ISSN: 0975-833X

*Available online at http://www.journalcra.com*

*International Journal of Current Research*
*Vol. 9, Issue, 06, pp.52329-52337, June, 2017*

**INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CURRENT RESEARCH**

**RESEARCH ARTICLE**

# A STUDY OF STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF AFRICAN AMERICAN FACULTY AT A HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY (HBCU)

***Charletta Barringer-Brown**

Ed.D., is Affiliated with Fayetteville State University, Fayetteville, North Carolina

**ARTICLE INFO**

***Article History:***
Received 07th March, 2017
Received in revised form
16th April, 2017
Accepted 29th May, 2017
Published online 20th June, 2017

***Key words:***
HBCUs,
Faculty evaluations,
Course evaluations.

**ABSTRACT**

During Student evaluations of their instructors is common practice in higher education. The purpose of this study was to approach the relationship of race with regard to student evaluations. Atraditional end-of-course evaluation form used in the College of Education (COE) at one selected Historically Black College and University (HBCU) in Southeastern North Carolinawas studied. Teaching effectiveness of instructors based on race (Caucasians, African Americans, and other racial groups including Asians, Latinos, and Native Americans) was reviewed using the critical race theory (CRT). The student responses at the selected HBCU were then analyzed to determine if, race affected student evaluation in this setting.



**Citation: Charletta Barringer-Brown. 2017.** "A study of student evaluations of African American faculty at a historically black college and university (hbcu)", *International Journal of Current Research*, 9, (06), 52329-52337.

## INTRODUCTION

The landscape of higher education in the United States (U.S) has changed dramatically over past 60 years. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2014) as of fall 2013, there were over 1.5 million instructors working in degree-granting higher education institutions in the U.S. There were 51 percent who were working full-time and 49 percent that were working in a part-time capacity. There faculty members were working at the rank and title of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, lecturer, assisting professor, adjunct professor, and or interim professor. Additionally, the National Center for Education Statistics (2014) reported that of all full-time faculty in degree-granting institutions of higher education, 79 percent were White, 6 percent were Black, 5 percent were Hispanic, and 10 percent were Asian/Pacific Islander. Comprising less than 1 percent each were full-time faculty who were American Indian/Alaska Native and of Two or more races. Among full-time professors, 84 percent were White, 4 percent were Black, 3 percent were Hispanic, and 9 percent were Asian/Pacific Islander. This accounts for less than 1 percent each were professors who were American Indian/Alaska Native and of two or more races. In the field of higher education increasing liberal views within the society regarding race and ethnicity have resulted in an increased number of African-American faculty/ instructors being hired at predominately white institutions of higher education. This has also been the case with the increased hiring of Whites and 'Others' at institutions of higher education that are not historically predominately white. These trends have indicated that colleges and universities have slowly become more racially diverse, either through their own volition and efforts to hire staff from under-represented groups or because of the increasing number of qualified African-American faculty applicants (Fryberg and Martínez, 2014; Frey, 2014). Promoting racial and ethnic diversity in higher education infers that the students themselves are now exposed to a broader range of faculty members from different backgrounds, as well as other predominately white faculty members of an institution. The increased diversity in higher education has also resulted in unique situations and issues primarily based on how faculty members interact with students. One of these situations is the issue concerning faculty evaluations of instructors completed by students. Various studies have been made that have investigated the relationship between the racially diverse faculty members with students and other staff members, especially in institutions of higher learning that are predominately white (Littleford, Ong, Tseng, Milliken, andHumy, 2010; Bavishi, Madera and Hebl, 2010). However, according to Smith and Hawkins (2007) there are only a few sources of quantitative data that studied the relationship between the race and ethnicity of instructors with student

****Corresponding author: Charletta Barringer-Brown***
Ed.D., is affiliated with Fayetteville State University, Fayetteville, North Carolina

evaluations. Incidentally, the few sources available are concentrated on institutions that were previously, predominantly white as it is reasonable to conclude that racial factors are more significant in these institutions that previously were not as racially diverse in their faculty hiring. In some cases, these studies reviewed student evaluation responses in simulated situations. This study intends to tackle the issue from a different perspective, choosing to focus on an unexplored area of research using quantitative methods to study whether students evaluate African-American teachers differently from other faculty of different races. Student evaluation of their instructors is a common practice in higher education, as it is one of the few ways where data from the students themselves are used to evaluate the performance of an instructor (Murphy, Hallinger and Heck, 2013; Marzano and Toth, 2013; Darling-Hammond, 2013). The system has received its fair share of criticism primarily directed at the subjective nature of the student-responses. The main premise of these arguments lies with the perceived subjectivity of student responses; while the students are considered to be a direct source of information about instructor, students have generally are not trained to identify or critique quality instructor performance (Murphy, Hallinger and Heck, 2013; Marzano and Toth, 2013). Others have argued that there is no relationship between teaching method and comprehension (Kintsch and Vipond, 2014; Plourde, 2011), and that students overemphasize this relationship incorrectly when evaluating their instructors (Van de Pol, Volman and Beishuizen, 2010; Gurpinar, Alimoglu, Mamakli and Aktekin, 2010). Given these criticisms, the practice continues in different universities and colleges, using almost similar systems to evaluate their faculty members. Many sources have argued that the opinions of students can be swayed by a variety of subjective factors such as personal preference, beliefs and opinions, regardless of their truth or veracity, decreasing the overall objectivity of the practice (Darling-Hammond, Amrein-Beardsley, Haertel and Rothstein, 2012; Price, Handley, Millarand O'Donovan, 2010;Gurpinar, Alimoglu, Mamakli, and Aktekin, 2010).

