CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING PERFORMANCE AND POTENTIAL *Guidelines for Blocking Bias*

All solutions must *block* the use of stereotypes in assessing merit. When stereotypes become a shortcut, bias can creep into the evaluation process. This is especially the case when evaluators are rushed because they rely on shortcuts and don't think carefully about their decisions.

SEE BIAS / BLOCK BIAS

Make sure the criteria you choose to assess merit are applied consistently. Assessments of "great," "good" and "needs improvement" may not be applied equally to all candidates. This is difficult to see if you write evaluations in isolation. Compare and contrast against all the members of your team.

Establish criteria in advance of reviews

Take time and add process. Don't rush. First determine which criteria are most important. Then prioritize the most important criteria, level-set "good" and benchmark against your peers to ensure consistency.

Equalize the bar used in evaluation (notice a higher bar or leniency)

Do not require extra proof or additional evidence of "good," and do not simply give a "pass" to employees you know better or with whom you are more comfortable.

Discard unnecessary criteria that may have inherent bias

Do you require participation in forums or engagements where men are more likely to be invited or welcome?

Block undue criticism of women's (and men's) personalities

Notice if you give harsh feedback and question if your comments are truly warranted. Instead of commenting on personalities (good or bad), focus on skills and accomplishments. Provide developmental feedback to help the person grow into a higher level of performance.

Review all evaluations for consistency

Take a final look. Do all reviews have a consistent length, give similar amounts of developmental feedback and offer a balanced evaluation of the leadership principles?

Share the knowledge

Ensure members of your team have a consistent approach to writing and evaluating the "content" of their reviews before beginning the process.

© Stanford University 2015. All Rights Reserved. Clayman Institute at Stanford University.