The UAF I	Faculty Senate passed the following at Meeting #173_on March 7, 2011:
<u>MOTION</u>	<u>:</u>
ThellAEl	Faculty Canata yman the recommendation of the Faculty Development. Accomment
	Agazitic Capata upon the recommendation of the Equilier Development Agazament
•	
and Improv	vement Committee, moves to approve the following actions:
• New	vement Committee, moves to approve the following actions: electronic student evaluations will not be implemented without Faculty Senate proval.
New of appMore	electronic student evaluations will not be implemented without Faculty Senate proval.
New of appMore the	electronic student evaluations will not be implemented without Faculty Senate proval. research on this issue will be done at the administrative level in order to complement
 New of app More the Eff 	electronic student evaluations will not be implemented without Faculty Senate broval. research on this issue will be done at the administrative level in order to complement FDAI committee's concerns and recommendations (attached). fective: Immediately tionale: During extensive discussions in the Faculty Development, Assessment and
 New of app More the Eff Rat 	electronic student evaluations will not be implemented without Faculty Senate broval. research on this issue will be done at the administrative level in order to complement FDAI committee's concerns and recommendations (attached). ective: Immediately cionale: During extensive discussions in the Faculty Development, Assessment and provement Committee, areas were identified that indicate that some aspects of online

Attachment to Motion submitted by the FDAI Committee: To: **Faculty Senate** This it a nummarica furthest has been discussed in our remedition as and in a the ours and some of electronic student evaluations. Committee member Melanie Arthur deserves special credit for digging more deeply into this issue, and compiling and summarizing some crucial data (see below). Attached are the two articles that best illustrate the current unreliable state of online surveys of teaching. The first attached article compares modes of administration (paper vs online), finding a huge

difference in response rates for in-class versus online evaluations (70% versus 29%, in the absence of special incentives for online evaluators). They included two additional groups of online evaluations, one in which the instructor provided an in-class demo of the online evaluation