DELTA STATE UNIVERSITY
HUMAN RESOURCE DEPARTMENT

2001 – 2002
VISION, MISSION, & GOALS

VISION:

"Fostering academic and administrative excellence in support of building Delta State University as a nationally distinguished university with a regional base".

MISSION:

• to formulate human resource policies and programs that enhance the quality of academic and administrative work environments;
• to collaborate with academic and administrative departments in supporting effective recruitment and development of a highly qualified faculty and staff workforce;
• to be a strategic partner in creating a work environment which fosters individual achievement, teamwork, integrity, professionalism, and accountability.

GOALS:

• Recruitment and retention programs will ensure that faculty and staff derive a sense of accomplishment, contribution, and pride from their association with DSU.

Strategic Direction
The Human Resource Department will assist departments in their efforts to recruit, retain, and develop a diverse faculty and staff who possess the core competencies needed for institutional success.

• Faculty and staff receive fair and consistent treatment in all aspects of Human Resource policy administration.

Strategic Direction
The Human Resource Department shall foster employee relation policies and actions that stress employee accountability for their performance and conduct in the workplace and help administrators understand and embrace their responsibility and accountability for effective HR practices.

• Maintain compensation and performance management systems that link rewards and recognition to performance and the acquisition of skills and competencies necessary for job position success.

Strategic Direction
Faculty and staff shall receive competitive compensation and benefits for work of comparable value and be retained on the basis of the value of their performance, with appropriate recognition for excellence in academic or administrative performance.
Delta State University
Human Resource Department
2000 –2001 HR Goals & Measurements

Human Resource Goals
- Maintain awareness and use of employee cafeteria benefit service.
- Provide assistance in achieving a recruiting and retention strategy that supports the needs of the department and university while minimizing advertising cost.
- Faculty and staff receive fair and consistent treatment in all aspects of Human Resource policy administration.

The Institutional Mission in Relation to Human Resource Administration:
- Provide administrative services, which are efficient and effective in the support of the institutional mission.

Indicators of Goal Achievement
- Communicated benefit information (individual and small groups) that help new and current employees understand how the plan helps them shelter a portion of their salary. (Measurement - See Cost Savings)
- Increased use of internet and discipline-specific web sites to post academic and administrative postings. The result indicates a decrease in recruitment costs while maintaining an effective university-wide recruiting strategy for the university. (Measurement - See Cost Savings)
- No formal EEOC charges filed within the year. Faculty and staff issues have been handled in a fair, equitable, and efficient manner.

Benchmarks - Human Resource Staffing and Expenditures

Staffing
Delta State University HR Staff Ratio 1 to 261 FTE Employees

Compared to
HR Staff Ratio (2000 National Median - CUPA) 1 to 142 FTE Employees
HR Staffing Ratio (2000 National Median – Education – BNA) 1 to 120 FTE Employees
HR Staff Ratio (2000 National Average–Private Sector- BNA) 1 to 100 FTE Employees

Human Resource Expenditures per FTE Employee

2000 DSU HR Expenditures per FTE Employee $130 per Employee

Compared to
1999 HR Expenditures - Median – BNA – All Employers $737 per Employee
1999 HR Expenditures - Median – BNA – Education $439 per Employee
2000 HR Expenditures - Median – BNA – All Employers $787 per Employee
2000 HR Expenditures - Median – BNA – Education $469 per Employee
### 2000-2001

**Human Resource Department**

**Performance Measurement Criteria**

1. **Administration / Management of Cafeteria / Reimbursement Plan**
   (Medical, Health, Dependent Care Accounts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Employees</th>
<th>Total Sheltered</th>
<th>DSU Savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline (96-97)</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>$694,062.00</td>
<td>$53,096.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-1998</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>$767,036.00</td>
<td>$58,678.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-1999</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>$813,600.00</td>
<td>$66,240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>$912,988.00</td>
<td>$69,844.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   *7% increase 11% increase 13% increase 5% increase*