Similar concerns but more focused on bigotry and prejudice have been identified as affecting how certain faculty members are evaluated. These concerns are mainly found in institutions that are predominately white, and some research in these areas reveal that is a prevailing perception from African American faculty members that their ratings from students are lower compared to other faculty members of different races (Ho, Thomsen, and Sidanius, 2009; Basow, Codos and Martin, 2013). These ratings affect faculty members benefits and employment status such as tenure, promotion and position, such concerns have merit and evidence have been gathered to support this concern in other studies. For this study, the focus is on Historically Black College/ Universities (HBCU) to determine if, similar situations occur in these types of universities. Historically Black College/University (HBCU) institution- Historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs) are institutions of higher education in the United States that were established before 1964 with the intention of primarily serving the African American community. They have always allowed admission to students of all races and are often known for having more racially diverse faculty members and students. Currently, there are 107 HBCUs in the United States, including public and private institutions, community and four-year institutions, medical and law schools (Brooks and Starks, 2011; Betsey, 2011).The largest of these institutions have more than 12,000 enrollees for each school year and have more than 4,000 undergraduate students within its colleges (Palmer, Hilton and Fountaine, 2012). Most were created in the aftermath of the American Civil War and are in the former slave states, although a few notable exceptions exist. If, low evaluations of African American faculty at predominately white institutions of higher education was motivated by race, it would be reasonable to expect that African American faculty would be evaluated significantly higher at a HBCU. However, further investigation is needed to determine if, race is the primary reason for the low evaluation rating or is it because of the actual teaching performance of the African American faculty members. This outcome would necessitate a study of the problem in another setting.

Concerning the information at hand, the purpose of this study was to approach the relationship of race with student evaluation from two fronts. First, to study this relationship, the STE tool used by undergraduate student to rate their faculty members is defined and studied. For HBCU's the teaching effectiveness of their faculty is evaluated using a traditional STE 36-ltem end-of-course evaluation form used in the College of Education (COE) at a Southeastern North Carolina, Historically Black College/University (HBCU), teaching focused institution. Second, using critical race theory (CRT), the teaching effectiveness of instructors based on race (Caucasians, African Americans, and other racial groups including Asians, Latinos, and Native Americans). As an overview, the evaluation covers three undergraduate, academic years' level courses that serves as a basis for student ratings for 28 items that are focused on end-of course evaluation. Twenty-six of these items cover multi-disciplinary aspects of teachings regarding the specific subject matter, while two items are global evaluation aspects that cover the overall teaching performance of the instructor and is given more weight on the end-of-course evaluation for. The remaining eight items are demographic data supplied by the student. The responses of the students from HBCU's are then analyzed to determine if, race affects student evaluation in HBCU's

**Conceptual framework**

Critical Race Theory (CRT) is a social science conceptual framework that applies critical theory that analyzes the social and cultural interaction of law, power and race with the main objective of identifying social inequality. This framework was developed in the field of legal studies to identify and analyze the effects of racism and ideals of racial supremacy in the United States justice system. The recognized contributors of this framework includes members of the academe of various institutions and legal scholars in response to the stunted process of racial reform in the country during the 1980's (Dixon and Rousseau, 2016; Hartlep, 2010; Connor, Ferri and Annamma, 2016). Critical Race Theory has three main premises. First, that race is a significant factor that determines inequality in society. This idea presupposes that an individual's race determines the extent and scope on how their individual rights are observed and protected, how their individual worth are judged and how their performance and attributes are evaluated or valued by society. This premise dictates that individuals from minority races are more likely to suffer from social oppression. Secondly, racial oppression, specifically, white supremacy is an ongoing process that spans generations. This premise infers that racial oppression is more than a generational idea, but rather a pervasiveidea that is already engrained in society and is reflected on how those that

have power enforce the law. Lastly, CRT promotes a race-conscious approach for social change that includes the aggressive use of political and social agenda for social change (Dixon and Rousseau, 2016; Hartlep, 2010; Connor, Ferri and Annamma, 2016). These three premises results into specific ideals that the theory also promotes. For instance, focus on inequality caused by race increases the emphasis on individual experiences or 'realities' of races, asserting the ideas that different people of different races are treated differently by society. The prevailing belief about white supremacy has caused the notion of associating CRT with revisionist history where in CRT asserts that the reforms made for racial civil rights are within the self-interests of Whites. CRT also supports that the current structural form of society favors the Whites over the other races. CRT also distinguishes itself from liberalism as a more aggressive form of social transformation that emphasize the need for different approaches depending on race and ethnicity (Dixon and Rousseau, 2016; Hartlep, 2010; Connor, Ferri and Annamma, 2016).

