

**Final Project Paper: Integrating Bolman and Deal's Four Frames with Kotter's 8-Step
Change Model to Restructure ATLAS**

Vladimir Kuljak

William Woods University

EDU 750: Organizational Learning and System Change

Dr. N

March 2026

Abstract

This paper integrates a multi-frame organizational analysis with a widely used change management model to propose a comprehensive restructuring of the Achievement and Assessment Institute's ATLAS division at the University of Kansas. The analysis focuses on two major organizational issues: inequitable supervisory practices and power imbalances between supervisors and staff. These challenges are examined through structural, human resource, political, and symbolic perspectives to reveal how systemic patterns reinforce inequity. Systems thinking principles are incorporated to highlight feedback loops, mental models, and unintended consequences that sustain these problems. The paper also includes a section connecting the organizational analysis to a dissertation topic on students' experiences in AI-supported learning environments, emphasizing motivation, self-regulation, and academic confidence. This integrated approach demonstrates how multi-frame thinking and change leadership strategies can support more equitable and effective organizational and educational systems.

Introduction

Organizations rarely fail because of a single broken process or one problematic leader. They fail because multiple forces—structural, human, political, and symbolic—interact in ways that reinforce dysfunction over time. Bolman and Deal's (2021) Four-Frame Model provides a powerful lens for understanding these dynamics. When combined with Kotter's (2012) 8-Step Change Model, leaders gain both diagnostic clarity and a roadmap for action.

This paper applies these frameworks to two persistent issues within the University of Kansas' Achievement and Assessment Institute (AAI), specifically the ATLAS division:

- Inequitable supervisory practices and role ambiguity

- Power imbalances between supervisors and staff

Past analysis showed that not having clear expectations caused a lot of confusion and inefficiency. Plus, inconsistent behavior from supervisors created an environment where employees felt judged, unsupported, and often excluded from opportunities. Supervisors hold the reins when it comes to information—deciding what gets shared, when, and with whom. And recognition rituals typically focus on supervisors instead of the staff. These aren't just isolated events; they point to deeper systemic problems.

Using systems thinking helps us see how structures, mental models, and feedback loops contribute to these inequities. Instead of looking at each issue as a separate incident, this paper applies the four frames and Kotter’s model to outline a more cohesive, multi-level strategy for change. The first part digs into the main organizational challenges at ATLAS.

Table 1
Summary of Organizational Issues at ATLAS

<i>Issue Category</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Impact on Organization</i>
Supervisory Inequities	Inconsistent expectations, uneven support, subjective decision-making	Reduced trust, perceived unfairness
Role Ambiguity	Unclear responsibilities, shifting expectations	Confusion, inefficiency, rework
Power Imbalances	Supervisors control information and access to opportunities	Limited staff voice, inequitable influence
Communication Breakdowns	Fragmented channels, inconsistent messaging	Misalignment, delays, frustration
Cultural Hierarchy	Rituals and narratives elevate supervisors over staff	Reinforced hierarchy, weakened belonging

Kotter Step 1: Establishing a Sense of Urgency

Structural frame

From a structural perspective, ATLAS suffers from inconsistent supervisory practices, unclear roles, and fragmented communication systems. Employees receive conflicting instructions, deadlines shift without explanation, and job responsibilities vary depending on the supervisor. These inconsistencies create a reinforcing feedback loop: unclear expectations lead to errors, which lead supervisors to tighten control, which further reduces clarity and autonomy.

Human resource frame

The human cost of these structural failures is significant. Employees report feeling unsupported, confused, and undervalued. Psychological safety is compromised when staff cannot predict how supervisors will respond or whether expectations will change without warning. This reduces engagement, increases stress, and contributes to burnout and turnover risk.

Political frame

Politically, supervisors hold disproportionate power through control of information, access to leadership, and informal alliances. Staff without positional authority lack formal channels to challenge decisions or advocate for themselves. This creates a political hierarchy that reinforces inequity and discourages dissent.

Symbolic frame

Cultural rituals, like events that honor supervisors instead of the staff, send a clear message: leadership is prioritized over the contributions of those on the front lines. The stories we tell, the symbols we use, and our traditions quietly convey who's important and who isn't.