2. **Recruitment Costs per Job Announcement**
   (Newspaper advertisements, discipline specific internet sites, journals and periodicals - based on Human Resource Purchase Orders)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Ads</th>
<th>Total Costs</th>
<th>DSU Savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline (96-97)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>$31,008.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-1998</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>$38,265.00</td>
<td>(7,257.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-1999</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>$30,900.00</td>
<td>$7,365.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>$27,150.00</td>
<td>$3,750.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   *15% increase 23% increase 19% decrease 12% decrease*

3. **New Hires Processed by HR Department (By EEO Group)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>99-00</th>
<th>98-99</th>
<th>97-98</th>
<th>96-97</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1100 Executive/Admin.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200 Faculty</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300 Other Professional</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400 Clerical</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 Tech./Paraprofessional</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600 Skilled Craft</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700 Service/Maintenance</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>118</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Hire per Month**

| 9.8 | 6.1 | 4.2 | 4.1 |
Delta State University
Human Resource Department
Strategic Shared Accountability

Overview

This report provides a broad look at the Delta State University Human Resource Department’s strategic accountability to the institution’s mission and goals. It also provides Department Chairs and University Administration with a framework to use in developing human resource related institutional goals and objectives in the future.

Human resource management (HRM) is everyone’s business. Higher education is evolving and University Administration must look at human resource management in a new way. As renowned HRM expert Dave Ulrich stated in a recent article called, *A New Mandate for Human Resources*, “The competitive forces that managers face today and will continue to confront in the future demand organizational excellence. The efforts to achieve such excellence -- through a focus on learning, quality, teamwork, and reengineering -- are driven by the way organizations get things done and how they treat their people. Those are fundamental HR issues.”

As a result, the role of HR at Delta State University is changing. The focus is no longer on just serving the individual employee and paperwork processing, but on the effective use of human resources -- people -- in achieving the university’s strategic objectives. It’s about achieving organizational excellence, a flexible workforce with the competencies to do the job well, and return on investment. This task is too large to be the responsibility of the Human Resource Department alone. Significant university administrative involvement is needed -- again and again if necessary -- as external circumstances require. *In sum, human resource accountability is about the responsibility shared by the President, University Administration, Academic and Administrative Department Chairs, and the HR staff for ensuring that people are used effectively, and in accordance with legal requirements.*

This document is specifically intended to enable academic and administrative departments to fulfill their HR accountability and responsibility. I believe it will be a useful tool for getting departments -- with the HR Department as the catalyst -- to establish viable HR accountability structures, and to help Department Chairs understand and embrace their responsibility and accountability for effective HR practices. It is no cure-all; other initiatives and tools will no doubt be needed. Ultimately, each department will need to find its own path to realizing these objectives.
Introduction
Why Shared Human Resource Management Accountability?

Shared human resource management accountability is based on the following simple premise: Human resources management does not exist as an end in itself but for the purpose of supporting university mission accomplishment.

The university department chair is not a free agent when it comes to managing people. HR activities are carried out within the framework of established university policies and the values of openness, fairness, and equity. On the other hand, HR policies and procedures cannot take on a life of their own independent from broad university goals. Department Chairs must instead be judged by how well they support those who work each day to carry out the university’s programs.

This is not a new premise, and it may seem to be no more than common sense. “Let managers manage,” as the saying goes, and let that include managing people. Yet in many universities, it represents a real change from the traditional role of the Human Resource Department.

Authority to make many human resource management decisions at Delta State University has historically been held with Department Chairs with inconsequential concern for compliance with HR laws/regulations or results. The Human Resource Department obviously participated in these decisions, but the Department Chair often retained final authority.

The focus now is to establish a HR structure that supports university mission accomplishment, while maintaining compliance with HR laws and regulations. This “shared accountability” structure places the direct responsibility of human resources management on those whose immediate task is mission accomplishment -- academic and administrative departments. These departments, supported by the human resources staff, must be given authority to manage human resources and then be held accountable for the results or outcomes of their decisions. This new “shared accountability” structure does not abandon compliance concern but rather represents a major shift in balance toward outcomes and results.

