

Literature Resources on Transparency in Evaluation in the Workplace

1. Science and Engineering Subcommittee on Faculty Evaluation and Development at the University of Michigan. (2004). *Report from the Gender in Science and Engineering Subcommittee on Faculty Evaluation and Development*. Available at: http://www.advance.rackham.umich.edu/GSE-Faculty_%20Evaluation_%20Development.pdf. Accessed on February 13, 2013.

This report states that annual review information should be collected from all faculty in a standardized manner within all departments and colleges. The committee has distilled what it believes are best practices into a faculty evaluation template form (see Appendix A of this document).

2. Waltman, J. (2007). Center for the Education on Women at the University of Michigan. *Final Report: ADVANCE Departmental Transformation Grant Faculty Interviews, 2006*. Available at: http://www.advance.rackham.umich.edu/DTG_FacultyInterviews_ADVANCE.pdf. Accessed on February 13, 2013.

This is a final report from the University of Michigan's Departmental Transformation Grant faculty interviews from 2006. The grants to departments "involved substantial awards (up to \$250,000) to departments that made rigorous, specific and ambitious proposals for improving their own internal policies, practices and climates, based on analyses of the current situation and recent past" (p. 1). In one department, an outcome of the grant was the improvement in the transparency of the tenure process (see p. 3).

3. Promotion and Tenure ADVANCE Committee, Georgia Institute of Technology (2003). *Recommended Best Practices in Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Processes*. Available at: <http://www.advance.gatech.edu/archive/ptac/RPTBestPracticesFinalOct03.pdf>. Accessed on February 13, 2013.

The Promotion and Tenure ADVANCE Committee (PTAC) stresses the importance of openness and transparency in the reappointment, promotion, and tenure processes at Georgia Tech.

4. Wylie, A., Jakobsen, J.R., and Fosado, G. (2007). *Women, Work, and the Academy: Strategies for Responding to "Post-Civil Rights Era" Gender Discrimination*. New York: Barnard Center for Research on Women.

Based upon their review of published research studies and reports, the authors provide a set of policy recommendations for academic decision makers that include the following (p. 14): "Structure evaluation procedures and decisions about resource allocation to ensure accountability for decisions and the transparency of the criteria on the basis of which they are made."

5. Chisholm, M., Hayes, E.J., LaBrecque, S., and Smith, D. (2011). The role of faculty evaluation in transformative change. *Journal of Faculty Development*, 25(1), 36-42.

This article emphasizes the importance of having a shared sense in the academic work environment that the evaluation system is impartial and as objective as possible.

“... even though evaluation rests on subjective judgments, institutions must nonetheless strive to realize and maintain among all those affected a shared sense that the system is at least impartial and as objective as possible.” (p. 37).

6. American Council on Education, American Association of University Professors, and United Educators Insurance Risk Retention Group, Inc. (2000). *Good practice in tenure evaluation: advice for tenured faculty, department chairs, and academic administrators*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education. Available at: http://www.uky.edu/Provost/APFA/Department_Chairs/GoodPracticetenureeval.pdf. Accessed on February 13, 2013.

This guide provides recommendations for the best practices for tenure evaluation. The four major themes are: clarity in standards and procedure for tenure evaluations, consistency in tenure decisions, candor in the evaluation of tenure-track faculty, and caring for unsuccessful candidates.

7. Arreola, R.A. (2007). *Developing a comprehensive faculty evaluation system: a guide to designing, building, and operating large-scale faculty evaluation systems*. Bolton, MA: Anker Pub. Co.

This book emphasizes the need for objectivity in evaluations and that if objectivity is compromised, this will damage the credibility of the system. Author Raoul Arreola manages a website (<http://www.cedanet.com>) in which he has included slides (which I have attached to the email that I have sent with this document) that outline his recommended process for designing a comprehensive faculty evaluation system. His book is well-cited in the literature on faculty evaluation.