

【附件三】成果報告（此為格式範例，詳情請見[格式說明](#)；請於系統端上傳 PDF 檔）

封面 Cover Page

教育部教學實踐研究計畫成果報告

Project Report for MOE Teaching Practice Research Program

計畫編號/Project Number：PHA1110203

學門專案分類/Division：人文藝術及設計

計畫年度：V 111 年度一年期 ☐ 110 年度多年期

執行期間/Funding Period：2022.08.01 – 2023.07.31

(計畫名稱/Title of the Project)

以英語紀錄短片製作提升雙語敘事能力與公民參與

**Short Documentary Production as Pedagogy:
Enhancing Bilingual Narrative Aptitude and Civic Participation**

(配合課程名稱/Course Name)

**英語數位敘事實作
Digital Storytelling Practicum**

計畫主持人(Principal Investigator)：翁家傑 Jerry Chia-Je Weng

協同主持人(Co-Principal Investigator)：

執行機構及系所(Institution/Department/Program)：國立臺灣大學外國語文學系

成果報告公開日期：☐立即公開 ☒延後公開（統一於 2025 年 7 月 31 日公開）

繳交報告日期(Report Submission Date)：2023 年 8 月 15 日

以英語紀錄短片製作提升雙語敘事能力與公民參與
Short Documentary Production as Pedagogy:
Enhancing Bilingual Narrative Aptitude and Civic Participation

一. 本文 Content

1. 研究動機與目的 Research Motive and Purpose

To date, the PI has implemented two projects under the aegis of the MOE Teaching Practice Research Program, both focusing on developing new methodologies in digital narrative and storytelling, with the aim of adapting the study of language and literature to a new era. The first initiative made use of a digital engagement framework to enhance digital storytelling projects, thus enabling students to think through issues such as audience, reach, objectives, assets, and values in relation to an online audience. The second project extended feature writing into a convergence media project that combines text and video. Both projects have emphasized hands-on practical experience with the co-creation of text and digital media.

The current project continues the exploration into digital storytelling, but with the important difference of producing a specific genre of storytelling in the form of the short documentary film. Past research has demonstrated that though students were highly motivated in creating their original digital projects, they were often at a loss when faced with the universe of possibilities available to them. The unimpeded free form of digital storytelling, as currently practiced in pedagogy, in fact became an impediment and delayed the planning and execution of their projects. The current project aims to identify, more clearly than others, the *parameters* and *specifications* of a viable piece of digital narrative that would be of interest to an international audience. The short documentary form, as a window into important societal and cultural issues, compels students to act and observe as responsible citizens of their local communities. Furthermore, by incorporating bilingual elements into the documentary video (interview translations, voice-over, and bilingual captions), this project studies the effectiveness of such a method in enhancing students' bilingual proficiencies.

The objectives of this project are to offer a new course designed to enhance digital storytelling through the short documentary form, to improve bilingual narrative capacity and foster civic participation. The curriculum will harness the strengths of the next generation of digital natives, increasing learning motivation and student engagement in the creative process. By integrating bilingual components within documentary production, students will gain valuable experience in

preparing digital media for an international audience; by documenting stories about local communities, students will feel a renewed sense of the value of humanities within a strong public culture. Finally, the project will contribute toward revitalizing the role of the humanities in a digital media landscape.

2. 研究問題 Research Question

This teaching project takes digital storytelling as a starting point into rethinking the traditional curriculum of the humanities in an increasingly digitized world. While digital storytelling has been well established as a useful tool in language pedagogy (see literature review below), the public and social value of such storytelling remains in question. Student projects remain defined and confined as class exercises, produced as a means to an end, ultimately languishing in buried folders on students' digital devices. Reflecting on those limitations, this project poses the following research questions:

- How can we invigorate the practice of digital storytelling so that students feel a keen sense of real-world accomplishment and civic participation?
- How can we incorporate the objectives of Bilingual Nation 2030 into digital storytelling, so that students connect with and produce for a global audience?