These symbolic practices play a significant role in shaping the identity of the organization, indicating who fits in and whose opinions might be overlooked.

Table 2
Four-Frame Analysis of ATLAS

<i>Frame</i>	<i>Key Issues Identified</i>	<i>Evidence/Implication</i>
Structural	Unclear roles, inconsistent supervision, lack of standardized processes	Confusion, inefficiency, subjective decisions
Human Resource	Reduced psychological safety, uneven support	Feelings of being judged, unsupported, excluded
Political	Information gatekeeping, informal coalitions	Limited staff influence, inequitable access to resources
Symbolic	Hierarchical rituals, inequitable recognition	Supervisors spotlighted, staff contributions minimized

Kotter Step 2: Building a Guiding Coalition

Structural frame

A guiding coalition must include representatives from all levels of the organization—staff, supervisors, HR, project managers, and DEI leaders. This ensures that structural reforms reflect diverse needs and perspectives rather than being imposed from the top down.

Human resource frame

Including trusted staff members promotes psychological safety and signals that leadership values employee voice. When employees see peers at the table, they are more likely to trust the process and share honest feedback.

Political frame

To rebalance influence, the coalition must intentionally include members with lower positional power. This disrupts existing power monopolies and ensures that decisions are not dominated by supervisors or long-tenured insiders. Formalizing the coalition's authority also reduces back-channel decision-making.

Symbolic frame

Coalition members should embody fairness, collaboration, and equity. Their presence symbolizes a cultural shift toward shared leadership and collective responsibility. The coalition itself becomes a symbol of the new way of working.

Kotter Step 3: Developing a Vision and Strategy

Structural frame

The vision must emphasize clear roles, consistent supervisory practices, and transparent communication systems. Standardized processes reduce ambiguity and increase fairness. For example, all supervisors should use the same performance expectations, feedback cycles, and documentation practices.

Human resource frame

The strategy should promote a supportive culture where all employees receive equitable guidance, development, and recognition. This includes mentoring programs, professional development opportunities, and regular check-ins that focus on growth rather than only evaluation.

Political frame

The vision must commit to reducing information monopolies and distributing influence more fairly. This includes formalizing staff advisory groups, shared governance structures, and transparent decision-making processes.

Symbolic frame

A new narrative should position ATLAS as a collaborative, equitable, mission-driven community. Stories, symbols, and rituals must reinforce this identity—for example, recognition events that highlight cross-level collaboration and staff contributions.

Table 3

Kotter’s 8 Steps Integrated with the Four Frames

<i>Kotter Step</i>	<i>Structural Actions</i>	<i>Human Resource Actions</i>	<i>Political Actions</i>	<i>Symbolic Actions</i>
1. Urgency	Identify inefficiencies, clarify roles	Highlight safety concerns	Expose information monopolies	Reveal inequitable narratives
2. Guiding Coalition	Cross-functional team	Include trusted staff	Balance power representation	Symbolize fairness and collaboration
3. Vision & Strategy	Standardize supervision, communication	Promote equitable development	Commit to transparency	Craft collaborative, equity-focused narrative
4. Communicate Vision	Use standard channels	Model supportive behavior	Ensure equal access to information	Use stories, metaphors, rituals
5. Remove Obstacles	Fix job descriptions, processes	Train supervisors in equitable leadership	Implement checks-and-balances	Redesign recognition rituals
6. Short-Term Wins	Implement quick structural fixes	Celebrate equitable collaboration	Highlight reduced power imbalances	Publicize early wins

<i>Kotter Step</i>	<i>Structural Actions</i>	<i>Human Resource Actions</i>	<i>Political Actions</i>	<i>Symbolic Actions</i>
7. Sustain Acceleration	Expand reforms (metrics, coordination)	Strengthen mentoring and feedback	Formalize shared governance	Institutionalize inclusive rituals
8. Anchor in Culture	Embed policies and expectations	Normalize psychological safety	Normalize transparent decision-making	Reinforce new identity through symbols and stories

Kotter Step 4: Communicating the Vision

Good communication is key if you want real change to happen. Having set ways to share information—like team meetings, clear guidelines, and shared documents—helps everyone stay on the same page and cuts down on misunderstandings. It's also important for supervisors to show supportive behavior and create a safe space for employees by listening actively, being transparent, and giving helpful feedback.