Critical Race Theory is an appropriate conceptual framework for the study primarily because of the first discussed premise that race is a significant factor that affects inequality and this relationship should also be considered within the context of student ratings given that it is probable that students give their ratings based on the race of their instructor (Dixon and Rousseau, 2016; Hartlep, 2010. As reported by Connor, Ferri and Annamma (2016) based on the results of the reviewed literature, instances of bias against African American faculty members in student evaluation has been identified in institutions where majority of undergraduates are Whites. Using CRT, applying the same analysis on HBCU's would show no such bias as these institutions have a larger African American student population. Based on CRT, it is prudent to assume that the results of the study would show a more even distribution of student evaluation compared with those in institutions that are predominantly White.

**Review of Related Literature**

Previous research that has studied the relationship between the race of the teacher and student's evaluation on performance can be group into two broad categories. The first group includes studies that studied student responses based on simulated situations in a neutral setting, while the second group includes studies that analyzed previous student evaluations of students to determine any trends or findings that supports the relationship of the teacher's race with the student's evaluation. Studies that belong in the first group primarily used simulated programs or exercises to determine student responses in a neutral setting. The study of Basow, Codos and Martin (2013) used a simulated lecture using virtual or animated professors, one as an African-American, and one Caucasian, teaching the same subject. Literature review of the study showed that African-American instructors have historically received poor student-evaluation and also perform poorly in terms of the academic performance of their students compared to White teachers. Three hundred and twenty-five undergraduate students were involved and answered a 25-point evaluation questionnaire at the end of the lectures and a 10 question exam to assess how much information the students were able to retain after the lectures. The researchers hypothesized that the Black professor will likely get a lower evaluation from the students based on their initial data gathering. However, the results were opposite. From the 25-point evaluation questionnaire, the Black professor had a higher rating from students compared with the White professor. But based on the 10 question exam, the students 'scores where better during the lecture of the White professor. While the results of the student-evaluation did not conform to reviewed studies, the student's performance remained consistent.

Similar findings were made by the study of Bavishi, Madera, and Hebl, (2010). In the study, students were presented with CVS of different professors that are different from their own race that they may encounter during their time in the university. The students were asked to rate the professors based on performance, legitimacy and interpersonal skills. In all counts, the African American instructors performed the poorest regardless of the race of the student. African American instructors were perceived to be less competent and legitimate compared to Asian and White professors. African American and Asian instructors were rated has having inferior interpersonal skills compared to the White professors. Bavishi, Madera, and Hebl(2010) concluded that prevailing stereotypes against African Americans faculty members is a serious concern as the observed negative perspective towards African American persists regardless of the race and ethnicity of students, inferring that not only White students have the capacity to negatively evaluate an African American faculty instructors based on skin color alone.

Littleford, Ong, Tseng, Milliken, Jennifer and Humy, (2010) developed and utilize their own measuring tool to determine whether the race (both the student and emulated instructors) and stereotypes affect teacher evaluation. The researchers has developed Perceptions of Diversity Instructors (PDI-32) based on two previously reviewed longitudinal studies that infers the role of race with teacher evaluation. The qualitative study utilized discussion groups among participating students from 116 business schools using the PDI-32 to evaluate the impact of verbalized factors that affect how they evaluate their teachers. Results of the study revealed that majority of students already have preconceived notions and beliefs about their teachers with different races. White instructors (American and European) are generally believed to be overall better at teaching compared with other ethnicities, but have less expertise with the content they are teaching. Students have also rated White instructors to have better interpersonal and communication skills towards students. African American and Asian teachers are perceived to be worse overall, have poor social and communication skills and were believed to be more bias or judgmental of their students. However, in this study Blacks and Asians where widely perceived to have more knowledge about their subject area, but are not as adept in teaching them in class compared to White.

Smith and Hawkins (2007) concluded that majority of these responses were made after only a few classes with the evaluated teachers. Having good interpersonal skills were identified by the study as a significant factors that improves the performance of instructorsas viewed by the students and have concluded that student-evaluation tools are currently too subjective to offer any fair assessment of the teaching ability of instructors. Studies that belong in the second group reviewed and analyzed student-teacher evaluation data over prolonged periods. One such study was the case study of Ho, Thomsen and Sidanus (2009) that reviewed the 8 year long student-teacher evaluation records of African American and White

faculty members of all the colleges and schools found in an undisclosed American university. Results of the study shows that African American instructors received low scores from students compared to White professors, but received a neutral score when the performance of their students were evaluated. The study has also determined that the personal beliefs or prejudice of students were statistically insignificant, inferring that students are more likely to evaluate African American instructors lower as compared to White professors, regardless of the presence or absence of racial prejudice against African American.

Ho, Thomsen and Sidanus (2009) explains that the consistently poor remarks made against black professors was caused by ingrained stereotypes in society that subconsciously manifest when individuals were confronted with a situation where they to need to make judgment involving Black individuals and warned that further scrutiny is needed when evaluating student-evaluations of faculty members. A similar study conducted by Reid (2010) offered the same results. Reviewing undergraduate student-evaluation data from 25 highest ranked liberal colleges in the US compiled using a third-party website (RateMyProfessors.Com). The study the evaluations for White (3,079), African American (149), Asians (238), Latino (130) and other races (130). Results of the study showed that overall, minority teachers received lower evaluation scores compared to White instructors. Overall, the evaluation reports for minority races, the African American instructors received the lowest student evaluation scores and the least positive feedback on overall quality, helpfulness and clarity. The study has also studied whether gender differences had any effects over student evaluations. Reid, (2010) has discovered that generally, gender differences have no significant impact, except for male African American instructors that have received worst performance evaluation scores compared to other male instructors with different ethnicities.