The current project posits the digital production of short documentary films as a viable pedagogical method and research topic, as elaborated below.

From digital storytelling to short documentary production

A succinct and working definition of digital storytelling (DST) is provided by Ohler (2013): “digital storytelling (DST) uses personal digital technology to combine a number of media into a coherent narrative” (p. 16). The practice involves working with the multimodal presentation of image, text, and narration, most commonly taking the format of a short, personal video. Joe Lambert, one of the pioneering figures in the field, identifies seven characteristics of digital storytelling: it is 1) self-revelatory, 2) told in the first-person, 3) about lived experience, 4) combined with still images, 5) accompanied by a soundtrack or ambient sound, 6) brief, minimal, raw and direct, 7) privileges self-awareness and self-expression (2013, p. 37-38). Evident in Lambert's characterization is the *private, individual* nature of digital storytelling, which encourages stories about oneself told in first-person narration. This feature may be a symptom of why digital storytelling is used primarily as a mere pedagogical tool. More often than not, storytelling projects generate little interest or influence beyond the individual creator. This project uses the short documentary film as an effective mode of storytelling that meaningfully engages a global public.

With the refinement and accessibility of digital audiovisual technology in the past decade, documentary filmmaking is no longer exclusive to studio directors and producers. According to the International Documentary Association, “the contraction of print and broadcast media and the expansion of digital platforms spurred an unprecedented crossover between journalism and independent nonfiction filmmaking.” It is now entirely possible to produce and direct a short documentary independently with powerful cameras in contemporary smartphones, free movie editing software, and a minimal budget. The short documentary film may be viewed as a specific form of digital storytelling, albeit with important ethical attributes that transcend the digital storytelling format.

What is documentary? In order to define the parameters of the documentary film, eminent film scholar Bill Nichols (2017) begins with three commonplace assumptions:

1. Documentaries are about reality, about something that really happened.
2. Documentaries are about real people.
3. Documentaries tell stories about what happens in the real world.

Proceeding from the above assumptions, Nichols attempts a broad definition of the genre:

Documentary film speaks about situations and events involving real people (social actors) who present themselves within a framework. This frame conveys a plausible perspective on the lives, situations, and events portrayed. The distinct point of view of the filmmaker shapes the film into a way of understanding the historical world directly rather than through a fictional allegory. (p.10)

The definition distinguishes documentary from narrative film, where a fictional world is created by the screenwriter and director; instead, the documentary focuses on real people and real events shaped by the filmmaker as a unique perspective on reality. Since documentary engages with the world through representation, further characteristics must be taken into consideration: 1) documentary offers a mimetic likeness of the real world but presents a distinct way of looking at the world; 2) documentary may stand for or represent certain interests; 3) documentary may “actively make a case or propose an interpretation to win consent or influence opinion” (p. 30). That is, there is a strong ethical, socially-conscious component in most documentary films because of the ways in which reality is engaged by the filmmaker.

The documentary form has thus become a vehicle for imaginative social change and civic participation. The ethical dimension of documentary film is underscored by the Sundance Institute, the organizer of one of the world’s most celebrated film festivals. Sundance encourages documentary work “that has expressed the world in creative, complex, beautiful, and provocative

ways, and has created real cultural and social impact around some of the most pressing issues of our time”; the Institute is “especially keen to raise the voices of underserved or underrepresented communities from around the world in the service of building a more fair, free, and open society.” By establishing the production of a short documentary film as a pedagogical outcome, this teaching project aligns itself with the social objectives of documentary form to contribute to a vibrant democracy represented by diverse voices.

3. 文獻探討 Literature Review

Digital storytelling and language education

In recent years, digital storytelling has emerged as an influential pedagogy among language educators. Studies of the effectiveness of digital storytelling in the classroom have produced positive results, demonstrating measurable improvements in students’ oral and writing skills in the target language, alongside other enhancements such as critical thinking and learning motivation. In a very recent study conducted in Taiwan, Fu, Yang, and Yeh (2021) have found that students made “significant progress in speaking competence” after using a storytelling app to create their own animations on digital devices. This echoes previous findings by Tahriri (2015) and Hwang et al. (2016), which indicate that students increased their oracy skills and motivation, and gained practice in speaking by narrating and recording digital stories in the target language. Also in Taiwan, Yeh, Heng, and Tseng (2021) confirm that video making projects enhanced EFL students’ writing skills, specifically in terms of creating meaning and contextual awareness.