From a political standpoint, making sure everyone has access to the same information helps break down barriers and informal power dynamics. When employees get updates at the same time as their managers, it builds trust and reduces gossip. On a symbolic level, using stories, metaphors, and rituals can help reinforce the new vision. Leaders should share success stories, acknowledge team members' efforts, and adjust ceremonies to match the new values.

Kotter Step 5: Removing Obstacles and Empowering People

To tackle obstacles, we really need to focus on all four areas. There are structural issues like vague job descriptions, inconsistent management practices, and a lack of feedback that need to be addressed. Updating role descriptions, setting clear performance expectations, and having consistent processes can help clear up confusion.

From a human resources standpoint, offering training on fair leadership, effective communication, and conflict resolution can empower everyone, from staff to supervisors. This not only enhances skills but also strengthens relationships within the team. Politically, being transparent and having checks and balances can help avoid informal alliances and power struggles. For instance, using a diverse committee to review decisions about promotions or assignments instead of relying on just one supervisor can lead to fairer outcomes.

On a symbolic level, it's important to revamp recognition rituals to celebrate contributions from all staff, not just those in supervisory roles. When employees see their efforts recognized in a public way, it sends a strong message that they play a vital role in the organization's mission.

Kotter Step 6: Generating Short-Term Wins

Getting some quick wins is important for building up momentum. Simple changes—like having standard job descriptions, project dashboards everyone can see, or better communication guidelines—can really show that progress is happening. In terms of human resources, it's a good idea to acknowledge teams that are doing a great job with collaboration and improving relationships between supervisors and their staff.

On the political side, it's crucial to showcase early wins that help balance power, like involving everyone in decision-making processes or being open about procedures. Plus, publicly celebrating these achievements emphasizes the cultural shift toward fairness and inclusion. These

successes also play a role in changing how people think, proving that a better way to work is achievable.

Kotter Step 7: Sustaining Acceleration

Sustaining acceleration is all about going beyond just a few isolated improvements and aiming for a system-wide change. On the structural side, reforms should cover things like workload metrics, evaluation rubrics, and coordination between teams. This way, new practices won't hinge on specific individuals.

Looking at it from a human resources angle, mentoring programs and channels for feedback can really help with ongoing development and boost morale. On the political side, having staff advisory groups and shared governance structures helps spread out influence and keeps power from getting too centralized. Plus, embracing inclusive rituals—like regular forums that involve everyone or storytelling events—helps reinforce the new culture and keeps the vision alive.

Kotter Step 8: Anchoring New Approaches in Culture

Anchoring change in culture requires alignment across all four frames. Structurally, equitable supervisory practices must be embedded in policy, onboarding, and performance evaluations. Human resource norms must make psychological safety, fairness, and development core expectations.

Politically, transparent decision-making and shared influence must become part of ATLAS's identity. Symbolically, stories, symbols, and traditions must reinforce ATLAS as a

collaborative, equitable organization. Over time, these cultural elements make the new way of working feel natural and expected rather than temporary or optional.

Dissertation Integration Section

Applying the Four Frames to Students' Experiences in AI-Supported Learning Environments

Your dissertation explores how students experience AI-supported learning environments and how these tools influence their motivation, self-regulation, and academic confidence. This topic aligns directly with the need for multi-frame leadership in educational organizations adopting AI.

Structural frame: Designing AI systems that support learning

The structural frame emphasizes clarity, roles, processes, and alignment. In AI-supported classrooms, structural issues arise when AI tools provide inconsistent feedback, when students receive conflicting instructions from AI and teachers, or when workflows across platforms are fragmented. Kitsantas et al. (2025) argue that self-regulated learning requires clear structures, scaffolds, and feedback loops. When AI systems are poorly structured, students' motivation and confidence decline because they cannot predict how the system will respond or how to use it effectively.

