

ADVANCE

EXCELLENCE | EQUITY | DIVERSITY

Ways to reduce bias in the evaluation of faculty

- Allow sufficient time for evaluations, because evaluators draw on stereotypes more when rushed or distracted.
- Don't depend too heavily on a single element (Bauer & Baltes, 2002; Blair & Banaji, 1996; Martell, 1991)
- Develop criteria for evaluation and apply them consistently to all faculty
 - Structured criteria for decision-making result in more accurate evaluations (Martell & Guzzo, 1991)
 - Structured processes for recording observations increase accuracy and reduce bias (Bauer & Baltes, 2002)
- Learn to recognize bias in written evaluations and how to minimize bias when writing evaluations (Trix & Psenka, 2003)
- Evaluations that describe specific behaviors, rather than overall evaluations, may be more fair (Bauer & Baltes, 2002)
- Writing both positive & negative comments on each individual is beneficial - reduces the use of stereotypes by treating the ratee as an individual (Bauer & Baltes, 2002)
- Have evaluators justify opinions. Increased accountability increases the accuracy in evaluations (Lerner & Tetlock, 1999)
- Avoid single general items as key measures of student ratings. Use student evaluations in conjunction with peer evaluations of teaching & course materials (Aleamoni, 1999)
- Have good intentions: when people adopt accuracy goals, intending to evaluate others as unique individuals, bias is reduced (Blair & Banaji, 1996; Wheeler & Fiske, 1991)
- Develop college & departmental norms for annual performance and P&T reviews that emphasize fairness and accuracy (Fiske, 2004)
- Have diverse review committees to improve accuracy (Kanter, 1977; Valian, 1998; Turner, 1999)
- Support your colleagues: research shows that visible support from senior & respected colleagues can reduce impact of negative stereotypes and result in more fair evaluations (Brown & Geis, 1984)