Further research suggests that the learning outcomes extend beyond the four-skills paradigm in language acquisition. Hung (2019) demonstrates that learners employ cognitive and metacognitive skills in the process of creating digital stories; Yang, Chen and Hung (2020) find that students improve not only their speaking proficiency but their creative thinking as well. The pedagogical benefits of digital storytelling are shown to extend further than conventional definitions of linguistic proficiency. Kim and Lee (2018) have found that “narratives become better stories” when students employ digital storytelling, especially in terms of “expressing one’s feeling, showing awareness of the audience, and adding more details to the story” (p. 1). Castañeda (2013) has shown that digital storytelling allows students to make an “epistemological shift” from the learning boundaries of language and technology to constructing “a meaningful project as a whole.” In a cross-cultural study on students in Finland, Greece, and California, Neimi and Multisilta (2016) demonstrate how student motivation and enthusiasm can be predicted by indicators such as student-driven knowledge creation, collaboration, networking and digital literacy – all of which are engaged in a digital storytelling project.

Two dimensions of the research on digital storytelling pedagogy are especially relevant to the current documentary project. First, students' bilingual capacities are enhanced beyond mere speaking and writing proficiencies to engage complex expressive modes of cognition, feeling, and narrative – modes that are germane to literature and filmmaking. Second, the level of authentic student engagement with real-life issues is heightened by the process of digital creation, suggesting the potential for broader civic participation as students pursue their digital projects.

Short documentary form, digital storytelling, and civic participation

As described in the previous section, the short documentary film may be seen as an extension of digital storytelling with a significant heightening of public and ethical consciousness. The pedagogical use of video making and documentary production has not been studied as extensively, and it is here that the current project may contribute to the limited scholarship. However, a few case studies where documentary making has been applied to higher education promises broad learning outcomes.

In one case study, Schul (2014) documented how film pedagogy might be applied in the history classroom. By guiding students to produce a “desktop documentary” – a video produced and edited on an ordinary desktop computer – the researcher observed enhancements in students' understanding of historical concepts, marked improvement in students' historical thinking skills, and a new level of student engagement with the class material.

Another richly documented case study by Rice (2017) describes the ASPIRE initiative at UCLA, an experimental curriculum teaching documentary production to non-film school students. Regarding the question of whether teaching filmmaking is best left to professionals in film school, Rice asserts the contrary: “making use of inexpensive digital technologies to teach nonprofessional, nonfiction models of media practice to students across many disciplines for potential use in wide-ranging careers fills a void in liberal education” (p. 39). The resulting seminar, *Documentary Production for Social Change: Mobility in Los Angeles*, examined the issue of commuting in LA from the perspective of environmental sustainability and social justice in accessing public transit. With modest funding for equipment, an interdisciplinary group of students were trained to produce short documentaries on commuters in the LA area, filming their workday routine and conducting interviews about the diverse challenges experienced in their commutes. The learning outcomes were excellent, as students reported a sense of intellectual excitement and deep fulfillment that was absent in most academic courses. Most noteworthy was the emergence of students' social consciousness and civic participation via producing the short documentary: students “collaborate on complex problems, learn practical skills, grapple with the ethics of representation, and contribute to social movements”; they “come to develop new interests in social issues and learn ways of being

leaders in these fields as a result of their media-making activities” (p. 50).

The course design of this project was modeled closely after this inspiring and successful initiative at UCLA, with the twin objectives of enhancing bilingual narrative and fostering a sense of civic participation and social responsibility.