The study conducted by Reid (2010)was also one of the few studies that attempted to determine the relationship with instructor performance and student perspective. Using two-cluster analysis, the study has determined that best teachers in terms of knowledge retention and comprehension are generally White, while the instructors who received the lowest scores were identified as African American and Asians. Reid's(2010) study is one of the few reviewed sources wherein the student-evolution scores are consistent with objective measurements of evaluating instructor performance. All of these demonstrate that the disparity between how students rate instructors is based on multi-disciplinary and global aspects of the STE regardless on the format used and how these evaluations were presented to the students. The reviewed literature communicates a common message, suggesting that racial prejudice and personal opinions about the issue, may result into the subconscious action of evaluating African American instructors differently compared to White instructors regardless of actual performance. Some of these studies such as the study of Basow, Codos and Martin (2013) has indicated that this subconscious bias is more evident when data concerning the global measures of STE are analyzed. The main difference with reviewed literature with the current study is the setting. Evaluating the tendencies of a large Black student population has only been done in a few studies (Hembree, Costa, Glaude, Akbar, and Hale, 2013; Kendricks, Nedunuri, and Arment, 2013) and these studies did not even discuss racial prejudice within the student population.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### Purpose

The primary purpose of the study was to describe the undergraduate student ratings of an HBCU institution based on the traditional 36-tem evaluation form used in the university. A second purpose was to compare the performance of the evaluated instructors, who are likely candidates for tenure, based on their race, on par with the other reviewed literatures for the study. Focusing on this specific group of instructors is identified as a necessity because this group is likely motivated to excel with their teaching and abide by university rules and policies to attain tenure. This group is therefore the most affected by any form of bias with student evaluations, further demonstrating the impact of observed racial prejudice in student evaluations.

### Procedure

The reviewed data was obtained from the university's institutional review board (IRB) and was responsible for collecting, storing, and analyzing the completed forms. Approval to access this data was secured from required department chairs, deans, and other university administrators. Files that accounted for courses taught by faculty members that were eligible or seeking tenure that used the traditional 36 item end-course evaluation were obtained by a database was created from these files. The data covered the latest three-year period for the involve courses wherein undergraduate students to make their evaluations that consist of 537 undergraduate student forms. The created database was used to determine trends or patterns on student evaluation as well as evaluate the performance of involved instructors. Directories of faculty members were made available for the study and was used to assign the appropriate race to the involved instructors in the different faculties. Each faculty member was assigned based on their race resulting into three racial classifications. These are Whites, African Americans and Others (composed of Asians. Latinos, and Native American). The decision to compile Asians, Latinos and Native Americans, was made based on their relatively small numbers within the faculty. A total of 98 instructors were identified in the university COE databases that were tenured or on tenure track level. The majority of the instructors in the database were African American (54.08%, followed by Whites (31.63%), and the remaining came from the 'Other' category (14.28%). The College of Education (COE) at the selected HBCU institution was one of the colleges that had the largest number of African American faculty members. The COE at this HBCU is one of the largest in the country and offers 10 different Bachelor of Science degrees. The university grounds and facilities are located in an urban setting, which is located in Southeastern North Carolina. The selected HBCU has a undergraduate students population consisting of78% African American,13% White, while the remaining consisted of (9%) are a mixture of Asian, Native American, and Hispanic students.

### Instrumentation

The standard 36-item course evaluation (STE) covers both multi-dimensional and global criteria used to evaluate teachers that taught undergraduate students. The multi-dimensional aspect measure a specific component of teaching such as competence, knowledge, preparation and organization. Multi-

dimensional aspects also include how the instructors approach different scenarios in the classroom such as student support, the teacher's strategy on managing learning differences and how the teacher manages cultural difference in the classroom (Spooren, Brockx, and Mortelmans, 2013; Zhao and Gallant, 2012). These multi-dimensional aspects were determine through simple, straightforward statements that measures the agreeability of students on how each of these statements apply to the instructor being evaluated using a 5-point Likert scale. The global measures account for the overall impressions or how the students perceive how the multi-dimensional aspects mesh together to reflect the overall performance of the instructor where in the faculty members with the highest rated responses were considered having shown better teaching technique and competence compared with their peers.

The questionnaire is printed onto a machine-readable page where the student's shaded answers are scanned and recorded. The first 8 items of the CTE covers the student's demographic data. Questions 9- 34 covers the discussed multi-dimensional aspects of the evaluation. The Likert scale responses are: 1=Almost Never, 2= Infrequently, 3=Occasionally, 4=Often and 5=Almost Always. The last two questions covers the global measures of the evaluation and have a different Likert scale. The responses are: 1=Poor, 2= Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good and 5=Excellent. Collected data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. The means of the responses and standard deviation for each racial category was calculated. A t-test was then conducted to compare the means of the different racial categories to determine any significant relationships within the responses.

