

Case Study: Greenhill College

DIRK BARRAM

George Fox University
dbarram@georgefox.edu

ABSTRACT: Greenhill College is an organizational decision-making case study involving the financial stability of a fictitious small, private, religious liberal arts college with an enrollment of more than 2,000 students. Traditional, small liberal arts colleges, long a staple of the American higher education scene, are facing unprecedented challenges for survival. Steadily rising tuition costs, stiff competition for students, and escalating operational expenses represent just some of the pressures currently confronting Greenhill College. The college faces the immediate threat of an unbalanced budget, difficult decisions on financial and non-financial issues, and the need to manage possible morale issues. Finally, the administration must carefully address the potential of internal and external perceptions of the viability of Greenhill College.

THE CASE STUDY

Provost Chad Logan ambled along the red bricked pathway leading to Centennial Hall, the 100-year-old original administration building of Greenhill College, established in 1909 by a group of protestant clergy and like-minded educators who wanted an alternative to the secular institutions of their day. The college had remained true to its historical roots as a faith-based, Christian, interdenominational institution. Chad entered, making his way directly to the Academic Affairs Office. Sue Grant, the department receptionist, was on the phone and shot him a warm smile and mouthed, “Good morning.” The red blinking light on his phone caught his eye as he entered his office. He reached over and punched in his code and listened to a pleasant voice telling him he had six new messages. The most recent was Emerson Wilson, longtime president of Greenhill, who wanted him to call as soon as he got in. Ten minutes later he was seated in the president’s office on the second floor. Chad still couldn’t decide if he liked Wilson. At one moment he could be warm and friendly, the next cold and unbending. The unpredictability of the man’s nature created stress among all those around him.

“Chad, you better pay more attention to the new stu-

dent enrollment projections for this fall,” Wilson said. “I saw Al Sanders this morning in the gym, and he tells me next fall’s new student numbers are projected to be down from this year. This is the first I have heard of it, and I’m not too happy about being kept out of the loop. I really don’t like hearing this news from the director of admissions.”

Chad felt that now-familiar pang of worry in his stomach. Unfortunately, Greenhill lacked the significant endowment, immediate name recognition, and the sterling academic reputation of its competition. Even though Greenhill had a rich history, the glaring lack of a big endowment and popular name recognition resulted in continual financial pressure. Greenhill was a tuition-driven institution. Eighty-five percent of the annual budget revenue came from student tuition dollars. Chad despised this dependence on student admissions. He believed it to be a stranglehold on the college’s ability to move forward.

Chad wasn’t frustrated with Al because he knew Wilson probably put him on the spot earlier that morning in the gym. Wilson’s management style didn’t confine him to the office. He could be like a cat on the prowl. He loved the college and believed it was appropriate to ask any employee — at any time and place — about their job. In

part this could be good. Employees knew he cared. Yet it also could be stressful, and maybe inappropriate, such as in the gym. Al Sanders, overweight and not the world's healthiest eater, certainly didn't need to be badgered about admissions while he exercised. The poor guy had enough pressure in his life. That's why he was in the gym in the first place. Rather than being visionary, Wilson was reactionary. He really wasn't a fun guy to be around! He wasn't the type of leader people would go to the wall for. At times Wilson just simply could not keep the bigger picture in mind. Take the admissions situation. Al Sanders' role was integral to a strong incoming freshmen class. So what did Wilson do? He cornered him in the weight room and asked him about admissions for next year. Why not take a different approach and just ask Al how he was doing and leave it at that? Al would have responded much better.

Wilson shifted his tall, rail thin frame uneasily in his leather swivel chair. His beak-like nose and thinning hair reminded Chad of that guy from the *Wizard of Oz*. What was his name?

"We are so tuition-driven, it isn't funny. I'm counting on you to bring in the numbers."

Chad knew the pressure Wilson felt from a demanding Board of Trustees. The present era in higher education was one of diminishing federal and state dollars, fierce competition for students from state schools, and an alarming rise in private college tuitions, including Greenhill. As if this weren't enough, the respected *Chronicle of Higher Education* had just come out with a report that said, "With the trend toward attending lower-cost alternatives, the business model of private colleges — higher prices for premium products — is being tested. Affordability is the largest challenge going forward said the admissions director of one very selective small private college..." (Van De Werf, 2008, p. 5). The *Chronicle* predicted difficult days ahead for the small, private, liberal arts colleges.

