

# Communication Skills 1:

---

## Critical review of the presentation of Ernest Blade from the 23.11.2016

The presenter Ernest Blade is from the Flumen Research Institute UPC-CIMNE-Barcelona. Topic of his presentation was “Modelling fluvial processes using the finite volume Method”. The main idea he was talking about was building in the physical difference between subcritical flow and supercritical flow into numerical modeling. The implementing led to much better results in his work which are closer to reality.

The presentation included a short summary how water flows by the formulas of the hydrodynamic shallow water equation, a short revision of the Navier-Stokes equation and the characteristics of the Reynolds Number.

To anticipate the resume of the presentation, I can state that I liked it. Although the presentation started with delay because of technical problems, that might have been avoided by setting up the technic in advance, the presentation was well prepared.

To the performance of the speaker:

He spoke with clear pronunciation and appropriate volume. He varied the speed of speaking in a natural range and kept alive the contact to the audience which made it more interesting to listen to his words. This was possible since he was presenting freely.

He was surprised by the mostly young, no professional audience and did not know about the state of knowledge of the audience. To make sure everybody can follow his presentation he anticipate possible questions to unknown theory and he was clear about questions, if they might appear the audience should just interrupt and ask. He reacted by reviewing and explaining parts of the unknown theory, necessary for following the presentation, with the help of a white board and some graphs. For example he repeated shortly the finite volume Method and basics about sediment transport and suspended sediment.

Different to the usual way of presenting he did not introduce the points he was talking about. Instead he concluded each topic summarizing what he was talking about by giving it a name.

The slides of the presentation only included material he was talking about. It was mostly formulas and images on them. There was no unnecessary text which made the slides appear clear, focused and supportive for delivering the message of the presentation. The images were explained clear and simple. He knew all of his slides very well, so he was able to react to the audience interests by talking longer or shorter about the content of the slide or even skipped a few slides and still finished on time.

The questions after the presentation he was able to answer properly. He seemed very confident and had a nice general knowledge about the topic.

As I stated before I enjoyed the performance very much.