BEST PRACTICES

to minimize bias in the evaluation of faculty

1. **Allow sufficient time for evaluations**, because evaluators draw on stereotypes more when rushed or distracted. Take time to evaluate each candidate’s entire file; don’t depend too heavily on only one element. (Martell, 1991; Bauer & Baltes, 2002).

2. **Develop criteria for evaluation and apply them consistently to all faculty.**
   a. Structured criteria for decision-making result in more accurate evaluations (Martell & Guzzo, 1991).
   b. Structured processes for recording observations increase accuracy and reduce bias (Bauer & Baltes, 2002).

3. **Learn to recognize bias in written evaluations** and how to minimize bias when writing evaluations (Trix & Psenka, 2003).

4. **Evaluations that describe specific behaviors**, rather than overall evaluations, may be more fair as representations (Bauer & Baltes, 2002).

5. **Writing both positive and negative comments on each individual** is beneficial because it individuates the ratee and reduces the use of stereotypes (Bauer & Baltes, 2002).

6. **Have evaluators justify opinions.** Increased accountability increases the accuracy in evaluations (Lerner & Tetlock, 1999).

7. **Avoid single general items as key measures of student ratings.** Use student evaluations in conjunction with peer evaluations of teaching and course materials (Aleamoni, 1999).

8. **Have good intentions:** when people adopt accuracy goals, intending to evaluate others as unique individuals, bias is reduced (Blair & Banaji, 1996; Wheeler & Fiske, 1991).

9. **Develop college and departmental norms** for annual performance and P&T reviews that emphasize fairness and accuracy (Fiske, 2002).

10. **Have diverse review committees to improve accuracy** (Kanter, 1977; Valian, 1998; Onorato & Turner, 2004).

11. **Support your colleagues:** research shows that visible support from senior and respected colleagues can reduce impact of negative stereotypes and result in more fair evaluations (Brown & Geis, 1984).