"Emerson, the summer is always a waiting game; you know that," said Chad.

"Yes, but what are you doing now to make sure we get the right numbers? Are you sure Al Sanders is the right guy for the job? He's so laid back, it makes me nervous."

Chad intensely disliked these kinds of conversations with Wilson. At the first sign of trouble, he wanted to fire someone and usually it was one of his people. He could be so impatient. Chad struggled with a president who at times seemed more to worry, than act in faith that God would provide. The dynamic of integrating one's faith with his or her work was an oft-used phrase at Greenhill. This seemed like a good time to practice this, thought Chad.

"Emerson, Al is doing a good job for us. He's thor-

ough, well organized, and on top of things."

The slightly balding college president arched his thin eyebrows in doubt.

"You better be right on this one Chad. Honestly, our necks are on the chopping blocks."

Greenhill's Challenge

Chad knew Greenhill was facing some real organizational challenges. He decided to sort things out, including developing a strategy of how to confront the issues, before his next meeting with Wilson. Undergraduate enrollment was projected to decrease seven percent from 1,689 in 2009-2010 to 1,571 in 2010-2011. At \$26,180, annual tuition per student, a seven percent increase over the previous year, that meant a decline in anticipated tuition revenues of \$1.7 million. Room and board for the students living on campus was \$8,320 for next year. This represented a three percent increase over last year's room and board rate of \$8,070. With a decline of 118 students, that reduced room and board revenues by another \$475,584.

The state's demographic data on high school graduates for the next seven years was sitting on Chad's desk. Projections called for a decline in high school graduates from the previous year and continuing for the next six years. The previous year it had been four percent and next year it would be six percent. The third year it was projected to be eight percent. Enrollment could be a long-term challenge for Greenhill.

Graduate enrollment projected a two percent decline for next year. In 2009-2010, graduate programs had enrolled 700 graduate students. Projections for next year, even with the two new graduate programs slated to start this fall, forecasted an enrollment of 686 which was 14 fewer graduate students. This represented a \$116,760 decline in graduate tuition.

Chad quickly added all three numbers. The total revenue shortfall was slightly more than \$2 million in tuition and room and board revenue. To make matters worse, Greenhill had already announced to undergraduate students the seven percent undergraduate tuition increase. What would it look like if the college raised tuition again?

Chad knew the Greenhill College Board of Trustees had established a set of strategic assumptions for the administration to follow. These included a \$500,000 contingency fund, a continued focus on undergraduate and graduate academic programs, evaluation of academic programs showing decline or stagnant growth, and a mandated institutional balanced budget. There was also the auxiliary enterprise budget and other increases in the new budget. These included summer maintenance projects of

\$1,225,000, a \$975,000 faculty and staff salary increase (unannounced), and \$360,000 in new academic programs to name a few. The college administration had a lot to consider. Certainly the 2010-2011 fiscal year budget had to be balanced. Should the undergraduate tuition be raised a second time? What about a graduate program tuition increase? How about the \$360,000 committed to new academic programs in 2010-2011? Might the \$1,225,000 dedicated to summer maintenance projects be delayed? Should some academic programs and even faculty be eliminated? What about not following through on the as yet announced faculty and staff salary increases? None of these options were perfect. In fact each carried less-than-pleasant ramifications. Finally, Chad had to think about the internal and external perceptions of Greenhill given this financial crises. Might campus morale become an issue? Chad knew he had to take the lead on this and make some tough decisions. The very future of Greenhill College rested on these decisions.