4. 教學設計與規劃 Teaching Planning

The curriculum design was implemented by designing a new course on short documentary theory and practice, conducted entirely in English as the medium of instruction (EMI). The course contents will consist of several interrelated phases (see attached syllabus for week-by-week description):

a) Documentary Theory and History (weeks 1-4)

Students read and discuss seminal articles on the documentary film, addressing its objectives and modes of representation. Students reflect on what constitutes a documentary film and what distinguishes it from other modes of visual storytelling. The primary modes of documentary (Nichols 2017) are introduced: the poetic, expository, reflexive, observational, performative, and participatory. This is complemented by viewing acclaimed films and clips from the documentary tradition, analyzing the styles, structures, and approaches of classic and groundbreaking films as diverse as *Grey Gardens* (1975), *Hoop Dreams* (1994) and *Citizenfour* (2014). This learning process will help students generate compelling documentaries of their own.

b) Documentary Storytelling (weeks 5-8)

Students are asked to brainstorm possible topics for their documentary projects, and develop storylines based on the creative arrangement of raw materials. The instructor will guide students through the various elements of pre-production: pitching and proposal writing; developing outlines, treatments, storyboards and scripts; identifying casting and locations; thinking through ethical and representational issues. Students work through several ideas with peer and instructor feedback to produce a viable proposal.

c) Documentary Production and Post-Production (weeks 9-18)

Half of the course is devoted to hands-on practice in producing the short documentary project. Students are guided through the process of filmmaking, including shooting footage and conducting interviews. The post-production phase cover topics such as film editing, narration and voice-over, sound treatment, and implementing bilingual captions. Several stages of peer review and revision

will be undergone for the content to be polished to professional standards. Students will also gain experience in the curation of their short documentary film by exploring venues of online publication and ways of maximizing social impact.

Assessment for the course will be outcome-based. Learning outcomes will be measured through criterion-referenced evaluation. Grading rubrics for the final documentary project will be as follows, combining both instructor and peer evaluation:

Documentary film grading rubric	
Literary element (30%) Storytelling, narrative, script content	Is the narrative clear and comprehensible? Is the storytelling well-developed, with a coherent sequence from beginning to end? Are the interviews well-conducted, arousing the viewers' interest? Is the overall story compelling for a film?
Directing element (20%) Organization and directorial style	Is the directing style clean and well-organized? Do the characters support the film narrative? Is the presentation of the film striking and memorable?
Visual element (15%) Cinematography and camera work	Is the visual composition effective? Is the camera movement smooth and natural? Is the variety of shots effective?
Editing element (15%) Post-production digital editing	Does the visual editing flow well from scene to scene? Is the audio editing clear and effective? Is the editing style supportive of the characters and message of the film?
Bilingual element (20%) Translations, voiceovers, captions	Is the narration clear and comprehensible? Are the interview translations and voiceovers accurate to represent the interviewees? Are the bilingual captions grammatically correct and free of errors?

Final scores for each category will incorporate a mixture of instructor assessment (60%), peer assessment (30%), and self-assessment (10%).

5. 研究設計與執行方法 Research Methodology

(1) **Research Framework:** A one-semester course was through the university course system, “Digital Storytelling Practicum: Theory and Practice,” whose contents were adapted to the current project’s focus on documentary film production. The course design implemented the methodology and implementation of teaching practice. With the completion of the course, a final project in the form of a short documentary film was produced. Data was collected after the course to measure the effectiveness of this project.

(2) **Research Hypothesis:** This project investigates how students may enhance their bilingual aptitude as short documentary producers and directors. It measures to what extent students meet the learning outcomes of the course, and to what extent they find the course valuable to their linguistic capability and social awareness.

(3) **Scope of Research:** This project involved the design and implementation of a one-semester course spanning 16 weeks. The PI met with students on a weekly basis for three hours of class. Class sessions were structured as workshops with the integration of flipped classroom pedagogy, with classes mainly held in person. The teaching assistants met with students outside of class hours to assist with various details of planning the documentary as well as technical aspects of video and audio editing. Students were formally assessed through a mix of instructor, peer, and self-evaluation; students then evaluated the course through online questionnaires designed to test the research hypothesis.

