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PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS

➤ This year's Performance Award Program seeks to award all faculty members who performed at a satisfactory level with a 2½ percent performance adjustment to their base salaries.

➤ The Program also seeks to award approximately 15 percent of the faculty who performed at the highest level of excellence with an additional adjustment to base salaries.

➤ Only Faculty Performance Application Materials (Application Form, Justification Sheet and Curriculum Vitae for the Performance Period) are to be forwarded for review. All other documentation should be assembled and retained in departmental offices for ready reference and submission in the event further review is necessary.

➤ AN ELECTRONIC COPY OF THIS PERFORMANCE PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENT PACKAGE IS AVAILABLE (in Microsoft Word/Office 2000 or PDF formats) at the website of either the Office of the Provost (http://www.provost.howard.edu) or the Office of Human Resource Management (http://www.hr.howard.edu).

Questions regarding these guidelines may be directed to:

Faculty Performance Award Program
Office of the Provost
Attention: Dr. Joseph P. Reidy, Associate Provost
Phone: 806-2550
E-mail: jreidy@howard.edu
The Howard University Faculty Performance Award Program is the University’s sole method for faculty salary adjustments that are premised on performance. The Program is intended to provide a clear and distinct link between pay strategy and exceptional performance of the members of the Howard workforce. Awards shall be determined based on annual performance evaluations by appropriate faculty Appointment, Promotion and Tenure (APT) Committees and administrators. The review and final decision-making process shall be guided by the guidelines described herein.

I. ELIGIBILITY

The Performance Award Program applies to all current personnel employed full-time during the review period in: (1) probationary, tenured, career status (including master instructor), and clinical educator track appointments; or (2) temporary appointments with a minimum of five (5) years of continuous service. Employees not eligible for award under this process include: faculty performing under part-time or extramural contract and grant hire; cabinet/subcabinet appointments (including Deans); faculty members in the College of Medicine who are members of the Faculty Practice Plan; faculty members on sabbatical leave during the review period who did not submit a sabbatical leave report; faculty members who did not submit official final course grades by the appointed deadlines.

II. GENERAL CONDITIONS

The decision to grant performance-based monetary awards is based on the availability of funding in each fiscal year.

Performance awards recognize achievement appropriate to the individual position level and consistent with priorities of the University as guided by The Strategic Framework for Action II. As a general rule, recognition for faculty warrants performance at a high level relative to others of equal experience and rank.

The evaluation begins with each faculty member completing an application form, justification sheet and abbreviated curriculum vitae. All applicants shall be assessed in accordance with established guidelines, taking into strong consideration where applicable the applicant’s actual APT evaluations for the performance period on file in the appropriate academic offices.

Nothing contained in these Guidelines is intended to create any legally enforceable right with respect to the payment of compensation or any other term or condition of employment. The University reserves the right to change these guidelines with or without prior notice and to withdraw or modify the Performance Award Program whenever it deems such action to be in the best interest of the University.

Final decisions for awards shall be determined by the Provost and are not subject to appeal.

III. AWARDS AND AWARD AMOUNTS

As was the case in previous award programs, the number and the dollar amount of the awards are determined by the University’s current fiscal capacity.

The Faculty Performance Award Program for FY2004 has two components: 1) a Performance Award (in the form of a 2.5 percent adjustment to base salary) to all eligible faculty members who fulfilled their faculty responsibilities at or above a satisfactory level, and 2) an additional adjustment to base salary for those faculty members who performed at the highest level of excellence.
IV. GUIDELINES FOR APPLICATION AND REVIEW

A. AWARD-WORTHY PERFORMANCE

Awards will be made based on documented evidence of the applicant’s performance in the areas of research, teaching, service, and professional development.

B. APPLICATION PROCESSES

All applications must be made using the Howard University Performance Award Program APPLICATION FOR FACULTY PERFORMANCE AWARD along with an accompanying JUSTIFICATION FOR AWARD (FACULTY) and a CURRICULUM VITAE FOR THE REPORTING PERIOD. Applicants must address performance within the specified period of recognition of July 1, 2002, through June 30, 2003.

All applications must be submitted to the applicant’s immediate supervisor to initiate the review process. Upon delivery to the applicant’s supervisor, the submission is acknowledged by signature, and a copy is given to the applicant. Once submitted, every application must follow the entire review process through each supervisory channels to the Provost.