This makes good “business” sense. Those with authority and responsibility for accomplishing the university’s mission should know best what they need from a human resource perspective. From a compliance perspective, this responsibility is also a legal mandate. Federal and State regulatory agencies hold universities accountable for their human resource management practices. Failure by a university to carry out federal and state compliance responsibility could result in a violation of the law. Just as important, it will also probably lead to a less than fully effective use of human resources, which in most universities constitutes by far the greatest budget expense.
Accountability Roles and Responsibilities
Who is Accountable?

Now that I have identified the “why” of accountability, it is important to identify the “who.” Who is accountable for HR decisions and what responsibilities do they hold?

Academic and administrative departments have their own unique idea as to what are the responsibilities of the HR Department. But, to point the way, the following guidelines have been developed for describing the shared HR accountability structure:

Guidelines for Shared HR Accountability

• Where HR authority has been delegated to a Department Chair but the HR Department has responsibility for processing the action, the HR Department is accountable for ensuring that the proposed action meets compliance with regulatory agencies, DSU policy administration, and is consistent with university goals and objectives.
• If the proposed action fails to meet regulatory/DSU policy compliance or university goals/objectives, the HR Department consults with the Department Chair to offer other options that enable the Chair to achieve the desired goal but comply with regulations. In this situation, the Department Chair and HR Department have shared accountability. Though the Department Chair has the final discretionary authority, the HR Department has the final compliance authority. Therefore, the Chair is accountable for the university impact of the HR decision while the HR Department is accountable for the regulatory compliance of the action at the time it is effected. In this case, if the Chair cannot select an option that meets regulatory/DSU compliance, the HR Department should not process the action.
• If the Chair continues to try to effect the action, the HR Department should go through appropriate channels to notify University Administration.

Traditional past practices have strongly affected roles and responsibilities for HR accountability.
• Department Chairs have exercised their authority independently without the assistance of the HR Department. Where this occurs, HR actions can be affected without input or review from the HR Department.
• If the HR Department has no review or approval role in the processing of the HR action, the Chair is directly accountable for the university impact AND regulatory/DSU compliance of the HR action.

However, even where the authority is delegated to the Department Chair, the HR Department has oversight (indirect) accountability for compliance. This obligation is met when the HR Department conducts periodic reviews of Chair-effected HR actions. If the HR Department finds that an action has been taken which does not meet compliance, it must ensure that corrective action is taken.

The HR Department also has oversight accountability for managing human resources effectively, even where the authority is delegated to the Department Chair. Where actions taken by the Chair meet compliance but do not constitute good university management practices, the HR Department will consult with the Chair regarding options for future actions.
Even with the emphasis on “shared accountability”, there will be situations where sensitive HR authority will not be delegated to the Department Chair due to legal and technical HR considerations. Federal and state regulatory interpretations regarding many HR policies, procedures, and actions of a complex nature will continue to be made by the HR Department, often in consultation with the President, appropriate Vice-President, and the IHL legal office.

Where the authority remains with the HR Department, the HR Director is responsible for advising the Department Chair regarding the degree of discretion available (the legal options) and recommending the best course of action from the standpoint of HR effectiveness. In this situation, the HR Department is directly accountable for HR compliance. However, roles and responsibilities in the HR process must emphasize the collaborative approach between Department Chairs and the HR Department. Both the HR Department and Department Chairs are accountable for results -- with the Chairs directly responsible for the decisions they make and the HR Department more broadly responsible for program effectiveness.

_Transitioning to a Shared HR Accountability Structure_

To facilitate a successful transition to this more collaborative approach, the HR Department, Academic and Administrative Department Chairs, and University Administration need to redirect their efforts in several different areas.

_The HR Department must:_
- Focus more on creating value;
- Become actively involved in the support of university mission accomplishment;
- Act as consultants to Academic and Administrative Chairs on HR issues, helping and encouraging them to consider the people aspect of their decisions;
- Simplify, streamline, or automate existing HR processes;
- Provide Chairs with accessible HR information.