(4) **Research participants** consisted of 8 undergraduate students from across the university; all students met a required level of English proficiency and were highly interested in documentary filmmaking. Instructor/student ratio was kept low in order to facilitate maximum interaction. Initial proficiency of students was assessed through a pretest at the beginning of the semester. Students enrolled in the course were asked permission to serve as research subjects and may opt out of research at any time (see Research Ethics Agreement Form).

(5) **Research methods and tools:** Data collection was based on a number of sources: student questionnaires will be given to measure students’ self-assessment and overall feedback on the course design; the final assessment of student projects was done by the instructor and by peers; data on final projects was compiled to gauge effectiveness of the documentary project.

6. 教學暨研究成果 Teaching and Research Outcomes

In addition to the official course evaluation conducted by the university, the learning outcomes of the course were measured by the following questionnaire:

Q1. How well do you now understand the theory and history of documentary film? (1~5)
Q2. How well was the documentary storytelling module organized? (1~5)
Q3. How well was the documentary production module organized? (1~5)
Q4. How would you rate your proficiency increase in bilingual language skills? (1~5)
Q5. How would you rate your improvement in digital media production? (1~5)
Q6. How would you rate your growth in civic awareness and participation? (1~5)
Q7. Which of the following skills have you gained the most from the course? a) knowledge of documentary theory and history; b) understanding of narrative and storytelling techniques; c) interview conduct and techniques; d) digital film production; e) bilingual proficiency; f) documentary ethics
Q8. After taking this course, would you be confident in producing another documentary project in English on your own? (1~5)
Q9. How would you rate the overall effectiveness of the course? (1~5)
Q10. Would you recommend this course to other students? (1~5)

Overall student response for the course was very positive. The course received an overall score of 4.89 out of 5.00 in the NTU evaluation system. Among the survey results:

- 100% of students agreed that the instructor was devoted to teaching (score of 5.00);
- 66.7% of students strongly agreed that the course was effective, while 33.3% moderately agreed (score of 4.67);
- 100% of students would recommend the course to other students (score of 5.00).
- 83.3% of students strongly agreed that the course met its objectives, while 16.7% moderately agreed (score of 4.83);

Among the qualitative student feedback received, one suggestion was to provide assistance with film editing early on in the course. Since the present course design focused more on theoretical aspects of documentary production and less on the technical side of film editing, future iterations may incorporate technical workshops on film editing using popular software packages. This would be a good opportunity to utilize the teaching resources of the university's Digital Learning Center.

二. 參考文獻 References

- Ames, E. (2012). *Ferocious reality: Documentary according to Werner Herzog*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Artis, A.Q. (2008). *The shut up and shoot documentary guide: A down & dirty DV production*. Burlington, MA: Focus Press.
- Basaraba, N., Arnds, P., Edmond, J., & Conlan, O. (2021). New media ecology and theoretical foundations for nonfiction digital narrative creative practice. *Narrative*, 29(3), 374-395.
- Bernard, S.C. (2016). *Documentary storytelling: Creative nonfiction on screen*. (4th ed.). London: Routledge.
- Bernard, S.C., & Rabin, K. (2020). *Archival storytelling: A filmmaker's guide to finding, using, and licensing third-party visuals and music*. (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- “Bilingual Nation.” (2021). National Development Council, Taiwan.
https://www.ndc.gov.tw/en/Content_List.aspx?n=BF21AB4041BB5255.
- Bricca, J. (2017). *Documentary editing: Principles & practice*. London: Routledge.
- Castañeda, M.E. (2013). “I am proud that I did it and it’s a piece of me”: Digital storytelling in the foreign language classroom. *CALICO Journal* 30(1), 44-62.
- Chanan, M. (2007). *The politics of documentary*. London: British Film Institute.
- Fitzgerald, J. (2017). *Filmmaking for change: Make films that transform the world*. (2nd ed.). Studio City, CA: Michael Wiese Productions.
- Fu, J.S., Yang, S-H., & Yeh, H-C. (2021). Exploring the impacts of digital storytelling on English as a foreign language learners’ speaking competence. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*. DOI: [10.1080/15391523.2021.1911008](https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2021.1911008)
- Hampe, B. (2007). *Making documentary films and videos: A practical guide to planning, filming, and editing documentaries*. New York: Holt.
- Hewitt, J. & Valquez, G. (2013). *Documentary filmmaking: A contemporary field guide*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hung, S-T.A. (2019). Creating digital stories: EFL learners’ engagement, cognitive and metacognitive skills. *Educational Technology & Society*, 22(2), 26-37.
- Hwang, W. Y., Shadiev, R., Hsu, J. L., Huang, Y. M., Hsu, G. L., & Lin, Y. C. (2016). Effects of storytelling to facilitate EFL speaking using web-based multimedia system. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 29(2), 215–241.
- Independent Documentary Association. (n.d.). Retrieved 1 December 2021, from <https://www.documentary.org/enterprise>.