C. WRITTEN JUSTIFICATIONS AND DOCUMENTATION

All applications must contain a completed Justification for Award form that evaluates the applicant’s performance in the areas of research, teaching, service, and professional development and a Curriculum Vitae form that lists all relevant activities during the performance period. Through descriptive, expository examples, the justification should provide convincing evidence of award-worthy performance. General evaluative or unsubstantiated statements do not constitute evidence of meritorious service. A well-written justification that speaks to the specified criteria should be sufficient for the administrative reviewers to reach final recommendations. The curriculum vitae should document all appropriate activity in each of the evaluation areas of research, teaching, service, and professional development during the performance period.

To assure that proper documentation of activities available in the event that an evaluator requests it, the applicant should be prepared to produce evidence of referenced accomplishments (such as title/cover page of publications, certificates of award, copies of letters of recognition of specific accomplishment, documentation of work products, etc.), but EXHIBITS OF DOCUMENTATION SHOULD NOT BE SUBMITTED WITH THE APPLICATION. If documentation is requested, the applicant must make such available not later than the next workday. Failure to present documentation when requested may negatively impact final decision-making.

D. REVIEW PROCESS

Each evaluator shall (1) review the application, (2) evaluate the performance of the applicant in each of the four areas of research, teaching, service, and professional development, (3) calculate the mean of the scores in each of the performance areas and provide a brief justification for the mean score, and (4) forward the application to the next level of review.

In assigning scores, reviewers will employ performance standards in current use within the respective schools and colleges, taking proper account of such variable factors as discipline, rank, appointment type, and the like. Reviewers will evaluate performance on the following four-point rating scale: 4 = outstanding, 3 = good, 2 = satisfactory, and 1 = unsatisfactory. In justifying the mean score, reviewers should offer a brief summary assessment of the applicant’s overall performance. Persons with an average mean score of less than 2.0 will be ineligible for Performance Awards. Persons who do not qualify for Performance Awards will be ineligible for Merit Awards.

All faculty applications must be reviewed and evaluated at four levels prior to being forwarded to the Provost: Department APT Committee; Department Chair; School/College APT Committee; and Dean of the School/College. In addition to providing numerical scores for each application in their respective units,
Deans will recommend faculty members in their units eligible for performance awards and identify and place in rank order the highest performing 15 percent of their eligible faculty members. A Faculty Performance Advisory Committee, convened by and reporting directly to the Provost, will assist in the final determination of awardees.

V. CRITICAL TIMELINES

The various steps in the application and review process of this Performance Award Program require adherence to a critical timeline. The following timetable references steps in the nomination and review process and the absolute deadlines (not later than close of business on the cited dates) for each activity:

- **November 10**  FACULTY APPLICATIONS Due to Department Chairs
- **December 1**  FACULTY APPLICATIONS Due to the Provost from the Deans
- **December 19**  Final Faculty Performance Awards Issued to Award Recipients

VI. FINAL APPROVAL AND CERTIFICATION

The Provost makes the final decision on all faculty applications. The final dollar allocation to awardees shall not exceed the total allocated budget for merit awards.

**Actual monetary awards shall be distributed to employees not later than December 19, 2003.** The Vice President for Human Resource Management and the Provost shall provide timely notice of final disposition of submissions to the respective deans and applicants.

VII. PERFORMANCE AWARD FORMS

Printable copies of all performance award forms are available at the website of either the Office of the Provost ([http://www.provost.howard.edu](http://www.provost.howard.edu)) or the Office of Human Resource Management ([http://www.hr.howard.edu](http://www.hr.howard.edu)). Paper copies are available in the offices of the Deans of the schools and colleges and in the Office of the Provost.
## HOWARD UNIVERSITY PERFORMANCE AWARD PROGRAM

### PART 1: APPLICATION FOR FACULTY PERFORMANCE AWARD

July 1, 2002 – June 30, 2003 Performance Period

Please Return the Completed Application to your Department Chairperson or Dean by November 10, 2003, 5:00 p.m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Received By:</th>
<th>Date: ________ a.m. / p.m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Print or Type</td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### I. EMPLOYEE DATA (to be completed by the faculty member)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICANT NAME</th>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>EMPLOYEE ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENT</td>
<td>SCHOOL OR COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Has any disciplinary action been taken on the applicant for this performance period or is there any pending?

