



Proposed process for faculty colleagueship review

Objectives:

- (1) Respond to the Ben Edelman situation in particular
- (2) Devise a means of providing (constructive/developmental) feedback to faculty – at least once within 7-9 years of initial appointment (and **independent of** – e.g., before – promotion reviews), and once thereafter, with other opportunities should circumstances or allegations warrant a review
 - Sense this might provide greater awareness of community values and individual responsibilities around interactions with others, "public nature" of HBS faculty role – more teeth when dealing with individual issues as they arise

Approach:

- (1) Generally: leverage the thought that has gone into the process for responding to allegations of sexual and gender-based harassment
 - Initial assessment to weigh allegations
 - If finding, written outline of allegations that is shared with respondent
 - Can provide a written statement in response
 - Liza and/or independent fact-finder (skilled at interviewing) paired with a faculty member (emeritus to avoid conflict with promotion reviews and subcommittees) conduct interviews/investigation and write draft report
 - Work done under direction of Dean's Office (Angela/Jean/Gabe?), drawing in Valerie, Ellen, SADs, or others to determine scope of investigation and initial interview list
 - Also must allow for input from Unit Head and, where appropriate, senior faculty colleagues
 - Draft finding of fact document written
 - Respondent can again provide a written statement in response
 - Final finding of fact document submitted to dean
 - May include recommendations (e.g., executive coaching) but would not include "sanctions"
- (2) In response to a catalyzing incident: same process as above. Are sanctions appropriate? Who determines?
 - Possible mechanisms: written apologies, counseling or coaching, "loss of privileges" (no DRF, no leadership bonus, no pay raise)

Considerations:

- Confidentiality of process during interviews – one thing during an annual or ongoing review; loss of privacy when done in response to more specific allegations
- Confidentiality of documents – beyond respondent, need to determine who has the right to see (Unit Head? Senior colleagues?) and process by which this is managed
 - Would prefer not to have copies of reports circulating
- Connection to Appointments Process – ideally this would unfold sufficiently before reviews that it would inform the Dean, SAD for Faculty Development, and Unit Head's determination as to whether a candidate should come forward for review.