

---

**From:** Edmondson, Amy  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 25, 2015 6:31 PM EST  
**To:** Healy, Paul; Nohria, Nitin  
**CC:** Schlesinger, Len; Crispi, Angela; Reinhardt, Forest; Cunningham, Jean  
**Subject:** FRB follow up  
**Attachments:** FRB Memo Post Case 1.docx, ATT00001.htm

Dear Paul and Nitin

Forest and I, along with the rest of the FRB, wanted to follow up on our conversation in person, to document our understanding of the case and its future steps.

I hope you both have a very happy thanksgiving!

Amy

**Amy C. Edmondson**

**Novartis Professor of Leadership and Management**

**HARVARD BUSINESS SCHOOL**

**Boston, MA 02163**

**Author of [Teaming: How organizations learn, innovate and compete in the knowledge economy \(Jossey-Bass, 2012\)](#)**

The members of the Faculty Review Board are pleased that the Dean and Senior Associate Dean offered Ben Edelman a two-year extension and that he accepted it. In our review of all of the available materials related to the case, we unanimously concluded that there was a lack of sufficient evidence that Ben had internalized the lessons from the Blinkx and Sichuan events. We also concluded that we lacked compelling evidence that Ben had understood the nature of the concerns about his interactions with the staff, especially related to his tone and to respect for and consideration of other points of view. We hope that the extension will give him the time to generate this evidence.

We anticipate that we, or our successors on the FRB, will need to write a second report in the summer or fall of 2017, covering the new evidence on these matters, and including a new recommendation.

We want to emphasize that for Ben to “stay out of trouble” over the next two years will not be sufficient to put our concerns to rest. We lack confidence that he understands his responsibilities as a faculty member of personal and institutional integrity; independent, objective, and ethical scholarship; accountability for actions and conduct, and preservation of the School’s standing as institution of public trust. As we noted in the report, we would like to have affirmative evidence that Ben has changed his behavior, not merely that he has managed to stay out of the papers. We worry that if he decides simply to accomplish this goal by turning down invitations to consult, speak, or testify until he has tenure, he will not gain the experience he needs to learn how to handle such experiences with the learning-orientation and respect we aspire to embody as Harvard faculty in the broader community.

We anticipate that, over the next two years, Ben will need to play different roles in the intellectual and administrative life of the School than he has in his time on the faculty thus far. In our view, this should include membership in one of the RC teaching groups, and possibly also membership on one of the School’s administrative bodies like the APC. These memberships will broaden his understanding of the work of the School, and also give senior faculty outside his unit a chance to know him and evaluate his potential long-term contributions to the community. It

also will give him additional opportunities to interact with staff in a different context, and they with him. We hope that he will be willing to invest his time in such assignments.