
In general the student feedback on the Unit Survey for Analytic Number Theory was very positive and I thank the students for writing what they did.

As a selection of complimentary comments I could pick out
“Chalk and talk lectures - explaining everything clearly and providing context for the direction we're heading”
“Enthusiasm for the course; made everything sound interesting and explained everything well.”
“Really interesting results covered in course”.
“Also Dr Coleman always wanted to cheer up the class and it helped sometimes.”

For other, more negative, comments we have
“It is a boring unit to learn because most of the lectures were stating theorems and proving them”

I think this is the nature of the beast. It wasn’t a ‘methods type’ course where I gave tools to be applied in many different problems (though Partial Summation is such a result). It was a Pure Mathematics course which I’m sure I made clear at the very start.

“The Prime Number Theorem was stated in the first week and Dr Coleman used almost three weeks to prove it.”

I think this shows how difficult the Prime Number Theorem is and it is to the credit of Manchester that we have time in our curriculum to present such a long proof. I could, of course, have presented the work as a study of the properties of the Riemann zeta function and it’s zeros. I would then have introduced and proved the Prime Number Theorem in a lecture or two.

“The level 4 material is very occasionally a little haphazardly organised, but it still works.”

Perhaps a little haphazard because I have more material prepared than I have lectures in which to give it. Thus I was continually choosing what to do next. Also, the deeper the material the more details there are and, in lectures, there is always a compromise between details and the teaching time I have (not to mention your concentration). This compromise was always in my mind which may have contributed to it looking as if I wasn’t completely prepared.

“Online notes do not follow what is written in lectures very well. In particular the ordering”

Perhaps true for the level 4 materials but I didn’t think it so for the level 3 version. I would appreciate further details.

“Having podcasts.”

Presumably, this refers to the fact that I didn’t have podcasts. I feel that I already offer more material than most students read including, background notes; full notes with all proofs and annotated to highlight the important and tricky parts; full solutions, even for the Additional questions; solutions to past exam papers, including the highlighting of commonly seen errors.
Tutorial is the only flaw of this unit.

I would agree for this as for the other courses I teach. I am old fashioned and believe students should attempt the questions before the tutorial and come with the problems they encountered while attempting them.

If a tutorial is referred to as a ‘Problems Class’ this is ambiguous. Students believe the word ‘problem’ in the title refers to the problems on the question sheet while I believe it refers to the problems you encounter while attempting the questions on the question sheet.

One student noted “there is no need to attend tutorial most of the time, because every bit of information you need to know is either on lecture notes or answer sheets.” But I give ‘every bit of information you need’ because of students’ comments on previous Unit Surveys which said they could not even start the questions.

Another student noted “I am not sure how to improve it [the running of the tutorials].” Perhaps you know how?