

Critical Review on the seminar „Kratos Multiphysics Time line”

On the 6th November 2019 a seminar about „Kratos Multiphysics Time line” was held by Pooyan Dadvand at the CIMNE institute of the UPC in Barcelona. In the following review of the seminar the external framework, the visual aids, the speech, the structure and the delivery are being analyzed.

First of all, the external framework two factors must be mentioned- the premises and the audience. The room chosen for the seminar was very full and hot. Most of people were standing in the back of the room. New people came and went, which made sounds, it was the reason why it was difficult to concentrate fully on the presentation, due to the lack of sufficient seating. The audience was mostly made up by expert personnel from the CIMNE institute and technical students. That was the reason, why the speaker was able to address the audience in technical language. The structure wasn't very clear. The presentation should divide into the introduction, body and conclusion, which would facilitate understanding of the topic. As visual aids were used a PowerPoint-presentation. The slides were partly very full of information, which were placed on the slide in an incomprehensible way. It wasn't readable for the audience, which could look for some logical connection. In addition the font size was chosen incorrectly, it was too small, which meant that for the audience at the back of the room was almost illegible, information and image captions.

Moreover, the slides were badly organized and each slide should show the title of the presentation as well as the name of the presenter. This gives the presentation a more professional look and clearly states, who is responsible. Knowing the name of presenter creates a more nice and relaxed atmosphere and encourages to ask questions. Positive features of the presentation were number of colorful animations, different types of graphics, which help to visualize more complex topics.

Concerning the delivery of the lecturer towards the audience loud voice was used, that's the reason was possible to hear him good. Occasionally presenter was speaking to individuals directly, it means good interaction with the audience. The communication took place in an interesting way as the speaker used humor, which put the atmosphere at ease at a right level.

A negative point of the speaker the most of the time was talking to the screen or to the floor, without eye-contact. The presenter most of the time kept his hand in his pocket, it shows a little disrespect for the audience.

Furthermore, however though the speaker was fluent in English he spoke with slightly pitched voice. Even he spoke loud, it wasn't clear to understand. This made it difficult to follow the content of the presentation. On the other hand, the presenter some of slides described and explained for few minutes, another skipped very quick that it was impossible to follow or understand what was there. Although the speaker had a laser pointer, he didn't use it, and showed all the explanations during the presentation by his hand on the slide, which contributed to the continuous covering of the presentation.

The main critical points of this presentation are the high amount of information or photos without descriptions on each slide, no eye-contact and the lack of understandable pronunciation. The negative critical points of this presentation prevail, but everything is possible to change for better only with a lot of practice.

All in all, the lecturer shared his enthusiasm of the topic with the audience and put the atmosphere a tease with occasional humor. He should work on way, how to present and speak with better interaction – eye-contact with the audience and more clear about pronunciation. However, the PowerPoint- presentation and the conditions of the premises should be revised and improved for the next seminar.