## RESULTS

### Overview of Student Ratings and evaluation

The analyzed student evaluation ratings are presented in the table below (Table 1). These findings reflect student undergraduate student evaluations within a three-year period. Data analysis shows that overall, the undergraduate students gave an average performance evaluation for multi-dimensional aspects to all qualified faculty members as a whole. For the multi-dimensional aspects, the lowest mean response for all racial categories is 3.80, for the question about testing materials and coverage (question 31) while the highest was at 4.69 for the question referring to the teacher's knowledge of the subject (question 33). For the global measures, the calculated mean scores were less favorable. For question 35, the mean score was 3.72, while the mean score for question 36 was 3.93. Based on these results, it may seem to infer that overall, it is likely that majority of students consider their teachers as merely 'average' with the possibility that only a few teachers received an 'above average'. However, it can be identified that the low average mean score given to teachers under the 'Black' category, has lowered the overall average mean score for the two global measures considering that teachers under both 'White' and 'Others' categories received mean scores above 4 or 'Very Good' rating. Mean score of the student ratings for items 9-34 revealed that instructors identified as 'Whites' received the highest mean scores overall, having been given the highest means responses for 19 out of 26 multi-dimensional aspects (9,10,13-16,18-20,23-28,30,32-34). Teachers that fall under the 'Other" category received the second highest mean score, having been given the highest mean response on 7 out of the 26 multi-dimensional aspects (11,12,17,21,22,29 and 31). Instructors that categorized as 'African American' received the lowest overall means scores and lagged behind the other two categories on all multi-dimensional aspects of the evaluation form. Furthermore, 'African American' instructors received the lowest mean score on questions that have negative connotations (12, 26 and 32). From these results, it can be determined that compared to teachers under the 'White' and 'Others' categories, 'African American' teachers are more likely observed to provide waste time on irrelevant course materials and assign and demand lot more unreasonable work to students. A low mean score in these negative multi-dimensional aspects may help explain the overall negative perception and overall low mean evaluation score, of students towards 'African American' instructors.

### Differences in student ratings based on race

The results of the STE shows that 'African American' instructors have received a lower mean score in almost all of the 36-point teacher evaluation. Based on these results alone, it cannot be inferred if the negative scores are influenced by racial issues are solely based on the poor performance of 'African American' instructors relative to their peers. To determine if a statistically significant relationship exists between race and student evaluation scores, a t-test (95% CI, alpha: 0.05) needs to be conducted. Under this test, the 'Others' category is discarded because there is not enough sample available to infer a significant comparison with the two other larger groups. To compare the 'White' and the 'African American' categories, two different comparisons were made. One from the aggregate of the 36-STE and another set of tests that compares the average mean score for individual aspects to identify areas where there are significant differences between the two groups. Analyzing the data from the multi-disciplinary aspect, results of the t-test ($p$=2.20 at 95% confidence interval) shows while the overall mean score received by the 'African American' instructors are lower compared with the 'White' instructors, the difference with the scores are statistically insignificant. This finding infers that overall, the capabilities and performance of the teachers in both categories are comparable. While the mean score of the 'White' instructors are better overall, the large difference of numbers between the two populations makes the difference statistically irrelevant when the aggregate data is analyzed. This finding infers that while the 'African American' instructors received the lowest scores overall, especially in the multi-disciplinary aspects in the STE that demonstrate negative instructor practices, the difference overall is irrelevant and not enough to distinguish the 'White' instructors from the 'African American' in terms of overall teaching performance. Examining each multi-disciplinary aspect separately can provide more specific details that may help explain the difference between the two groups. There are two multi-disciplinary aspects that 'White' instructors are statistically better than 'African American' instructors. These were aspect 15, which dealt with how the teacher helps their student see appreciate the potential of their course and see beyond its limits ($p$=0.0051 at 95%; M: 4.65, SD:0.91 for 'Whites', M: 3.2, SD;1.38 for 'African American'), aspect 34that deals with the instructor's ability to identify learning difficulties in students ($p$=0286. at 95%; M: 4.36, SD:0.99 for 'Whites', M: 3.22, SD;1.41 for 'African American').