// NO // YES: Explain _______________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

### II. ASSESSMENT (To be completed by appropriate reviewing and approving authorities)

#### RESEARCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Justify the Mean Score on the back of this sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENT A.P.T. COMMITTEE</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL COLLEGE A.P.T. COMMITTEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### III.A. DEAN’S RECOMMENDATION FOR PERFORMANCE AWARD:

YES _____ (AVERAGE OF THE MEANS \( \geq 2.0 \))

NO _____ (AVERAGE OF THE MEANS < 2.0)

### III.B. DEAN’S RECOMMENDATION FOR MERIT AWARD:

YES _____ (APPLICANT RANKS ______ AMONG _______ APPLICANTS IN SCHOOL/COLLEGE)

NO _____

### IV. PROVOST’S DECISION

[ ] APPROVED FOR AWARD [ ] DISAPPROVED FOR AWARD

This application and subsequent review recommendations have concluded with the following certification:

**ADJUSTMENT TO BASE** at 2½ % Increase ___________ Additional Merit Award ___________

**CERTIFIED BY** ___________ DATE ___________

RICHARD A. ENGLISH, PH.D., Interim Provost and Chief Academic Officer
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V. JUSTIFICATION FOR MEAN SCORE

Performance standards in current use within the respective schools and colleges provide the basis for assessing performance in the four evaluative areas on the four-point rating scale where 4 = outstanding, 3 = good, 2 = satisfactory, and 1 = unsatisfactory. These assessments should take account, among other things, such variable factors as discipline, rank, appointment type, and the like. The mean score should reveal a composite assessment of the applicant’s overall performance. The justification statement for the mean score should briefly summarize the applicant’s overall performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVIEWER</th>
<th>JUSTIFICATION FOR MEAN SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENT A.P.T. COMMITTEE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL/COLLEGE A.P.T. COMMITTEE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVIEWER</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY-WIDE FACULTY COMMITTEE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOWARD UNIVERSITY FACULTY PERFORMANCE AWARD SYSTEM
PART 2: JUSTIFICATION FOR AWARD (FACULTY)
Performance Period of July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2003

APPLICANT:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Employee ID #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

For each of the four areas of evaluation (research, teaching, service, and professional development) reported on Part 3 of this application, the applicant must provide an assessment of his or her activities in relation to minimal expectations of performance for the individual’s discipline, rank and Faculty Workload agreement. If, by reason of the type of the individual’s appointment or the approved Faculty Workload agreement, an individual faculty member has no activity to report in one of the areas, indicate as much with the notation “Not applicable by reason of . . .”

1. Research

Evaluate your Research during the period under review, with special emphasis on publications, performances or juried exhibits, sponsored research activity (submissions as well as awards), and presentations at professional meetings. Note publications jointly authored with students.

2. Teaching

Evaluate your Teaching during the period under review, addressing, as applicable, your 1) classroom, laboratory and clinical instruction; 2) service as major professor or committee member on master’s theses and doctoral dissertations; 3) mentorship of students in internships, practica and research settings. Pay special attention to new courses you have developed and new approaches to student learning you have fostered, whether through new media or other pedagogical innovations. Make reference to student and peer evaluations of your teaching.
3. Service
For the period under review, evaluate your service to the department, school/college and university, to relevant professional associations and organizations, and to the local, national and international communities.

4. Professional Development
For the period under review, evaluate your Professional Development activities, including your attendance at professional meetings, workshops or training sessions, your acquisition of new skills or competencies and the like.
Itemize your activities in each of the four reporting areas:

1. Research

Provide full bibliographic citations for publications and list other research activities.

2. Teaching

Indicate names of courses taught or course lectures given, and the names of students supervised or mentored, with dates.
3. Service
For service to the department, school/college and university and relevant academic or professional associations, indicate the type(s) and date(s) of the service and any leadership role. For service to the community at large, indicate the organization or agency and the type(s) and date(s) of the service.

4. Professional Development
Indicate venue, date, and sponsoring agency for each activity.