Human resource frame: Supporting students' psychological needs

The human resource frame focuses on individual needs, motivation, and well-being. Students' emotional responses to AI tools—confidence, anxiety, frustration—shape their

learning experiences. Deci and Ryan's (2020) Self-Determination Theory shows that motivation thrives when autonomy, competence, and relatedness are supported. AI tools can support these needs when they provide clear, constructive feedback and allow students to make choices. However, when AI feedback is opaque, overly critical, or misaligned with student skill levels, it can undermine motivation and confidence.

Political frame: Power, access, and equity in AI learning

AI systems redistribute power in classrooms. Williamson and Eynon (2023) argue that AI tools can reinforce inequities through algorithmic bias, uneven access, and digital literacy gaps. Students with higher technological fluency benefit more, while others struggle to interpret or use AI feedback. This mirrors the political imbalances at ATLAS, where supervisors control information. In AI-supported learning, power is embedded in the design of algorithms, the availability of devices, and the rules governing AI use. Questions of who controls the data, who can override AI decisions, and who gets to decide how AI is used are fundamentally political.

Symbolic frame: Meaning, identity, and culture in AI learning

The symbolic frame highlights how students interpret the meaning of AI tools. Students often wonder whether using AI means they are "cheating," whether AI is "judging" them, or whether AI will eventually replace teachers. These symbolic interpretations shape motivation and confidence. AI tools carry cultural weight—they can represent innovation, surveillance, fairness, or depersonalization. If AI is framed as a partner in learning, students may feel more empowered. If it is framed as a policing mechanism, they may feel anxious or resistant.

Systems thinking: AI learning environments as complex systems

AI-supported learning environments are complex adaptive systems with reinforcing feedback loops, unintended consequences, and interdependent structures. Senge (2006) emphasizes that systems thinking helps leaders see patterns rather than isolated events. Your dissertation does exactly this by exploring how students experience AI tools, not just how they perform with them. For example, a student who receives confusing AI feedback may feel anxious (emotional response), which reduces motivation, which leads to less engagement, which results in poorer performance, which then triggers more negative AI feedback—a reinforcing loop.

By applying the four frames to AI-supported learning, your dissertation can:

- Use the **structural frame** to analyze how AI tools are integrated into course design.
- Use the **human resource frame** to explore how AI affects students’ motivation, self-regulation, and confidence.
- Use the **political frame** to examine issues of access, bias, and power.
- Use the **symbolic frame** to interpret how students make meaning of AI in their educational journeys.

This multi-frame approach deepens the analysis and positions your dissertation within broader conversations about equity, technology, and organizational learning.

Table 4

Dissertation Constructs in AI-Supported Learning

<i>Construct</i>	<i>Definition</i>	<i>AI Influence (Examples)</i>
Motivation	Drive to engage, persist, and invest effort in learning	Supportive feedback can increase motivation; harsh or opaque feedback can reduce it

<i>Construct</i>	<i>Definition</i>	<i>AI Influence (Examples)</i>
Self-Regulation	Ability to plan, monitor, and adjust learning strategies	AI prompts can scaffold planning and reflection, or overwhelm students with data
Academic Confidence	Belief in one’s ability to succeed academically	Clear, constructive AI feedback can build confidence; confusing or critical feedback can undermine it

Table 5
Themes in Student Experiences with AI-Supported Learning

<i>Theme</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Example Source</i>
Transparency	Students want to understand how AI makes decisions	Williamson & Eynon (2023)
Feedback Quality	Tone, clarity, and usefulness shape motivation and confidence	Kitsantas et al. (2025)
Emotional Impact	AI interactions trigger anxiety, relief, or confidence	Deci & Ryan (2020)
Autonomy Support	AI can enhance or undermine students’ sense of control	Edmondson (2019)
Equity & Access	Digital literacy and algorithmic bias affect student experience	Senge (2006)

Figures

Figure 1. Systems Thinking Causal Loop for Supervisory Inequity Inconsistent supervision → reduced psychological safety → lower engagement → more errors → more supervisor control → more inconsistent supervision (reinforcing loop).