Greenhill's History

Greenhill College had been founded in 1909 as a religious, liberal arts college. The college had 30 undergraduate majors, the top four being business, nursing, education, and biology. Not all of these 30 majors were growing. Undergraduate student enrollment was at 1,689 (2009-2010). In the last ten years since 2000, the college had launched graduate programs in education, business, and psychology, which added more than 700 graduate students (2009-2010). Greenhill had 360 employees, 150 of whom are regular, full-time faculty (110 undergraduate and 40 graduate). Greenhill had an active student life program with more than 85 percent of the undergraduate students living in campus residence halls. Graduate students lived in town or nearby. The college contracted with a national food service for all on-campus student meals and catering for on-campus events. The college was accredited with the Northeast Association of Schools and Colleges. Greenhill was a member of the National College Athletic Association, Division Three, and offered a wide variety of men's and women's sports. The primary source of financial revenues came from student tuition dollars. Approximately 85 percent of revenue was tuition-generated. The remaining 15 percent came from restricted and unrestricted giving from donors and money generated from the college's endowment. While Greenhill was private, students still were eligible for federal and state college loan programs. Greenhill had an academic scholarship program that awarded money to eligible students. Undergraduate tuition for the 2010-2011 academic year was \$26,180 and room and board as

\$8,320. The typical financial aid package was more than \$11,000 per student. Graduate tuition was \$695 per semester credit hour. The average graduate student was enrolled in six hours per semester or 12 hours per year. The annual budget of \$56 million was well managed, and while it didn't allow for all needs to be met it did satisfy most. The college currently had an endowment, which generated less than \$1 million annually. During the previous two fiscal years, the endowment has lost 30 percent of its value.

Case Study Conclusion

Chad believed that as a faith-based institution, Greenhill had been called to be a good steward of its resources (Matthew 25:14-30). He wondered how this biblical mandate translated into subsequent organizational decisions he and others would be called upon to make. Stewardship of resources meant using financial resources wisely, but it also implied managing human resources, such as effectively utilizing faculty and staff. One could interpret this to mean addressing faculty performance issues. Was Greenhill putting the best faculty in the classroom? Related to this was also the tuition question. Students were facing increasing challenges of affordability. He knew of students who held several off-campus jobs just to make ends meet. Given the high cost of college, didn't Greenhill have a responsibility to provide students with the best faculty possible? Was this not a fundamental stewardship imperative? Yet perhaps the greatest struggle Chad faced was the biblical principle to treat people fairly or as he would want to be treated (Matthew 7:12). "Do unto others as you would want them to do unto you" kept ringing in his ears. The question of faculty layoffs weighed heavily on Chad. The dilemma, maybe even the moral question, of laying off a longtime, loyal, decent but not excellent faculty member in order to provide students with a superior teacher in the classroom continually plagued Chad. This was not simply an economic dilemma, but also a spiritual mandate.

Chad also believed in the biblical principle that every man should be paid his due for a day's work (Matthew 20:1-14). This led to the question of whether the unannounced faculty salary increase should be implemented. Christian colleges historically were behind most schools in terms of faculty salary levels. Greenhill needed to increase faculty salaries, yet Chad knew he could recapture some monies by not instituting the proposed increases. Would such action be inconsistent with the biblical principle of paying people a fair wage (Malachi 3:5)?

As provost, Chad knew Greenhill College absolutely needed to address organizational issues and direction. Yes, the immediate problem was the \$2 million deficit, but

larger, more critical issues of organizational dynamics and even survival cast an invisible shadow over the quiet campus. There was work to do, and Chad knew it would take the effort of a representative group of faculty, staff and administrators. He decided to appoint a blue ribbon strategy task force to address the issues facing Greenhill College. The biblical principle of counting the cost came to Chad's mind (Luke 14: 28–30). The integration of this biblical principle with Greenhill's budget management process would be an important first step for the task force.

TEACHING CONTEXT AND RATIONALE

This case study was specifically designed for and product tested in a senior-level organizational behavior course at a church-related, liberal arts university. The case study seemed to have particular appeal to senior business majors in part because of their familiarity with the organization (most had been enrolled for four years), and the issues such as tuition increases and facilities were of interest. The class was made up of accounting, finance, management, and marketing students. In this course, students learned the dynamic nature of organizations and that there are no clear cut-choices when it comes to budget, program, and human resource decisions within organizations. Robert Kreitner and Angelo Kinicki (2010) wrote that "organizational behavior deals with how people act and react in organizations of all kinds" (p. 5). For students in organizational behavior, this case study sought to provide them the opportunity to respond to some of the difficult situations faced by organizations. Seeking to understand the impact of decision-making in an organization is one of the ultimate objectives of organizational behavior. This case study was designed to achieve this objective.