**Table 1. Undergraduate Student Ratings for STE; Items 9-36**

| Item | Statement | White | Black | Others |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | The instructor's communication of course expectations (such as grading criteria, online organization, assignment delivery options, and options for seeking assistance. | | | |
| | Mean | 4.40 | 3.70 | 4.55 |
| | Standard Dev. | 0.85 | 1.28 | 0.65 |
| 10 | The course content (such as simulations, reading material, group assignments, discussions, tutorials and webinars, individual assignments, web links, audio and video files, surveys, self-tests, and/or any additional instructor created content. | | | |
| | Mean | 4.55 | 3.90 | 4.51 |
| | Standard Dev. | 0.79 | 1.10 | 0.70 |
| 11 | The instructor's clarity about expectations throughout the course. | | | |
| | Mean | 4.30 | 3.95 | 4.34 |
| | Standard Dev. | 1.13 | 1.23 | 0.97 |
| 12 | The instructor's use of class design (such as assignment timing, frequency of assignments and variety of assignments, etc.) | | | |
| | Mean | 4.03 | 3.95 | 4.30 |
| | Standard Dev. | 1.08 | 1.16 | 0.94 |
| 13 | Assess the extent in which the course contributed to your learning (set aside your feelings about subject matter, course difficulty, and other similar factors). | | | |
| | Mean | 4.39 | 4.16 | 4.28 |
| | Standard Dev. | 0.99 | 1.03 | 0.99 |
| 14 | The instructor provided open communication and encouraged students to ask questions | | | |
| | Mean | 4.56 | 4.40 | 4.44 |
| | Standard Dev. | 0.80 | 0.99 | 0.87 |
| 15 | The instructor expanded your levels of learning to assist in other courses. | | | |
| | Mean | 4.65 | 3.20 | 4.44 |
| | Standard Dev. | 0.91 | 1.38 | 0.87 |
| 16 | The Instructor was prepared for each class meeting. | | | |
| | Mean | 4.61 | 4.15 | 4.51 |
| | Standard Dev. | 0.74 | 1.18 | 0.85 |
| 17 | The instructor clearly described the grading expectations for the course. | | | |
| | Mean | 4.23 | 3.88 | 4.41 |
| | Standard Dev. | 1.08 | 1.39 | 1.00 |
| 18 | Test content was representative of assigned material | | | |
| | Mean | 4.51 | 4.00 | 4.33 |
| | Standard Dev. | .77 | 1.20 | 0.97 |
| 19 | The instructor provided timely feedback to students. | | | |
| | Mean | 4.21 | 3.70 | 4.09 |
| | Standard Dev. | 0.95 | 1.21 | 1.04 |
| 20 | The Instructor demonstrated enthusiasm to students regarding the subject matter | | | |
| | Mean | 4.72 | 4.15 | 4.54 |
| | Standard Dev. | 0.62 | 0.98 | 0.76 |
| 21 | The instructor was clear about basic course principles. | | | |
| | Mean | 4.21 | 3.84 | 4.29 |
| | Standard Dev. | 1.07 | 1.28 | 1.00 |
| 22 | The instructor encouraged critical thinking-problem solving. | | | |
| | Mean | 4.29 | 3.84 | 4.38 |
| | Standard Dev. | 1.00 | 1.28 | 0.89 |
| 23 | The syllabus was available the first week of class. | | | |
| | Mean | 4.52 | 3.88 | 4.29 |
| | Standard Dev. | 0.81 | 1.20 | 0.94 |
| 24 | The instructor tried to simulate creative abilities | | | |
| | Mean | 4.18 | 3.78 | 4.08 |
| | Standard Dev. | 1.03 | 1.19 | 1.09 |
| 25 | The instructor interacted with the class regularly (such as posting to boards, updating assignments, sending out regular e-mails grading assignments, providing feedback, etc. | | | |
| | Mean | 3.98 | 3.39 | 3.82 |
| | Standard Dev. | 1.17 | 1.38 | 1.25 |
| 26 | The instructor assigned meaningful assignments. | | | |
| | Mean | 4.28 | 3.98 | 4.03 |
| | Standard Dev. | 1.03 | 1.19 | 1.17 |
| 27 | The instructor gave presentations that were logically arranged | | | |
| | Mean | 4.50 | 3.80 | 4.35 |
| | Standard Dev. | 0.85 | 1.27 | 0.97 |
| 28 | The instructor tried to increase interests of class members in the subject | | | |
| | Mean | 4.40 | 3.90 | 4.29 |
| | Standard Dev. | 0.83 | 1.16 | 0.94 |
| 29 | The instructor's information seemed updated | | | |
| | Mean | 4.66 | 4.32 | 4.71 |
| | Standard Dev. | 0.60 | 0.88 | 0.61 |

……continue

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 30 | What grade do you ex | | | |
| | Mean | 4.45 | 3.90 | 4.20 |
| | Standard Dev. | 0.99 | 1.28 | 1.02 |
| 31 | The instructor explained confusing materials to students | | | |
| | Mean | 3.96 | 3.48 | 4.10 |
| | Standard dev. | 1.29 | 1.34 | 1.20 |
| 32 | The instructor does not demand an unreasonably large amount of work | | | |
| | Mean | 4.06 | 4.01 | 4.04 |
| | Standard Dev. | 1.12 | 1.21 | 1.15 |
| 33 | The instructor is well-informed about the course materials presented | | | |
| | Mean | 4.72 | 4.23 | 4.71 |
| | Standard Dev. | 0.57 | 1.02 | 0.59 |
| 34 | The instructor recognized student's difficulties in understanding new materials | | | |
| | Mean | 4.36 | 3.22 | 3.99 |
| | Standard Dev. | 0.99 | 1.41 | 1.05 |
| 35 | Overall value of course | | | |
| | Mean | 4.65 | 3.31 | 3.82 |
| | Standard Dev. | 0.99 | 1.28 | 1.12 |
| 36 | Overall Teaching Ability | | | |
| | Mean | 4.66 | 3.48 | 4.08 |
| | Standard Dev. | 0.77 | 1.36 | 1.05 |

As for global aspects, results of the t-test shows that there is a statistical significance with the evaluation score for the two categories in global aspect 35 ('Overall value of the Course'; $p$=0.0076 at 95% CI; %; M: 4.65, SD:0.99 for 'Whites', M: 3.31, SD: 1.28 for 'African American') and 36 ('Overall Teaching Ability'; $p$=0.0138 at 95% CI; M: 4.66, SD:0.77 for 'Whites', M: 3.48, SD: 1.36 for 'African American'). In these two aspects, instructors from the 'White' category received significantly higher ratings compared to the 'African American'. These results differ with the multi-disciplinary aspects that showed that the 'Whites' and 'African Americans' are virtually equal in performance aside from two specific aspects. Based on CRT, the reason behind the difference between the evaluation ratings between multi-disciplinary and global aspects can be attributed to prevailing racial bias against African American as this finding is consistent with the results of reviewed literature and studies of Bavishi, Madera, and Hebl (2010) that show how instructors that demonstrate similar skills, competence and quality teaching methods, can be given significantly different evaluation scores because of their race. As reported by and Reid (2010) data analysis of the multi-disciplinary aspects show that the range of difference between the student evaluations are based on random, separate events and are thus can be considered as genuine responses that can be caused by a number of factors that includes individual preference of the student, different experiences, and the relationship with the individual students and the instructors.

