
 16. {no response}
 17. Read Bowers, then read Bowers again. Practice writing formulas before you get here.
 18. Keep in mind that descriptive bibliography is a very specific field/term and is limited to the definitions you choose to use. Do the reading but don't try to memorize.
 19. Do the reading and be prepared to work hard. It's very rewarding.
 20. Great knowledge acquired. Bibliographical description is not a "dead language." Do it with pride and confidence.
 21. Do the reading, but don't agonize over Bowers' fine-print digressions.
 22. Don't worry about reading Gaskell too closely. Read Bowers religiously though. Don't worry about taking notes on Bowers though—the handbook is incredibly sufficient and efficient, noting all of the major cases/exceptions and giving a concise index of where to find tricky notations.
 23. Definitely be sure to get ample rest during the week! For museums, scan the descriptions in advance to help focus your time with the objects during the

- session.
24. Make sure to plan to spend 3–4 hours a day doing homework.
 25. MUST be prepared to stay at Alderman for 13 hours/day, must warn family, &c. that seeing them during the week is optional. Homework in Alderman is the most difficult part of the class yet seemingly the most important.
 26. Make sure you do the readings, take notes, and take your time on the homework sessions.
 27. {no response}

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

1. I came. I saw. I collated. 10/10. I hope to be back.
2. {private response}
3. I've never learned so much in so little time with such ease.
4. Deeply focused.
5. Oh "DesBib": Once a foreign jumble of words and numbers, now a very close friend.
6. {no response}
7. Exhausting, but worth it.
8. WWBD
9. The best week of my summer. The best and most validating piece of my rare book education thus far. Thank you all!
10. {no response}
11. Intimacy of Bowers—
that kind of knowledge,
not mere intellection!
12. It was an incredibly fulfilling and enjoyable week, and I met some incredible people.
13. Des. Bib. Is a well-oiled machine!
14. Accept no substitutes.
15. "Creative Bowers"
Use what you can, infer rest.
Collation (= guessing)
16. Intense, rewarding, and inspiring.
17. It was an amazing experience, and I can't wait to come back!
18. A solid foundation for future exploration into books.
19. {no response}
20. Don't be afraid—"Just do it."
21. Intellectually challenging, and fun!
22. The people are really nice, the time is not used efficiently, and there wasn't as much learning as I was promised. But a good group! Good networking opportunities too.
23. {no response}
24. This is the best course that RBS offers, and I had an unforgettable experience.
25. Difficult, enlightening, worthwhile.
26. Bower is crazy
bibliography what

just kidding I learned.
27. {no response}

Student Data

Number of respondents: 26 (of 26)

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

My institution/employer gave me professional leave time: 10 (38.46%)
My institution/employer did not give me professional leave; I used paid or vacation days: 6 (23.08%)
I am self-employed, and can arrange my own schedule: 2 (7.69%)
I am a student or non-year-round employee, with a more flexible summer schedule: 6 (23.08%)
My situation does not fit any of the options above: 2 (7.69%)

Who paid your RBS tuition costs?

My institution/employer paid 100%: 4 (15.38%)
My institution/employer paid part; I paid the rest: 4 (15.38%)
I used a scholarship/fellowship to pay/waive 100%: 2 (7.69%)
I used a scholarship/fellowship to pay/waive part; I paid the rest: 14 (53.85%)
I used a scholarship/fellowship to pay/waive part; my institution/employer paid the rest: 1 (3.85%)
My situation does not fit any of the options above: 1 (3.85%)

Who paid your RBS housing expenses?

I paid 100% myself: 11 (42.31%)
My institution/employer paid 100%: 9 (34.62%)
I used a scholarship/fellowship to cover 100%: 2 (7.69%)
I stayed with friends/family, or stayed in my own home and commuted: 4 (15.38%)

Who paid your RBS travel expenses?

I paid 100% myself: 15 (57.69%)
My institution/employer paid 100%: 6 (23.08%)
My institution/employer paid part; I paid the rest: 1 (3.85%)
I used a scholarship/fellowship to cover 100%: 2 (7.69%)
I used a scholarship/fellowship to cover part; my institution/employer paid the rest: 1 (3.85%)
I live locally, and had no travel expenses: 1 (3.85%)

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

Library disciplines:

Archivist: 1 (3.85%)
Cataloger/metadata librarian: 2 (7.69%)
Curator: 1 (3.85%)
Special collections librarian: 4 (15.38%)

Student working toward a/n:

M.A./M.S.: 1 (3.85%)
M.L.I.S./M.L.S.: 1 (3.85%)
Ph.D./D.Phil: 5 (19.23%)

Professional educator:

Lecturer/adjunct: 1 (3.85%)
Assistant professor: 2 (7.69%)
Associate professor: 1 (3.85%)

Book trades:

Antiquarian bookseller: 5 (19.23%)

Other occupations/vocations:

Post-doctoral fellow/researcher/scholar: 1 (3.85%)

No Response: 1 (3.85%)