

# Critical Review

Gabriel Valdés Alonzo

January 23, 2017

This critical review will be with respect to the first seminar from the course, "Numerical Analysis of Factors of Safety and Probabilities of Failure in Geotechnical Engineering" from professor D.V. Griffiths. The seminar was mainly about modeling of the soil through numerical analysis and different kinds of simulations in order to obtain a statistical model of the fail modes of the ground under certain kinds of loading. The topic was specific enough to not be known by everyone present in the room, so the way the professor delivered his speech was crucial to keep the interest of the audience and to get his message to everyone present.

During the lecture, the professor delivered his presentation in a standard way: started introducing himself with some jokes in order to lighten the mood, and then proceeded to introduce the topic in a simple way in order to move to some more complex issues, always in a steady pace and a variable tone in order to not be monotonous. At the end of the lecture he answered the question with confidence, as expected from a professor, which gives the impression of a very well developed and closed topic.

There are some points to be noted more extensively about the lecture:

- Length of the presentation: the length is fixed by the time slot and it's limited for a topic so extensive like this, so it's crucial that the presenter adapts his speech to deliver the most, and the professor did not do so well, since he took more time than assigned, which lead to the distraction of the crowd in the final minutes.
- Keep interest of the crowd: again the professor did not do so well in this topic, since the people not familiar with the topic got disinterested on the presentation, since nothing appealing on the speech was offered, and the professor did not use some resources to keep the interest of the crowd, like showing more real life examples or recurring to some jokes mid-presentation in order to relieve a little the exhaustion of the crowd.
- Address of the topic: the topic was well addressed, since it was a progression from the most common topics to the crowd to the more specific ones. The professor took his time to explain the most complex topic and distributed the time evenly between the different issues of interest.
- Manner of speech of the presenter: the rhythm given to the presentation was good, since the professor talked in a calmed way, keeping his volume at adequate levels and making good use of the pauses and hand gestures, which helped to give more fluidity to the presentation and to avoid to make a monotonous speech.

The presentation, overall, was well delivered. The speech of the presenter was clear, without distracting accents or perks that deviated the attention, and in a pace that was right for the kind of lecture that he was giving: not too slow to get the audience bored and not too fast to make it unintelligible. In any case, for future events, some suggestions can be made to the presenter. The timing in these kind of short seminar is crucial to deliver all the information needed, so it would be beneficial for future presentation not to exceed the established time frame. Humor also can be beneficial for the presentation, so it would be better if the professor could be more relaxed, since all his jokes were delivered during his introduction, leaving a too serious speech for the rest of the lecture.