The case study required a significant use of class time. This called for a serious alteration of the syllabus as well as the instructor turning a good portion of the class over to the students. Initially there were questions. Would this even work? Would students take the case study seriously? Would they be accountable? How would the administration respond to seniors delving into case study issues that no doubt mirrored their own institution? Even though the case study was fictitious, the similarities might have hit too close to home. Kenneth Eble (1979) said that teaching requires a "willingness to take risks," and that "teaching is not a safe occupation, either for teacher or student" (p. 157). I take heart, if not courage, from these words.

Not only was the pedagogy risky, it also required a mindset that my teaching could improve. Weimer (1990)

suggests that faculty "continue to rely on the teaching methods they have always used – despite research documenting the need for students to learn actively" (p. xi). I have never tried using a lengthy case study in organizational behavior before. Faculty must be open to taking risks in the classroom and be willing to move outside their comfortable paradigms and look for creative and innovative ways to truly engage students, even if it is uncomfortable. The pedagogical change I was about to embark upon required both risk as well as a paradigm shift in my thinking. Utilizing this lengthy case study in class was a departure for me as a faculty member.

Would students be motivated to truly engage in the case study was another major question. Nigel Nicholson (2003) said the job of the manager in motivating employees is to "create the circumstances in which their inherent motivation — the natural commitment and drive that most people have — is freed and channeled toward achievement goals" (p. 57). The same concept applies to the classroom. This case study, in which students were required to actually present a balanced budget by making some tough organizational decisions, was inherently motivating to students. They were given a significant amount of responsibility, authority, and autonomy to address the serious issues facing Greenhill College. Frederick Herzberg (2002) referred to this in the work world as job enrichment and vertical job loading where employees are motivated by intrinsic rewards (p. 1). A story that was integrated with real-life management issues, at least in this case, proved to be good motivation for learning.

Another interesting result of this class is what I call the accountability factor. Could students be counted on to rise to the occasion and hold themselves accountable for their work since the teams have so much autonomy? Thomas Connellan (2003) said, "Be sure everyone understands the goal" when it comes to accountability (p. 57). Students in organizational behavior clearly knew they had to develop a balanced budget with the case study. They had to reduce the Greenhill institutional budget by more than \$2 million. Connellan also said, "The message I get from people is, 'Let me know what you want me to do, hold me accountable for getting results, and get out of the way'" (p. 77). This was precisely what happened in this class. I presented the challenge, told students they were accountable for balancing Greenhill's budget, and turned them loose. This was both freeing and frustrating for students, yet I saw them hold themselves accountable for their work product.

SUGGESTED TEACHING APPROACHES AND QUESTIONS

The Greenhill College case study can be used in a number of business classes, including finance, accounting, business management, organizational behavior, and business ethics. There are no clear-cut choices in terms of budget, program, and people decisions. All will have impact on the organization. Seeking to minimize the impact and continuing to move the organization forward in a positive direction must be the ultimate objective.

This case has been classroom tested in a senior-level organizational behavior class of more than 35 undergraduate business and accounting majors. The class was divided into teams of six who were required to carefully read and analyze the case as if they were the administrators at Greenhill. The students were given a case study analysis guideline and were required to consult with and obtain signatures from at least three administrators at their own institution. At the end of the semester, each team made a major presentation as to their findings and ultimate decisions. This case was highly interactive with students vigorously debating the issues within and at times outside their teams.

Serious consideration should be given to how Greenhill College's financial decision-making reflects the teachings of Scripture. A suggested teaching approach would be to include how the scriptural imperatives to treat people fairly, pay a fair wage, and to be good and faithful stewards of God-provided resources should impact the budget management process.

Learning Outcomes

1. Students should further develop their understanding of systems thinking in their decision-making (Senge, 1990). The idea that organizational decisions are not made in isolation, but rather are interrelated is a critical concept for students to learn in this case study.
2. Students will learn how financial and non-financial data impacts an organization's decisions, and that it is critical to analyze and give appropriate weight to both.
3. Students will see the value and productivity of working in teams and how each member has something to contribute.
4. Students will develop critical analysis and critical thinking skills and learn the value of using these to support a position.