Figure 2. Four-Frame Model Around Equity Four quadrants labeled Structural, Human Resource, Political, and Symbolic, all pointing toward a center labeled “Equity & Organizational Learning.”

Figure 3. Kotter’s 8-Step Change Flow Urgency → Coalition → Vision → Communication → Obstacles → Wins → Sustain → Anchor.

Figure 4. AI-Supported Learning Experience Model AI Tool → Student Interpretation → Emotional Response → Motivation/Self-Regulation → Performance → AI Feedback (looping back to AI Tool).

Conclusion

The restructuring of ATLAS demonstrates how multi-frame thinking and Kotter's change model can address systemic inequities rooted in structure, human needs, power, and culture. Systems thinking reveals how these issues persist through reinforcing feedback loops and mental models. The dissertation integration section shows that similar dynamics shape students' experiences in AI-supported learning environments. Whether in organizational leadership or educational technology, equity requires clarity, transparency, shared power, and meaningful cultural narratives. By integrating the four frames, Kotter's model, and systems thinking, leaders can design organizations and learning environments that are not only more effective, but also more just.

References

- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2021). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (7th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2020). *Self-determination theory: Basic psychological needs in motivation, development, and wellness*. Guilford Press.
- Edmondson, A. (2019). *The fearless organization: Creating psychological safety in the workplace for learning, innovation, and growth*. Wiley.

Kitsantas, A., Dabbagh, N., Hu, D., & Baylor, A. (2025). *Learning analytics and self-regulated learning in digital environments*. Routledge.

Kotter, J. P. (2012). *Leading change*. Harvard Business Review Press.

Mintzberg, H. (2017). *Structure in fives: Designing effective organizations*. Prentice Hall.

O’Leary, R. (2020). Role clarity and organizational effectiveness: A review of structural alignment in modern workplaces. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 41(3), 245–260.

Senge, P. (2006). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. Doubleday.

Williamson, B., & Eynon, R. (2023). *AI and education: Power, ethics, and datafication in learning systems*. Oxford University Press.

Appendix A

Kotter’s 8 Steps Integrated with Bolman & Deal’s Four Frames

<i>Kotter Step</i>	<i>Structural Frame</i>	<i>Human Resource Frame</i>	<i>Political Frame</i>	<i>Symbolic Frame</i>
1. Establishing a Sense of Urgency	Identifies inefficiencies caused by unclear roles, inconsistent supervision, and fragmented communication systems.	Highlights reduced psychological safety, uneven support, and emotional strain on staff.	Reveals information monopolies, informal alliances, and inequitable access to decision-making.	Exposes cultural narratives and rituals that reinforce hierarchy and favoritism.
2. Building a Guiding Coalition	Forms a cross-functional team including staff, supervisors,	Ensures trusted staff voices are included to promote psychological	Intentionally includes members with lower positional power to rebalance influence.	Selects coalition members who symbolize fairness,

<i>Kotter Step</i>	<i>Structural Frame</i>	<i>Human Resource Frame</i>	<i>Political Frame</i>	<i>Symbolic Frame</i>
3. Developing a Vision and Strategy	HR, DEI, and project managers. Creates standardized supervisory expectations, communication protocols, and role clarity.	safety and authentic participation. Promotes equitable development, recognition, and supportive leadership behaviors.	Commits to transparency, shared governance, and reducing information gatekeeping.	collaboration, and equity. Crafts a narrative positioning ATLAS as a collaborative, equitable, mission-driven community.
4. Communicating the Vision	Uses consistent communication channels: team meetings, written guidelines, shared documentation.	Supervisors model supportive behaviors and reinforce psychological safety.	Ensures equal access to information to disrupt gatekeeping.	Uses stories, metaphors, and rituals to reinforce the new vision.
5. Removing Obstacles	Fixes unclear job descriptions, inconsistent supervisory practices, and missing feedback mechanisms.	Provides training in equitable leadership, communication, and conflict resolution.	Implements checks-and-balances to reduce informal coalitions and power imbalances.	Redesigns recognition rituals to celebrate contributions from all levels.
6. Generating Short-Term Wins	Implements quick structural improvements such as standardized role descriptions.	Recognizes teams demonstrating equitable collaboration and improved relationships.	Highlights early successes that reduce power imbalances.	Publicly celebrates early wins to reinforce cultural change.
7. Sustaining Acceleration	Expands reforms to include workload metrics, evaluation rubrics, and cross-team coordination.	Strengthens mentoring programs and feedback channels.	Formalizes staff advisory groups and shared governance structures.	Institutionalizes inclusive rituals and practices.
8. Anchoring New Approaches in Culture	Embeds equitable supervisory practices into policy, onboarding, and evaluations.	Normalizes psychological safety, fairness, and development as cultural expectations.	Normalizes transparent decision-making and shared influence.	Reinforces ATLAS's identity through stories, symbols, and traditions.