_Academic and Administrative Department Chairs must:_
- Increase their knowledge of HR laws and regulations, DSU policies and procedures, and effective “human resource” practices;
- Develop a clear understanding of how HR decisions affect university mission accomplishment and how their management decisions impact personnel and the university;
- Ensure the proper exercise of HR authority.

_University Administration must:_
- Recognize and communicate that people at Delta State University are its single most valuable and irreplaceable resource;
- Demonstrate a strong commitment to HR accountability and the shared roles between Chairs and the HR Department;
- Require HR management training and education to enable Chairs to make informed HR decisions compliant with law and regulation;
- Require Chairs to understand the importance of HR programs the university supports.
Accountability Roles and Responsibilities
The Process

The roles and responsibilities of Department Chairs and the HR Department are obviously not the only pieces of the HR accountability puzzle. HR accountability should be seen as a continuous cycle, or process. A systemic approach enables the university to identify, collect, and use the information or data on which accountability is ultimately based. It overcomes the common problem of fragmented, disjointed efforts that do not add up to the sum of their parts.

HR accountability starts with identifying DSU’s strategic goals. Following that, HR goals and measures in support of the university’s strategic goals are defined. But the process does not stop there.

HR goals must be widely communicated. Then, the university must use this information to make improvements where necessary. Periodically, the HR accountability process itself will need to be evaluated to ensure that it accomplished what was needed in the most efficient and effective way. Finally, the process starts over at the beginning, with goals changing as necessary based on the information gathered from the review and the changing needs of the university and its constituents.

I am not advocating “reinventing the wheel”. In this time of potential budget downsizing, or streamlining, departments have limited resources to devote to the development of an accountability system. Therefore, the most efficient manner to start the process is to use what we already have and build up from there. In the end, this effort will be worth the investment of time and resources, because creating a system out of what may now be a set of loosely related pieces will maximize their effect and value in support of effective human resource practices.
HR Goals & Measures:  
How Are We Held Accountable / What We’re Accountable For

Now, the most critical aspect in this structure: “Establishing HR Goals and Measures.” Identifying goals and measures is how each department says what it is willing to hold itself accountable for as far as human resources management is concerned, and how it will determine whether it is meeting these goals.

As stated earlier, human resources management does not exist as an end in itself but for the purpose of supporting university mission accomplishment. Human resources goals should be driven by a pursuit for excellence, along with respect for practices and traditions that reflect the best in DSU.

Establishing Human Resource Goals that Support Delta State University’s Strategic Plan

I have identified three (3) goals that express the values of human resource management and set appropriate parameters for HR authority. These goals are also fully in keeping with the obligation imposed on Delta State University as an employer and manager of its human resources. These goals provide a uniquely appropriate framework for identifying HR effectiveness at DSU. The goals are:

1. Recruitment and retention programs will ensure that faculty and staff derive a sense of accomplishment, contribution, and pride from their association with DSU.

Strategic Direction
The Human Resource Department will assist departments in their efforts to recruit, retain, and develop a diverse faculty and staff who possess the core competencies needed for institutional success.

Indicators of Goal Achievement

- Academic/administrative chairs and designated faculty and staff personnel have knowledge of human resource policies and procedures on recruiting and retaining personnel
- An effective university-wide recruiting and retention strategy that support the needs of the department and university
- Faculty and staff have input on hiring decisions
- Delta State University has a reputation as a desirable place of work “University of Choice”

2. Faculty and staff receive fair and consistent treatment in all aspects of Human Resource policy administration.

Strategic Direction
The Human Resource Department shall foster employee relation policies and actions that stress employee accountability for their performance and conduct in the workplace and help administrators understand and embrace their responsibility and accountability for effective HR practices.
Indicators of Goal Achievement

- Academic/administrative chairs and designated faculty and staff personnel have knowledge of Human Resource programs and policies through documented briefings and assistance
- Perception that grievance and appeal procedures are conducted in an impartial manner.
- Faculty and staff have input into the Human Resource policy administration process
- University goal progress and key performance criteria is shared with faculty and staff
- High faculty and staff perception that policy administration issues are handled in a fair, equitable, and efficient manner


Strategic Direction
Faculty and staff shall receive competitive compensation and benefits for work of comparable value and be retained on the basis of the value of their performance, with appropriate recognition for excellence in academic or administrative performance.

