

## **Natural Sciences and Mathematics Department Head's Vision on the Position Descriptions for Divisional Deans and New Organizational Chart within Colleges of Arts & Sciences**

General Structure: (i) Division Deans within CAS form the executive council that is advisory to the Executive Dean to maintain collaboration and work on the shared College goals; (ii) each Division Dean will have 1.0 FTE appointment; (iii) each Division Dean will have 1.0 FTE office assistant.

Budget: Divisional Deans should have their own budgets allocated by the Executive Dean so that they can build and support faculty, graduate programs, research infrastructure, and core facilities within the individual divisions. To help manage these budgets, each Divisional Dean should have an assistant for budget/finance (1.0 FTE). The Executive Dean should be responsible for budget allocation to divisions and should have their own budget for strategic cross-division investments.

Hires: Executive Dean should be responsible for support for startup funds, spousal hires, inter-divisional appointments, joint appointments between the UT and ORNL, UT and UTORII, etc. Each Divisional Dean should be responsible for tenure-track, non-tenure-track, and support staff hires within their divisional departments, with final approval from the Executive Dean.

Tenure, promotion, and annual reviews: Each Divisional Dean should form an individual promotion and tenure committee. Each committee should have one representative from each department in the division. The Divisional Dean will serve as an ex officio on the divisional Promotion and Tenure committee and provide a separate letter for each case. The Executive Dean will make the college decision for promotions and tenure, informed by the Promotion and Tenure committee and Divisional Dean recommendations. It should be Divisional Dean's job to oversee all tenure and promotion cases in their departments. Divisional Deans should be responsible for the annual departmental reviews, post-tenure reviews, and annual reviews for the departmental heads.

Personnel: Each Divisional Dean should handle all their personnel issues. In case when Divisional Dean cannot resolve the situation, Executive Dean's authority will be used. The current Associate Dean for Personnel position should be eliminated from the organizational chart because this position is 100% overlapped with the Divisional Dean's roles and responsibilities.

Research and infrastructure support at the Dean's office: The current Associate Dean for Research and Infrastructure position should be eliminated. Instead, the following positions should be created: (i) Associate Dean for Research (1.0 FTE). This person will oversee the entire research operation in the College with a large emphasis on the Divisions of Social Sciences and Humanities. (ii) Associate Dean for Infrastructure support (1.0 FTE). This person will be responsible for all renovations, leading efforts for capital investments and new buildings within the College. (iii) Associate Dean for Research (Natural Sciences and Mathematics; 1.0 FTE). The College of Engineering (6 Departments) has the Associate Dean for Research and 12 staff members. As a result, the College of Engineering generates twice more external funds each year than the whole College of Arts and Sciences. The Division of the Natural Sciences and Mathematics should have at least four staff members in the office of the Associate Dean for Research (Natural Sciences and

Mathematics). (iv) In addition, the position of infrastructure manager (1.0 FTE) should be created for the Division of Natural Sciences and Mathematics. Conducting research in the field of Natural Sciences and Mathematics requires a significantly more complex infrastructure (special power lines, vacuum lines spanned across the buildings, air handling, pressurized nitrogen lines, clean rooms, culture facilities, -80°C freezers, etc.). The infrastructure manager would liaise between the Natural Science and Mathematics division departments, its technical support units and facility services to provide informed and timely information to divisional dean and enhance advocacy of behalf of NS departments. It takes a lot of time and effort to keep research running without significant disruptions. Making sure that the research infrastructure runs as planned will be the primary responsibility of the new infrastructure manager.

Development: We should keep a centralized Development office in the College. Staff members of this office should work closely with the Divisional Deans to increase our donor base and the level of the endowment funds. Executive Dean should be the person who has the power to make asks.

Advising: It might be more beneficial to shift advising efforts to the Divisions, but the centralized advising office still could be acceptable. The centralized office provides more flexibility in terms of the workload per individual advisor. However, shifting advisors to the divisions might create an opportunity to form a more coherent effort in the recruitment and retention of undergraduate students.

Academic programs: The Associate Dean for Academic Programs will work with three Divisional Deans to ensure the coordination between individual undergraduate and graduate programs. Divisional Deans should have the power to accommodate the Departmental undergraduate and graduate academic programs and curriculum to the need of the specific division.

Assessment: A proposed divisional structure should undergo a detailed assessment after 12 months. In particular, the following parts of the new structure should be evaluated (with the help of survey(s) developed by the task force):

1. How is the communication between the College and University improved? Were Divisional Deans better advocates for their divisions? Does the University know better what is happening in the College of Arts and Sciences?
2. Does the College of Arts and Sciences get a fair share of the campus-wide initiatives? This includes cluster hires, core facilities, new UT-ORII initiatives, etc.
3. Has communication between the Divisional Deans and the Department Heads/faculty improved?
4. Proposal submitted/funded metrics for the first 12 months.
5. A number of new undergraduate/graduate programs were created.
6. A number of new undergraduate/graduate courses were created.
7. Was decision-making time improved?
8. Was coherence in the interdisciplinary research initiatives improved?

Below, please find a proposed new organizational chart that takes into account some planned changes:

**Proposed Organizational Chart:**