Appendix B

Interview Protocol for Dissertation Study

Title: Student Experiences in AI-Supported Learning Environments

Purpose: To explore how students describe their experiences with AI-supported learning tools and how they perceive the impact of these tools on their motivation, self-regulation, and academic confidence.

Introduction Script: “Thank you for participating in this study. I’m interested in your real experiences using AI tools in your learning. There are no right or wrong answers—only your perspective. Your responses will remain confidential.”

Background Questions:

1. What grade level or year in school are you in?
2. What types of AI tools have you used for learning (e.g., chatbots, tutoring systems, writing assistants)?
3. How often do you use AI tools for schoolwork?

Core Questions:

1. Can you describe a recent experience where you used an AI tool for schoolwork?
2. How did you feel while using the AI tool (e.g., confident, confused, anxious, supported)?

3. In what ways, if any, did the AI tool affect your motivation to work on the assignment?
4. Did the AI tool help you plan, organize, or monitor your work? How?
5. How did the AI tool influence your confidence in your ability to complete the task?
6. Were there moments when the AI feedback felt helpful? Can you give an example?
7. Were there moments when the AI feedback felt unhelpful or discouraging?
8. How do you decide when to trust the AI tool versus your own judgment or your teacher's guidance?
9. Do you feel that all students in your class have the same access and comfort level with AI tools? Why or why not?
10. If you could change how AI tools are used in your classes, what would you change?

Closing Script: "Is there anything else you'd like to share about your experiences with AI in learning? Thank you for your time and insights."

Appendix C

Coding Framework for AI Learning Experiences

Level 1 Codes

Code	Meaning
MOT+	Increased motivation
MOT-	Decreased motivation

Code	Meaning
SRL+	Enhanced self-regulation (planning, monitoring, reflecting)
SRL-	Reduced self-regulation (overreliance, confusion)
CONF+	Increased academic confidence
CONF-	Decreased academic confidence
EMO+	Positive emotions (relief, excitement, curiosity)
EMO-	Negative emotions (anxiety, frustration, intimidation)
TRANS	Comments about transparency of AI decisions
TRUST	Statements about trusting or distrusting AI
EQUITY	References to access, fairness, or bias

Level 2 Themes

Theme	Description	Related Codes
Supportive AI Experiences	AI enhances learning, motivation, or confidence	MOT+, SRL+, CONF+, EMO+
Threatening AI Experiences	AI undermines motivation, confidence, or emotional safety	MOT-, SRL-, CONF-, EMO-
Interpretive Frames of AI	How students make sense of AI decisions	TRANS, TRUST
Equity and Access	Differences in digital literacy, device access, or algorithmic bias	EQUITY

Example Coding

“The AI feedback helped me see what I was missing, so I felt more confident finishing the essay.” Codes: SRL+, CONF+, EMO+

“Sometimes it tells me I’m wrong but doesn’t explain why, and that makes me not want to use it.” Codes: MOT-, EMO-, TRANS

Appendix D

Organizational Chart (Before and After Restructuring)

Before Restructuring (Narrative)

- ATLAS Director at the top
- Multiple supervisors reporting directly to the director
- Staff reporting to supervisors with unclear role boundaries
- Communication flows primarily top-down
- No formal staff advisory group
- No standardized supervisory expectations