Indicators of Goal Achievement

- Faculty and staff have input into evaluating their own performance
- Compensation and benefit programs are competitive
- Top faculty and staff performers get significant more pay than average performers
- University has an improvement plan for poor performance / terminates unacceptable performance
- High faculty and staff satisfaction with compensation and performance evaluation programs

These goals represent sound management practices based on common sense which will ensure that DSU faculty and staff are treated fairly and equitably and that all policies support university mission accomplishment, while maintaining compliance with HR laws and regulations. The goals cover key HR issues, including diversity, open competition, efficiency and effectiveness, performance, and responsibility to the public.

Establishing Measures Related to Human Resource Goals

Goals define purpose and the results the department or university hopes to achieve. I have been very careful to talk about goals and measures in the same breath, because it is a very common mistake in strategic planning to jump right into measurement, without the focus provided by well-chosen goals. Goals give direction. Without a good, clear vision of where the university wants to go, measurement becomes an exercise in itself. How can a university measure its success if it does not know what it seeks to achieve?

The next step is measuring HR goals, which is the most meaningful way to hold faculty and staff personnel accountable for HR decisions. Measurement is an essential tool for this purpose, especially since President Potter has communicated to University Administration the importance
of data-driven performance indicators in measuring/assessing the outcomes of departmental activity. However, there are many other advantages to measurement outside of the mandate by Dr. Potter. The payoffs include identifying HR’s contribution to the university, and the strengths and weaknesses of the HR program.

Historically, this department has been evaluated too heavily on compliance with laws, rules, and regulations and not on service delivery and contribution to university effectiveness. Unfortunately, our academic and administrative departments have not consistently devoted a tremendous amount emphasis on establishing any type of consistent HR related baseline for data comparison. Data has not always been collected in the past, and therefore, no solid documented history exists. Yet in order to measure improvement over time, a baseline must be established to compare against. Because of this situation, the Human Resource goals become an even more valuable framework of measurement.

The following list of recommended measurements is by no means definitive;-- it is subject to change and improvement -- but it does provide a starting point to track and assess HR effectiveness. The recommended list of measurements include:

- general climate survey on faculty and staff satisfaction
- focus surveys (Academic & Administrative specific)
- number of formal appeals and grievances over time
- entrance and exit interview evaluations
- costs associated with managing human resource effectiveness at the operating budget level include:
  - costs per employee / costs of new hires over time
  - recruitment costs per job announcement (newspaper advertisements, discipline specific internet sites, journals and periodicals)
  - costs associated with training of academic and administrative personnel on HR laws and regulations, DSU policies and procedures
- the education level, length of service, age, and diversity of workforce
- amount of funding for faculty / staff training and development over time
- recruitment efforts to avoid skill shortages

Final Thoughts

While goals and measurements are a sound starting point, I must emphasize that there is no “one size fits all”. Each department is different, has a different culture, and will therefore need to tailor its goals and its measures to its own climate.

If we believe that faculty and staff are our most important assets in accomplishing the goals and ultimately the mission of the university, then a shared human resource accountability structure must be realized.
## Delta State University - Budget Worksheet

### Office of Human Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>JOBS SAL</th>
<th>POSN BUD</th>
<th>POSN SAL</th>
<th>AMT CHG</th>
<th>NEW SAL FRINGE AMT</th>
<th>FTE FUND</th>
<th>ORGN</th>
<th>ACCT</th>
<th>PROG</th>
<th>FCT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3376 Director of Human Resources</td>
<td>48,645</td>
<td>34,052</td>
<td>34,052</td>
<td>$5,644</td>
<td>$5,644</td>
<td>8,853</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4113</td>
<td>61100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bufkin, Benjamin A</td>
<td>24.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3077 Senior Secr Human Resources</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$17,000</td>
<td>4,420</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4113</td>
<td>61300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods, Stella J</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0921 Human Resources Coordinator</td>
<td>27,700</td>
<td>19,390</td>
<td>19,390</td>
<td></td>
<td>$27,700</td>
<td>5,041</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4113</td>
<td>61300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giger, Lisa Weeks</td>
<td>13.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** FUND 10 TOTAL **

