HOWARD UNIVERSITY

Goal: To assist Howard University with financial resources needed to carry out its educational mission.	Funding History ($ in millions)			
	Fiscal Year	Appropriation	Fiscal Year	Appropriation
Legislation: Congress issued a charter for Howard University by an act of March 2, 1867, and provided for federal assistance in subsequent acts (codified, as amended, at 20 U.S.C. 121 to 130aa-5).	1985	$158	2000	$219
	1990	$182	2001	$232
	1995	$205	2002 (Requested)	$232

Program Description

The main goal is to improve the quality and financial strength of Howard University as a vehicle for providing postsecondary access and opportunity for predominantly African Americans. Funds are designed to help support Howard University's academic operations, endowment, research programs, and the University Hospital.

Howard University, located in Washington, D.C., provides a major avenue of postsecondary access and opportunity for African Americans and other historically disenfranchised groups. The University offers master's degrees and doctoral degrees in 56 and 26 areas, respectively. Fall enrollment in 2000 includes 10,010 students of which 6,702 are at the undergraduate level.

The Howard University annual appropriation provides partial support to the University in areas such as the University's academic program; the endowment; the University Hospital; and construction, development, improvement, and maintenance of the University. Howard University has the discretion to use appropriated funds for the following activities: Academic Program, Endowment Program, Research Program, Construction, and Howard University Hospital.

For more information, please visit the program Web site at: http://www.howard.edu/

Program Performance

OBJECTIVE 1: MAINTAIN AND STRENGTHEN ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND ACHIEVEMENT BY (1) RECRUITING BETTER STUDENTS, (2) IMPROVING STUDENT RETENTION, (3) IMPROVING GRADUATION RATES, AND (4) PROMOTING EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING.

Indicator 1.1 Better students: The average SAT scores of incoming freshman will increase by 0.5 percent per year.

Targets and Performance Data						Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Average SAT score

Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets	
	Math	Verbal	Total	% change	Total	% change
1997:*	494	513	1007			
1998:*	506	519	1025	1.8		
1999:*	517	533	1050	2.4		
2000:	**525**	**537**	**1062**	**1.1**	**1055**	**0.5**
2001:					1060	0.5
2002:					1065	0.5

* Math and Verbal Scores for 1997, 1998, and 1999 were inadvertently transposed on the earlier report. These have been corrected on this report.
+This number (2) reflects the correct percentage. Last year's reported 1% was a miscalculation.

Assessment of Progress

Status: Target exceeded.

Explanation: Average SAT scores increased from 1050 in 1999 to 1062 in 2000, resulting in a 1.1 percent increase, double the target of a 0.5 percent increase. The 2001 objective is to increase average SAT scores by 0.5 percent.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Howard University.
Frequency: Annually.
Next collection update: 2001.
Date to be reported: 2001.

Validation Procedure: No formal validation procedure used.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: None.

Indicator 1.2 Student retention: Decrease attrition for undergraduate FTIC (first time in college) students by 2 percent until national average is bettered.

Attrition rates

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets
	National Rate	HU Rate	
1996-97:	26.7%	**19.6%	
1997-98:	26.4%	**17.6%	
1998-99:	25.0%	**16.0%	Continuing decrease
1999-00:	**32.7%**	**15.1%**	**15%**
2000-01:			14%
2001-02:			13%

** Rates for these years were inaccurate in the previous report and have been corrected on this report.

Assessment of Progress

Status: Target of bettering the national average and decreasing attrition by 1 percent was achieved.

Explanation: The attrition rate of 15.1 percent at Howard University is well below the national average of 32.7 percent. The objective remains to decrease the attrition rate by 1 percent per year.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Howard University.
Frequency: Annually.
Next collection update: 2001.
Date to be reported: 2001.

Validation Procedure: No formal validation procedure used.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: None.

Indicator 1.3 Graduation rates: The undergraduate and graduate graduation rates will increase by 2 percent per year until the national average is reached or exceeded.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
6-year graduation rate	**Status:** Target achieved.	**Source:** Howard University.
(see table below)		*Frequency:* Annually.
	Explanation: The graduation rate at Howard University of 49 percent demonstrated continued improvement from the previous years' graduation rates of 46 and 41 percent.	*Next collection update:* 2001. *Date to be reported:* 2001. **Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure used. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** The reported 6-year national rate comes from the Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange at the University of Oklahoma. Howard University is a member of the institution.

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets
	Consortium Rate	HU Rate	
1997:		49.0%	
1998:		40.9%	
1999:	54.2%	46.1%	43%
2000:	**No Data Available**	**48.7%**	**48%**
2001:			50%
2002:			52%

Indicator 1.4 Excellence in teaching and scholarship: The participation rate of faculty in activities of the Fund for Academic Excellence will increase.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Proposals	**Status:** Target for funded proposals met.	**Source:** Howard University.
(see table below)		*Frequency:* Annually.
	Explanation: The principal goal for the Fund for Academic Excellence is to be a catalyst for increasing extramural research. Enhanced standards for faculty extramural repeat awards will ultimately constrain the participation rate for faculty.	*Next collection update:* 2001. *Date to be reported:* 2001. **Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure used. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets	
	Submitted	Funded	Number of Participants	To Be Funded	Number of Participants
1998:	258	153	189		
1999:	218	152	200	Continued increase	Continued increase
2000:	**149**	**128**	**173**	**125**	**210**
2001:				155	220
2002:				158	231

OBJECTIVE 2: TO PROMOTE EXCELLENCE IN RESEARCH.