The same randomness is not seen when the global disciplinary aspects are analyzed as the t-test shows that the difference between the 'White' and 'African American' instructors are significant enough that the difference cannot simply be attributed to random sequence of events. The responses for both the multi-disciplinary and global aspects should remain consistent as designed. However, when race is included as a variable in the study like in previous reviewed research, the difference with the mean and standard deviation of the two groups becomes statistically significant and are caused by deliberate events and actions. Considering that the statistical difference of this pattern is present only in other studies where race is a variable, the initial belief of prevailing racial prejudice against African American instructors has significance. The fact that the same dataset is identified in a HBCU institution where majority of students are African American also showed that this phenomenon occurs regardless of the race of the students as previously believed in some studies. Initially, there were expectations based on the reviewed literature that 'African American' instructors performed poorly as compared to other instructors. However, the observed parity between 'Whites' and 'African American' helps discredit the belief as to the probability that overall, the competence level of African American instructors was recognizable by the students. Based on the available data, there are no other identified reason, which would explain the discrepancy between how the students evaluated their instructors based on multi-disciplinary and global aspects, except for the idea that student's evaluation ratings are influenced by the race of the evaluated instructors when overall performance and overall course value is evaluated. It is reasonable to assume that ainstructor that has shown to have the ability to receive 'good' to average scores would have similar marks for global aspects of the STE. The results of the study show the opposite. Other factors such as gender and age of the instructors were left-out of the study, racial issues and tendencies remained a probable reason as observed in other previous studies. Results of the study showed that the same pattern of varying instructor performance can also be seen in HBCUs where the majority of students are also African American, showing that the race of the students who complete the evaluation is a significant factor that affects how instructors were evaluated.

## Conclusion and Recommendation

Results of the study were consistent with previously reviewed studies, which showed that students, regardless of race and gender, have a tendency to demonstrate some form of racial prejudice against African American instructors. The study conclude that the result was consistent with similar studies only with the global aspects of a STE and that racial prejudice should be considered as a significant reason for the occurrence. In some studies, these tendencies were observed in both the multi-disciplinary and global aspects but were conducted in primarily White student populations. The rationale for this study was that students at a HBCU, where the majority of the students are African American, would demonstrate a different set of results was nulled as the evaluation results remained consistent with previously reviewed studies. This finding suggested that racial prejudice persists regardless of the race of the students who complete the faculty evaluation and further supports the tenets of the CRT. The focus lies with how different the multi-disciplinary and global aspects were

evaluated. Judging from mean evaluation scores and standard deviation, the 'African American' instructors were evaluated poorly by students of all races surveyed. Only by using t-test was it revealed that the initially analyzed difference was statistically insignificant. This pattern has also been observed in reviewed literature and other similar studies of STE and may indicate an underlying trend on how students use the multi-disciplinary aspects of the STE to evaluate instructors given that many institutions present these aspects differently and that difference may not as a significant as originally thought.

This observation is different when global teaching aspects are evaluated as seen in the results. There was clearer distinction that separates the 'White' from 'African American' instructors unlike with the multi-disciplinary aspects. As asserted by (Basow, Codos and Martin, 2013) racial bias and personal opinions about its impact is shown to be a probable cause of this difference as the same results is seen only in studies that consider race as a variable compared to other studies that exclude it. Using CRT as a framework further supports this probability as the analyzed data that includes the low scores given to 'African Americans' is a valid issue that supports CRT's indication that African Americans can be judged unfairly even if they show comparable performance to Whites. These findings indicate that global evaluation measures are better predictors of student evaluation when race is considered and should be given more weight when analyzing the performance of instructors. Outside of racial prejudice, there are other factors that can be considered that help explain the statistical disparity between the multi-disciplinary and global aspects. As Reid (2010) suggested there is no way to confirm the effect of these factors because not enough data is present in the created database since the race of the faculty members was the focused. For instance, the significant advantage the 'White' instructors have over the 'African American' teachers in evaluation points 15 and 34 may be enough to give a significant advantage to 'White' instructors over 'African American'. Likewise, the low evaluation scores that 'African American' instructors received for items 12, 16,32 may also influenced the students to give African American a lower evaluation score in the global evaluations aspects. But these are only a few points out of 26 multi-disciplinary aspects and it is reasonable to suspect that these aspects alone are not statistically significant enough to tilt the ratings in favor of the 'White' instructors considering that majority of the STE evaluation already indicate parity between the groups. However, it is possible that there are students that value these aspects more than the others influencing their decision to give a lower score for the global evaluation aspect.