Discussion Questions and Issues for Consideration

1. What are the critical issues and how would you effectively address them?
2. How might Greenhill's financial pressures impact organizational culture?
3. What might be some examples and ramifications of Greenhill making isolated rather than interrelated decisions in its attempt to solve the current crises? (systems thinking in organizations)
4. What might be some examples and ramifications of Greenhill making interrelated rather than isolated decisions in its attempt to solve the current crises? (systems thinking in organizations)
5. What might be the value of the Blue Ribbon Task Force on Greenhill's culture and morale?
6. How would you utilize critical thinking and analysis to address the financial and other pertinent issues facing Greenhill College?
7. How might Greenhill College's leadership faithfully integrate the biblical principles of financial management and stewardship of God provided resources in its budgeting process and institutional decision making?

REFERENCES

- Connellan, T.K. (2003). *Bringing out the best in others*. Austin: Brad Press.
- Eble, K. E. (1976). *The craft of teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishing.
- Herzberg, F. (2002). *One more time: How do you motivate employees?* Cambridge: Harvard Business School Publishing.
- Kreitner, R., & Kinicki, A. (2010). *Organizational behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin Publishing.
- Nicholson, N. (2003). *How to motivate your problem people*. Cambridge: Harvard Business School Publishing.
- Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline*. New York: Doubleday.
- Van De Werf, M. (2008). *Financial uncertainty and the admissions class of 2008*. Washington, D.C.: Chronicle Research Services.
- Weiner, M. (1990). *Improving college teaching*. San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Appendix A: Statement of Current Fund Revenues and Expenditures

	2009/2010 <i>(ending June 30)</i>	2010/2011 <i>(ending June 30)</i>
Revenues		
Educational and general		
Student tuition undergraduate	42,892,155	41,128,780
Student tuition graduate	5,838,000	5,721,240
Government grants	350,000	400,000
Private gifts and grants	1,200,000	900,000
Endowment income	850,000	800,000
Other revenues	200,000	250,000
Total educational and general revenues	51,330,155	49,200,020
Auxiliary enterprises	6,165,824	6,840,000
Total revenues	57,240,979	56,040,020
Expenditures		
Educational and general		
Academic instruction	29,000,000	29,300,000
Academic support	1,900,000	2,000,000
Student services	2,900,000	2,950,000
Student life	1,900,000	2,100,000
Intercollegiate athletics	1,900,000	2,000,000
Institutional support	5,000,000	5,200,000
Advancement	1,900,000	1,900,000
Contingency fund	500,000	500,000
Summer facilities projects	1,100,000	1,225,000
Auxiliary enterprises	10,100,000	11,010,000
Total expenditures	56,200,000	58,185,000
Excess (deficit) of revenues over expenditures	1,584,350	-2,144,980

Appendix B: Greenhill College Summary of General Educational Expenses

	2009/2010 <i>(ending June 30)</i>	2010/2011 <i>(ending June 30)</i>		2009/2010 <i>(ending June 30)</i>	2010/2011 <i>(ending June 30)</i>
Academic Instruction			Intercollegiate Athletics	1,900,000	2,000,000
School of Liberal Arts	12,192,000	12,200,000	Institutional Support		
School of Business	5,210,000	5,320,000	Executive management	2,380,000	2,480,000
School of Education	5,361,000	5,443,000	General administration	1,800,000	1,900,000
School of Science	6,237,000	6,337,000	External relations	820,000	820,000
Total	29,000,000	29,300,000	Total	5,000,000	5,200,000
Academic Support			Advancement	1,900,000	1,900,000
Library	1,100,000	1,150,000	Plant Operations		
Faculty professional growth	396,000	406,000	Plant administration	510,000	520,000
Academic administration	332,000	362,000	New construction	175,000	225,000
Graduation	72,000	82,000	Building maintenance	910,000	940,000
Total	1,900,000	2,000,000	Mechanical and electrical	780,000	795,000
Student Services			Grounds	495,000	515,000
Admissions UG	1,000,000	1,200,000	Custodial services	853,000	870,000
Orientation	12,000	17,000	Utilities	975,000	995,000
Admissions GR	400,000	425,000	Environmental /Safety	2,000	2,000
Student financial services	832,000	582,000	Total	4,700,000	4,862,000
Registrar	600,000	670,000	Allocated across departments	0	
Other/Admin/Assessment	56,000	56,000	Personnel Benefits		
Total	2,900,000	2,950,000	Social security	1,350,000	1,400,000
Student Life			Retirement	1,250,000	1,300,000
Campus ministries	125,000	155,000	Medical insurance	2,300,000	2,500,000
Dean of students	316,000	326,000	Worker's compensation and insurance	175,000	195,000
Associate dean	168,000	188,000	Unemployment	5,000	4,000
Orientation	78,000	98,000	Life & disability insurance	127,000	130,000
Health and counseling center	256,000	276,000	Tuition Remission	1,600,000	1,700,000
Academic learning center	192,000	202,000	Total	6,807,000	7,229,000
Security	278,000	298,000	Allocated across departments	0	
Multicultural services	77,000	97,000	Contingency Fund	500,000	500,000
Career development center	197,000	207,000	Summer facilities projects	1,100,000	1,225,000
Intramural athletics	186,000	206,000	Auxiliary Enterprises	10,100,000	11,010,000
Housing programs and services	27,000	47,000			
Total	1,900,000	2,100,000	Total Educational and General Expenditures	56,200,000	58,185,000