| | 70,442 | 70,442 | 18,314 |

*** ORGN TOTAL ***

<p>| | 70,442 | 70,442 | 18,314 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>PRIOR YEAR</th>
<th>PHASE 1: ADJ. BUD</th>
<th>PHASE 2: CHANGE</th>
<th>PHASE 3: AP&amp;PRED</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.40</td>
<td>Office of Human Resources</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROGRAM:**

**05** General Administrative Services

**ACTIVITY:**

Activity not budgeted

**LOCATION:**

Location not budgeted

**ACCOUNT:**

- **.100** Executive, Admin, & Managerial
  - 34,052.00
  - 34,052.00
  - 39,916.00
  - 0.00
  - 0.00

- **.300** Professional Non-Faculty
  - 19,401.00
  - 19,390.00
  - 19,390.00
  - 0.00
  - 0.00

- **.400** Clerical & Secretarial
  - 16,985.00
  - 17,000.00
  - 17,000.00
  - 0.00
  - 0.00

- **.6000** Fringe Benefits
  - 17,808.00
  - 18,313.00
  - 19,779.00
  - 0.00
  - 0.00

- **.00** Travel
  - 3,991.00
  - 2,086.00
  - 2,086.00
  - 0.00
  - 0.00

- **.211** Postage & Post Office Charges
  - 550.00
  - 450.00
  - 450.00
  - 0.00
  - 0.00

- **.220** Telephone Local Service
  - 1,020.00
  - 1,092.00
  - 1092.00
  - 0.00
  - 0.00

- **.230** Telephone Long Distance
  - 1,200.00
  - 780.00
  - 780.00
  - 0.00
  - 0.00

- **.240** Telephone Installation & Maint
  - 40.00
  - 40.00
  - 40.00
  - 0.00
  - 0.00

- **.790** Other Professional Fees & Services
  - 2,000.00
  - 900.00
  - 900.00
  - 0.00
  - 0.00

- **.820** Dues
  - 1,325.00
  - 725.00
  - 725.00
  - 0.00
  - 0.00

- **.840** Subscriptions
  - 840.00
  - 840.00
  - 840.00
  - 0.00
  - 0.00

- **.870** Computer Software Acquisitions
  - 100.00
  - 40.00
  - 40.00
  - 0.00
  - 0.00

- **100** Commodities
  - 2,500.00
  - 2,500.00
  - 2,500.00
  - 0.00
  - 0.00

_Justification:_
### Delta State University

**Unit Budget Plan**

**FY 2002 Budget**

**AS OF 24-APR-2001**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Prior Year</th>
<th>Phase 1: Adjusted B</th>
<th>Phase 2: Change</th>
<th>Phase 3: Approved</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Labor</td>
<td>88,246.00</td>
<td>88,755.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expense</td>
<td>13,566.00</td>
<td>9,413.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Transfers</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Net</td>
<td>-101,812.00</td>
<td>-98,168.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OWN TOTAL:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Prior Year</th>
<th>Phase 1: Adjusted B</th>
<th>Phase 2: Change</th>
<th>Phase 3: Approved</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Labor</td>
<td>88,246.00</td>
<td>88,755.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expense</td>
<td>13,566.00</td>
<td>9,413.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Transfers</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Net</td>
<td>-102,812.00</td>
<td>-98,168.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FUNCTION TOTAL:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Prior Year</th>
<th>Phase 1: Adjusted B</th>
<th>Phase 2: Change</th>
<th>Phase 3: Approved</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Labor</td>
<td>88,246.00</td>
<td>88,755.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expense</td>
<td>13,566.00</td>
<td>9,413.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Transfers</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Net</td>
<td>-101,812.00</td>
<td>-98,168.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Diff: 7,350
* 5260 - Gli Certification
* 446 - Additional Training*