- Kim, H., & Lee, J.H. (2018). The value of digital storytelling as an L2 narrative practice. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 27, 1–9.
- Lambert, J. (2013). *Digital storytelling: Capturing lives, creating community*. New York: Routledge.
- McLane, B. (2012). *A new history of documentary film*. (2nd ed.). New York: Continuum.
- Mirza, H. S. (2020). Improving university students' English proficiency with digital storytelling. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET)*, 7(1), 84–94.
- Morandi, H., & Chen, H. (2019). Digital storytelling in language education. *Behavioral Sciences*, 9(12), 147.
- Murch, W. (2011). *In the blink of an eye: A perspective on film editing*. (2nd. ed.). New York: Silman-James Press.
- Neimi, H., & Multisilta, J. (2016). Digital storytelling promoting twenty-first century skills and student engagement. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, 25(4), 451-468.
- Nichols, B. (2017). *Introduction to documentary*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Nichols, B. (2016). *Speaking truths with film: Evidence, ethics, politics in documentary*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Ohler, J.B. (2013). *Digital storytelling in the classroom: new media pathways to literacy, learning, and creativity*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Palfrey, J., & Gasser, U. (2008). *Born digital: Understanding the first generation of digital natives*. Philadelphia: Basic Books.
- Prensky, M. (2010). *Teaching digital natives: Partnering for real learning*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.
- Quinn, J. (2013). *This much is true: 15 directors on documentary filmmaking*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Rabiger, M. (2020). *Directing the documentary*. (7th ed.). London: Routledge.
- Rice, D.A. (2017). Nonfiction video practice as twenty-first-century liberal education: The ASPIRE experiment at UCLA. *Journal of Film and Video* 69(3), 38-53.
- Rosenthal, A. (2002). *Writing, directing, and producing documentary films and videos*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Schul, J.E. (2014). Film pedagogy in the history classroom: Desktop documentary-making skills for history teachers and students. *The Social Studies* 105, 15-22.
- Smaill, B. (2010). *The documentary: Politics, emotion, culture*. New York: Palgrave.
- Sundance Institute. (n.d.) *Documentary film*. Retrieved 1 December 2021, from <https://www.sundance.org/programs/documentary-film/>.

- Tahriri, A., Tous, M.D., & Movahedfar, S. (2015). The impact of digital storytelling on EFL learners' oracy skills and motivation. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 4(3), 144–153.
- Tapscott, D. (2009). *Grown up digital: How the net generation is changing your world*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill.
- Türkmen, B. (2020). Utilizing digital media as a second language (L2) support: A case study on Netflix with translation applications. *Interdisciplinary Description of Complex Systems*, 18(4), 459-470.
- Yang, Y.-T. C., Chen, Y.-C., & Hung, H.-T. (2020). Digital storytelling as an interdisciplinary project to improve students' English speaking and creative thinking. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 9(4), 1–23.
- Yeh, H-C., Heng, L., & Tseng, S-S. (2021). Exploring the impact of video making on students' writing skills. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 53(4), 446-456.