Appendix C: Auxiliary Enterprises

	2009/2010 <i>(ending June 30)</i>	2010/2011 <i>(ending June 30)</i>
Housing		
Revenues	11,585,695	11,110,112
Expenditures		
Personnel Costs	349,999	260,000
Program costs	4,409,305	5,600,000
Total expenditures	4,759,304	5,860,000
Excess (deficit)	6,826,391	5,250,112
Food service		
Revenues	3,792,847	5,489,888
Expenditures		
Personnel costs	130,000	130,000
Program costs	3,500,000	3,700,000
Other costs	150,264	200,000
Total expenditures	3,780,264	4,030,000
Excess (deficit)	12,583	1,459,888
College bookstore		
Revenues	887,152	950,000
Expenditures		
Personnel costs	100,000	75,000
Program costs	940,432	700,000
Other costs	50,000	50,000
Total Expenditures	1,090,432	825,000
Excess (deficit)	-203,280	125,000
Conferences		
Revenues	289,000	300,000
Expenditures		
Personnel costs	225,000	100,000
Program costs	225,000	175,000
Other costs	20,000	20,000
Total expenditures	470,000	295,000
Excess (deficit)	-181,000	5,000
Total Auxiliary Enterprises	10,100,000	11,010,000
Revenues	16,554, 695	17,850,000
Expenditures	10,100,000	11,010,000
Excess (deficit)	6,454, 695	6,840,000

Appendix D: Undergraduate Majors as a Percentage of Undergraduate Enrollment

Majors	2010/2011		2009/2010		2008/2009		2007/2008	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Business	225	13.321%	215	13.633%	210	14.957%	195	15.081%
Nursing	195	11.545%	188	11.921%	100	7.123%	90	6.961%
Elementary Education	135	7.993%	130	8.244%	120	8.547%	100	7.734%
Psychology	102	6.039%	95	6.024%	88	6.268%	65	5.027%
Biology	101	5.980%	95	6.024%	88	6.268%	75	5.800%
Engineering	93	5.506%	85	5.390%	78	5.556%	68	5.259%
Art	71	4.204%	67	4.249%	65	4.630%	61	4.718%
Writing	61	3.612%	57	3.614%	56	3.989%	65	5.027%
Consumer Science	61	3.612%	59	3.741%	58	4.131%	65	5.027%
Accounting	59	3.493%	55	3.488%	50	3.561%	45	3.480%
Physical Education	54	3.197%	51	3.234%	48	3.419%	39	3.016%
Media Communications	60	0.030%	52	3.297%	45	3.205%	41	3.171%
Religion	68	3.000%	49	3.107%	45	3.205%	40	3.094%
Sociology	52	3.079%	49	3.107%	42	2.991%	39	3.016%
Chemistry	51	3.020%	38	2.410%	35	2.493%	32	2.475%
Mathematics	48	2.842%	49	3.107%	42	2.991%	39	3.016%
English	45	2.664%	48	3.044%	49	3.490%	47	3.635%
Computer Science	25	1.480%	38	2.410%	37	2.635%	44	3.403%
Athletic Training	32	1.895%	31	1.966%	30	2.137%	29	2.243%
Social Work	29	1.717%	28	1.776%	25	1.781%	21	1.624%
History	27	1.599%	28	1.776%	27	1.923%	27	2.088%
Spanish	26	1.539%	19	1.205%	17	1.211%	16	1.237%
Organizational Communication	21	1.243%	16	1.015%	19	1.353%	18	1.392%
Economics	14	0.829%	9	0.571%	7	0.499%	8	0.619%
International Studies	14	0.829%	9	0.571%	8	0.570%	5	0.387%
Music	8	0.474%	7	0.444%	6	0.427%	10	0.773%
Theatre	6	0.355%	5	0.317%	5	0.356%	4	0.309%
Philosophy	6	0.355%	5	0.317%	4	0.285%	5	0.387%
Total UG Enrollment	1571		1698		1404		1293	