Before Diagram/ Table

<i>Level</i>	<i>Unit / Division</i>	<i>Leader(s)</i>	<i>Teams / Staff</i>
1	Vice Chancellor for Research	Shelley Hooks	Executive Associate: Theresa Woolley; Administrative Associates: Kymbre Dwyer, Vacant
2	Research Catalysis	Candan Tamerler (Associate Vice Chancellor)	Proposal Enhancement (Bornemann, Dietz); Researcher & Trainee Development (Chicas-Mosier, Arbuthnot)
2	Research Administration	Alicia Reed (Assistant Vice Chancellor)	Research Administration (Biles); Pre-Award Services (Bernet → Weber, Roberts, Stevens teams); Contract Negotiations (Crim); Sponsored Accounts & Revenue Management (Vacant → APS + SPAR); Administrative Compliance & Audit (McDowell); Award Management (Johnson Webb → multiple teams)
2	Research Fiscal Affairs	Gina Cregg (Executive Director / CFO)	Budgets & Financial Services (Sadler); Procurement/Contracts (Calloway); Cash Control & Auditing (Schaller); Financial Reporting (Yoon); BI Reporting & Systems (Vacant)
2	Impact & Belonging / Communications	Mindie Paget	Communications Coordinator: Vince Munoz
2	Research Integrity	Susan MacNally	Staff: Haase, Maclean, Dumpert, Dobbeleare, Smith, Szrot, Caviel, Scott
2	Human Subjects & Animal Care	Kathleen Lynne Lane, Anthony Fehr	Faculty Fellows: Dave Tell, Eleazar Trey Vasquez

<i>Level</i>	<i>Unit / Division</i>	<i>Leader(s)</i>	<i>Teams / Staff</i>
2	Research Facilities	André Faucher	Kerich, Smith, White, plus multiple vacant positions
2	KU Center for Technology Commercialization (KUCTC)	Cliff Michaels	Licensing, IP, Admin, Operations, Marketing staff

After Restructuring (Narrative)

- ATLAS Director remains at the top
- Supervisors now have standardized role expectations
- Staff roles clarified and aligned across teams
- A Staff Advisory Council added to represent employee voice
- Communication flows both upward and downward
- Shared governance structures implemented
- Transparent decision-making processes established

After Diagram/ Table

<i>Level</i>	<i>Unit / Division</i>	<i>Leader(s)</i>	<i>Teams / Staff</i>
1	Vice Chancellor for Research	Shelley Hooks	—
2	Supervisory Leadership Team	Tamerler, Reed, Cregg, Paget, MacNally, Faucher, Michaels	Unified cross-division leadership
2	Staff Advisory Council	Representatives from all divisions	Formal staff voice and shared governance
3	Research Catalysis	Candan Tamerler	Proposal Enhancement (Bornemann, Dietz); Researcher & Trainee Development (Chicas-Mosier, Arbuthnot)

<i>Level</i>	<i>Unit / Division</i>	<i>Leader(s)</i>	<i>Teams / Staff</i>
3	Research Administration	Alicia Reed	Research Administration (Biles); Pre-Award Services (Bernet → Weber, Roberts, Stevens teams); Contract Negotiations (Crim); Award Management (Johnson Webb)
3	Research Fiscal Affairs	Gina Cregg	Budgets & Financial Services (Sadler); Procurement/Contracts (Calloway); Cash Control & Auditing (Schaller); Financial Reporting (Yoon); BI Reporting & Systems (Vacant)
3	Impact & Belonging / Communications	Mindie Paget	Communications Coordinator: Vince Munoz
3	Research Integrity	Susan MacNally	Staff: Haase, Maclean, Dumpert, Dobbeleare, Smith, Szrot, Caviel, Scott
3	Human Subjects & Animal Care	Lane, Fehr	Faculty Fellows: Tell, Vasquez
3	Research Facilities	André Faucher	Kerich, Smith, White, plus vacant positions
3	KU Center for Technology Commercialization (KUCTC)	Cliff Michaels	Licensing, IP, Admin, Operations, Marketing staff
