

**Title of lecture: PT IA (Paper 3) History 2**

**Response from: Martin Ennis (2 December 2017)**

I should like to start by expressing my gratitude for the many complimentary comments on the course; it was very pleasing to see that so many students found the lectures stimulating and engaging. The only really recurrent criticism related to the speed of presentation. I probably do speak too quickly when enthused. In my defence, I would point out that the role of a lecture is not to present information that can be written down in its entirety. As I said in the introductory session, regurgitation of material in examinations (or, for that matter, supervision essays) is usually far from welcome. Rather, lecturers should aim to enthuse their listeners, encouraging them to go away and follow up the issues raised. In other words, students' main task is to digest the main points of lectures – points that I always try to repeat in varied verbal formulations – and then to strike out independently.

There were also some very positive remarks about supervisions; at least four supervisors were mentioned by name, some with great enthusiasm. It's good to see that the two parts of 'the learning process' seem, in so many cases, to have been working symbiotically. Where problems with supervisions were mentioned, I have tried to follow them up; however, in the absence of names, this was sometimes impossible. Students are advised to discuss any recurrent supervision problems with their Director of Studies.