Indicator 2.1 Grants received: The number of grant proposals that are funded will increase.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
(see table below)	**Status:** Target not achieved.	**Source:** Howard University.
		Frequency: Annually.
	Explanation: While Howard University had fewer awards in number, the average value (and quality) of the awards increased.	*Next collection update:* 2001. *Date to be reported:* 2001. **Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure used. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997:	232	
1998:	279	
1999:	299	Continued increase
2000:	**252**	**301**
2001:		260
2002:		270

Indicator 2.2 Grant funding: The total funds received through research grants will increase.

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Target achieved.	**Source:** Howard University.
	Value of Grants Received	% Change	Value of Grants Received	% Change		*Frequency:* Annually.

Year	Value of Grants Received	% Change	Value of Grants Received	% Change
1997:	$45,268,427			
1998:	$44,057,827	–2.7		
1999:	$47,533,841	7.9	Continuing increase	
2000:	**$50,294,706**	**5.8**	**$48,009,180**	**20% over 1997**
2001:			51,700,000	
2002:			53,800,000	

Assessment of Progress

Status: Target achieved.

Explanation: Receipt of approx. $50.3 million in research grants in 2000 demonstrates improvement in obtaining research grant funding.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Howard University.
Frequency: Annually.
Next collection update: 2001.
Date to be reported: 2001.

Validation Procedure: No formal validation procedure used.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: None.

OBJECTIVE 3: INCREASE HOWARD UNIVERSITY'S FINANCIAL STRENGTH AND INDEPENDENCE FROM FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Indicator 3.1 Endowment: The value of the endowment each year will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Market value of endowment			**Status:** Target achieved.	**Source:** Howard University.

Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1997:	$211.2 million	
1998:	$252.9 million	
1999:	$297.0 million	Continuing increase
2000:	**$329.3million**	**$320 million**
2001:		$346 million
2002:		

Assessment of Progress

Status: Target achieved.

Explanation: The market value of Howard University's endowment increased 11 percent in 2000, from $297 million to $329.3 million.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Howard University.
Frequency: Annually.
Next collection update: 2001.
Date to be reported: 2001.

Validation Procedure: Audited Financial Statements.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: None.

Indicator 3.2 Outside support: The funds raised from all private sources will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Alumni contribution			**Status:** Target achieved.	**Source:** Howard University.

Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1997:	$11.8 million	
1998:	$8.4 million	
1999:	$9.2 million	Continuing increase
2000:	**$13.9million**	**$11.0 million**
2001:		$14.5 million
2002:		$18.0 million

Assessment of Progress

Status: Target achieved.

Explanation: Outside support increased to $13.9 million in 2000.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Howard University.
Frequency: Annually.
Next collection update: 2001.
Date to be reported: 2001.

Validation Procedure: Audited Financial Statements.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: None.

Indicator 3.3 Outside support—alumni: The participation rate of alumni who contribute to the school will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Participation rate			**Status:** Did not meet target.	**Source:** Howard University.
				Frequency: Annually.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Explanation:** The 12.2 percent participation rate is below the desired goal. However, it represents a turnaround in the previous year's downward trend, and is the highest rate on record to date. The University's fundraising operations have been completely restructured to ensure greater congruence with the goals.	*Next collection update:* 2001.
1998:	11.4%			*Date to be reported:* 2001.
1999:	9.4%	Continuing increase		
2000:	**12.2%**	**25.0%**		**Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure used.
2001:		30.0%		
2002:		32.0%		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.

Indicator 3.4 Cost savings at the Howard University Hospital: The difference between the hospital's net revenue (excluding Federal appropriations) and total expenses will decrease.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Net Revenue		Total Expense		**Status:** Did not meet target.	**Source:** Howard University.
	Actual	Target	Actual	Target		*Frequency:* Annually.
1997:	$170,084,807		$209,761,348		**Explanation:** The difference between the hospital's net revenue and total expenses ($213,879,600 and $246,819,944) results in a slightly higher deficit of $32.9 million from the previous year's deficit of $30.5 million due to:	*Next collection update:* 2001.
1998:	$183,789,977		$211,689,178			*Date to be reported:* 2001.
1999:	$204,360,845		$234,841,266			
2000:	**$213,879,600**	**$184,510,111**	**$246,819,944**	**$225,813,215**		**Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure used.
2001:		$193,735,617		$237,103,876	1) Y2K expenses for information technology and clinical facilities equipment replacement and remediation. Balanced Budget Act.	
2002:		$203,422,397		$248,959,070	2) Changes in net revenue brought about by managed health care, coupled with uncompensated health care to indigenous populations. These made achievements of the goal in this period unattainable.	**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.