三. 附件 Appendix

Attached is the official student evaluation results for the course offered in the spring semester of 2022.

Statistical Results of the Course Questionnaire

The Second Semester, Academic Year 2022, National Taiwan University

Course Title: Digital Storytelling Practicum
Instructor: 翁家傑(JERRY CHIA-JE WENG)

Curriculum Number: FL3264 Class:
Date of Issue: 06/29/2023

Part I: Background Information

- How many times have I missed class ? (1)Never: 3 (50.0%) (2)1-2 times: 2 (33.3%) (3)3-4 times: 1 (16.7%) (4)5-9 times: 0 (0.0%) (5)10 times or above: 0 (0.0%) **average: 1.1 times**
- Were there any learning activities assigned outside the classroom ?
(1)Yes: 6(100.0%)
total: 0(0.0%) Exercise: 0(0.0%) Preparation for quizzes: 0(0.0%) Reading reflection: 0(0.0%)
total: 8(133.3%) Written report: 0(0.0%) Preparation for class oral presentation: 2(33.3%)
Project: 1(83.3%) Preparation for quizzes: 5(16.7%)
Others: 0(0.0%)
(2)No: 0(0.0%)
- How many hours per week (on average) did I spend on this course outside the classroom?
(1)0 hour: 0 (0.0%) (2)1 hours: 1 (16.7%) (3)2 hours: 1 (16.7%) (4)3 hours: 2 (33.3%)
(5)4 hours: 1 (16.7%) (6)5 hours: 1 (16.7%) (7)6 hours: 0 (0.0%) (8)7 hours: 0 (0.0%)
(9)More than 8 hours: 0 (0.0%) **average: 3.0hours**
- Please indicate the teaching mode of this course.
(1)entirely online instruction : 0 (0.0%)
(2)online instruction mainly and partly face-to-face: 0 (0.0%)
(3)face-to-face instruction mainly and partly online: 1 (16.7%)
(4)entirely face-to-face instruction: 5 (83.3%)

Part II: Curriculum and Instruction

	strongly disagree (1)	disagree (2)	neutral (3)	agree (4)	strongly agree (5)	score
1. The instructor was devoted to teaching.	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	6(100.0%)	5.00
2. In general, this is an effective course.	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	2(33.3%)	4(66.7%)	4.67
3. I would recommend this instructor to other students.	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	6(100.0%)	5.00
4. This course helps me to achieve course objectives. (Not included in the evaluation value)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	1(16.7%)	5(83.3%)	4.83

By the end of the course, students will gain an in-depth appreciation of storytelling techniques in selected literary, cultural, and cinematic texts. Those insights will be applied to a creative digital storytelling project that will be published online. In the process, students will develop valuable and marketable skills in narrative development as well as visual and sound editing.

The average evaluation scores of the whole university courses could be checked via the following online steps.

(Online Path: my NTU--> tPo --> start editing tPo --> students evaluations)

<Number of Enrollment: 8> <Number of Respondents: 6> <Counted Number of Statistics: 6>
<Non-counted Number of Statistics: 0> <Average score: 4.89>

The responses of the students who missed the class more than 5 time are not included in this analysis.

Instructor's Department: DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

Students' Background	Categories	Number of Students											
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	O
	College(Note 3rd)	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	A. 1st B. 2nd C. 3rd D. 4th E. above 4th F. Master G. Doctoral O. Others	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	—	—	—	—	—

Notes: 1 Score = (strongly disagree (1 pt)*samples+ disagree (2pts)*samples+...strongly agree(5pts)*samples)/ Counted Number of Statistics

2. The average score comes from the average scores of the three questions in Part 2

3. A: College of Liberal Arts B. College of Science C. College of Social Sciences D. College of Medicine E. College of Engineering

F. College of Bio-Resources & Agriculture G. College of Management H. College of Public Health I. College of Electrical

Engineering & Computer Science J. College of Law K. College of Life Science O. Others

102 30540