The study found that based on the constructed database, there is insufficient data to identify this difference and will require further studies in the future. The same can be stated for evaluation points 12, 16 and 32, evaluation points that have negative connotations. Historically, low scores in these areas do not immediately indicate poor teaching performance as school work and requirements can vary depending on the year level, course and requirements for advancing to the next year level. Further study is needed to investigate how having a poor score with these three points increases the likelihood that these i will also perform poorly under the global aspects of the STE. In a previous study conducted by Kintsch and Vipond (2014) these claims have disputed their results and have shown that the difference is statistically insignificant. Other sources such as the study of Wilkins and Balakrishnan (2013) and Oliveri, Ercikan, and Zumbo (2013) have different findings, asserting that there are situations where in the multi-disciplinary and global aspects are completed independently from each other, requiring the need to continue analyzing student evaluation scores using different contexts. For instance, how the Likert scale is constructed is considered by some researchers such as Zhao and Gallant (2012) to be another possible issue. As previous studies have shown, making changes to the Likert scale such as eliminating the middle-ground respond, can force participants to make more defined decisions with their choices. Zhao and Gallant (2012) also reported that analyzing any written responses from students through qualitative, discourse studies can also provide additional data that can help investigate how if, African American instructors are being evaluated unfairly because of their race.

## REFERENCES


American Federation of Teachers. 2010. *Promoting racial and ethnic diversity in the faculty: What higher education unions can do*. Washington, DC: American Federation of Teachers.

Basow, S., Codos, S., and Martin, J. 2013. The Effects of Professors' Race and Gender on Student Evaluations And Performance. *College Student Journal, 47*(2), 352-363.

Bavishi, A., Madera, J. M., and Hebl, M. R. 2010. The effect of professor ethnicity and gender on student evaluations: Judged before met. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 3*(4), 245-256. doi:10.1037/a0020763

Darling-Hammond, L., Amrein-Beardsley, A., Haertel, E., and Rothstein, J. 2012. Evaluating teacher evaluation. The Phi Delta Kappan, 93(6), 8-15.

Frey, W. H. 2014. *Diversity Explosion: How New Racial Demographics are Remaking America*. Washington, D.C: Brookings Institution Press.

Fryberg, S. A., andMartínez, E. J. 2014. *The truly diverse faculty: New dialogues in American higher education*. New York City, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gurpinar, E., Alimoglu, M. K., Mamakli, S., andAktekin, M. 2010. Can learning style predict student satisfaction with different instruction methods and academic achievement in medical education?. Advances in Physiology Education, 34(4), 192-196.

Hartlep, N. D. 2010. Going public: Critical race theory and issues of social justice. Mustang, Okl.: Tate Publishing and Enterprises.

Hembree, G., Costa, A., Glaude, T., Akbar, R., and Hale, R. P. (2013). A Model That Works: An Hbcu Preparing Teachers to Educate Diverse Students. *Journal of Intercultural Disciplines*, *13*, 23.

Ho, A. K., Thomsen, L., and Sidanius, J. 2009. Perceived Academic Competence and Overall Job Evaluations: Students' Evaluations of African American and European American Professors. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 39*(2), 389-406. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2008.00443.x

Kendricks, K. D., Nedunuri, K. V. and Arment, A. R. 2013. Minority student perceptions of the impact of mentoring to enhance academic performance in STEM disciplines. *Journal of STEM Education: Innovations and Research*, *14*(2), 38.

Kintsch, W. and Vipond, D. 2014. Reading comprehension and readability in educational practice and psychological theory. Perspectives on memory research: essays in honor

of Uppsala University's 500th Anniversary, L. Nilsson, Editor. 1979, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 329-65.

Littleford, L. N., Ong, K. S., Tseng, A., Milliken, J. C., and Humy, S. L. 2010. Perceptions of European American and African American instructors teaching race-focused courses. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education,3*(4), 230-244. doi:10.1037/a0020950

Murphy, J., Hallinger, P., and Heck, R. H. 2013. Leading via Teacher Evaluation: The Case of the Missing Clothes? *Educational Researcher,42*(6), 349-354. doi:10.3102/0013189x13499625

National Center for Education Statistics 2014. Race and ethnicity of college faculty. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=61

Palmer, R. T., Hilton, A. A. and Fountaine, T. P. 2012. *Black graduate education at historically Black colleges and universities: Trends, experiences, and outcomes*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Pub.

Reid, L. D. 2010. The role of perceived race and gender in the evaluation of college teaching on RateMyProfessors.Com. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 3*(3), 137-152. doi:10.1037/a0019865

Smith, B. and Hawkins, B. 2007. Examining student evaluations of black college faculty: does race matter? *The Journal of Negro Education, 80* (2), 49-162.

Spooren, P., Brockx, B., and Mortelmans, D. 2013. On the validity of student evaluation of teaching the state of the art. Review of Educational Research, 83(4), 598-642.)

Van de Pol, J., Volman, M., and Beishuizen, J. 2010. Scaffolding in teacher–student interaction: A decade of research. *Educational Psychology Review*, 22(3), 271-296.

Wilkins, S., and Balakrishnan, M. 2013. Assessing student satisfaction in transnational higher education. *International Journal of Educational Management,* 27(2), 143-156.

Zhao, J., and Gallant, D. J. 2012. Student evaluation of instruction in higher education: exploring issues of validity and reliability. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education,* 37(2), 227-235.

*******