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Outline of this Session

• Introduction of CASE (10 minutes)
• Discussion subgroups (15 minutes)
• Introduction evaluation model (5 min)
• Discussion subgroups (15 minutes)
• Plenary presentation results (15 minutes)
4TU Centre for Engineering Education

- Virtual simulations and labs
- Virtual Reality Systems
  - Literature review/interviews
- Pilots
  - Exploring E-Coaching with VR
  - Exploring the use of virtual tours
  - Exploring virtual simulation in Go-labs
Criteria for Pilots

- Low threshold for lecturers
- Contribute to economy of scale/low costs
- Quick innovation and when it works (positively effects learning outcomes) hand it over to the institutional organisation
- Does it bridge the skills gap with industry
Preliminary results VR & E-Coaching

• 1st pilot e-coaching

• Presentations skills: Communication Centre had too many students and too little practice time.

• Does extra individual VR practice offer a solution to this dilemma?

• Does it provide the right kind of feedback for learning?
Virtual speech.com

speech app demo

Different audiences, eye contact, loudness, filler words, audience response
VirtualSpeech App - Oxford Uni

Users/Week

Time in Rooms (min)
- Main Menu: 112
- Classroom: 114
- Courses Menu: 16
- Interview: 18
- Video Tips: 57
- Conference: 109
- Meeting Room: 108
- Wedding/Formal: 26
- Recordings & Stats: 115
- TEDx Styled Room: 33
- Distractions (C): 90
- Eye Contact (C): 104
- Introduction (C): 103
- Networking (C): 59

Features Used (Coming soon)
- Voice Analysis: N/A
- In-App Slides: N/A
- Sound Distractions: N/A
- Speech Insights: N/A

APP SESSIONS: 229
MINUTES IN APP: 1,125
ROOMS OPENED: 3168
ACTIVATIONS: 38/18
Adapted from Zhang et al. 2017
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Adapted from Zhang et al. 2017
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