**Appendix E: Undergraduate Enrollment and Retention Data
for the University and by Academic Department, Last Four Years**

Majors	2010/2011	2009/2010	2008/2009	2007/2008
Business	225	215	210	195
Nursing	195	188	100	90
Elementary Education	135	130	120	100
Psychology	102	95	88	65
Biology	101	95	88	75
Engineering	93	85	78	68
Art	71	67	65	61
Writing	61	57	56	65
Consumer Science	61	59	58	65
Accounting	59	55	50	45
Physical Education	54	51	48	39
Media Communications	60	52	45	41
Religion	68	49	45	40
Sociology	52	49	42	39
Mathematics	48	49	42	39
English	45	48	49	47
Chemistry	51	38	35	32
Computer Science	25	38	37	44
Athletic Training	32	31	30	29
Social Work	29	28	25	21
History	27	28	27	27
Spanish	26	19	17	16
Organizational Communication	21	16	19	18
Economics	14	9	7	8
International Studies	14	9	8	5
Music	8	7	6	10
Theatre	6	5	5	4
Philosophy	6	5	4	5

Appendix F: Academic Department Full Time Equivalent Faculty				
Majors	2010/2011	2009/2010	2008/2009	2007/2008
Business	9	9	8	7
Nursing	9	7	6	5
Elementary Education	8	9	8	7
Psychology	5	4	3	3
Biology	5	5	4	4
Engineering	5	5	4	4
Art	4	3	3	2
Writing	4	4	3	3
Consumer Science	4	4	4	4
Accounting	2	2	2	2
Physical Education	4	4	3	3
Media Communications	3	3	2	2
Religion	6	5	4	3
Sociology	3	3	2	2
Mathematics	3.5	3.5	3	3
English	3	3	3	2
Chemistry	3	3	3	2
Computer Science	2	2	3	3
Athletic Training	3	3	2	2
Social Work	3	3	2	2
History	4.5	3.5	3	3
Spanish	3	2	2	2
Organizational Communication	3	3	3	2
Economics	3	2	2	2
International Studies	1	1	1	1
Music	5	5	4	3
Theatre	2	2	2	1.5
Philosophy	1	1	1	.5
Total	110	104	90	80

Appendix G: Academic Department Full Time Equivalent Faculty

Majors	2010/2011	5 year change %
Religion	5600	30%
Business	3200	58%
Nursing	1700	N/A
Elementary Education	1400	-59%
Psychology	2888	35%
Biology	2584	18%
Engineering	1150	102%
Art	2200	29%
Literature	2088	10%
Consumer Science	1350	67%
Accounting	1227	62%
Physical Education	703	-63%
Sociology	2056	25%
Mathematics	2210	43%
Writing	1523	37%
Chemistry	1822	18%
Computer Science	449	-34%
Athletic Training	1573	65%
Social Work	577	45%
History	2400	0%
Spanish	837	24%
Cinema and Media	748	162%
Organizational Comm	1914	38%
Economics	1160	37%
International Studies	200	-41%
Music	1863	45%
Theatre	679	7%
Philosophy	843	-9%

Appendix H: Greenhill College Organizational Chart

