

Principles and Procedures for Upholding Community Values and Academic Standards among the Faculty

Harvard Business School's Community Values exemplify the School's aspiration to be a model of leadership, honor, and integrity. All stakeholders of the School—students, program participants, faculty, staff, and alumni—accept these principles when they join the HBS community, and agree to abide by the following Community Standards:

- Respect for the rights, differences, and dignity of others
- Honesty and integrity in dealing with all members of the community
- Accountability for personal behavior

Additionally, faculty members are expected to contribute actively to the HBS community, to help foster an environment conducive to the work of others, and to advance the School's mission and those activities that support and foster it.¹ Faculty members at HBS bear a responsibility to adhere to the highest standards of collegiality and conduct, understanding that activities or behaviors that undermine the academic environment or damage the standing of Harvard have a wide-ranging impact.

When a faculty member is alleged to have failed to uphold the School's Community Values or standards of collegiality, the following procedures shall apply. These procedures are designed to be flexible, recognizing the need to weigh multiple factors such as the kind of behavior alleged and the seriousness of the allegations.² At the same time, they provide a framework to allow an equitable resolution of allegations in a wide variety of circumstances.

The following principles and considerations shall guide those carrying out these procedures:

- Every reasonable effort should be made to protect the reputations of the individual alleging problematic behavior and the faculty member accused of problematic behavior.
- Privacy and confidentiality are important considerations; information generally should be shared only on a need-to-know basis, and consistent with what is practicable.
- The procedures should be transparent, fair, and timely. Allegations should be articulated in writing and evidence presented clearly.
- Recognizing that it can be difficult to anticipate every circumstance that may arise, the individuals responsible for administering these procedures will use their best efforts and judgment, and will keep the parties informed throughout the process.

¹ Consistent with the School's *Policies and Procedures with Respect to Faculty Appointments and Promotions* (revised Spring 2013), pages 6 and 9.

² These procedures are not intended to respond to allegations of research misconduct or violations of sexual and gender-based harassment; these are covered, respectively, by the Research Integrity Policy (<https://inside.hbs.edu/Departments/faculty/Documents/Research%20Integrity%20Policy.pdf>) and the Harvard University Sexual and Gender-Based Harassment Policy (http://diversity.harvard.edu/files/diversity/files/harvard_sexual_harassment_policy.pdf).

Procedures

The Office of the Dean coordinates the response to allegations of misbehavior involving a faculty member. Allegations should always be brought to the attention of the Office of the Dean.

It is expected that many, if not the majority, of concerns about faculty behavior can be resolved informally, locally (e.g., within a department or unit), and through discussion between the involved parties. There are resources available to help in these situations, depending on the nature of the issue at hand. Support may be sought from staff in the Division of Research and Faculty Development, Human Resources, and the Office of the Dean, as well as from more senior faculty colleagues or faculty members in leadership roles (e.g., Senior Associate Deans or Unit Heads).

Matters that are not, in the reasonable judgment of the Office of the Dean, appropriate for informal resolution—for example, *egregious* behavior or actions, or incidents that indicate a *persistent and pervasive pattern* of problematic behavior—may be referred to a Faculty Review Board (FRB).

The FRB will typically comprise a faculty chair, two additional faculty members, and a senior staff member, all appointed by the Dean. In these cases,

- A draft summary of the allegation, as it is known at the time, will be written.
- The FRB, aided in some instances by a fact finder, will investigate the allegation. The investigation may require factual inquiry, interviews, and the review of materials (e.g., documents, email exchanges, social media).
- The FRB will prepare a draft report that should include a summary of the evidence gathered; comments on the seriousness of the offense, including the FRB's conclusions on whether the School's standards for collegiality have been upheld and met; and potential recommendations for redress or remediation of the incident or behavior, including possible sanctions.³

The faculty member and, if applicable, the person making the allegation, will have an opportunity to review the allegation, the evidence gathered, and the draft report, and to respond to them in writing. Additionally, both parties can designate a member of the community as an advisor—someone to accompany them to any meetings or interviews, for example, or review written materials. These individuals may not be family members, subordinates, or attorneys, though both parties can consult with any of these individuals at any time. Advisors also are expected to respect the confidentiality of the process.

While the work and activities of the FRB are considered private, the FRB may, in the course of its proceedings, need to inform or solicit input from others—including faculty members (e.g., a

Commented [PH1]: I always struggle with this – does this mean faculty have to complain to the dean, which seems pretty intimidating, or is there someone else who could be the point person. Who would junior faculty or staff feel comfortable talking to? Do those approached have a duty to report to the deans office?

ACE - *Office of the Dean isn't the Dean him- or herself – is the problem solved by ensuring that there is someone in the Dean's office who is easily approachable?*

Commented [JC2]: This was meant to leave room open for others being approached – senior faculty, folks like Valerie -- but these folks, in turn, need to loop in the Office of the Dean at some point. The goal is to make sure we can connect dots. In reality, the first part is what already is happening today – people reach out to others they are comfortable talking to. We just want to make sure we're recording all of these to see patterns.

Commented [PH3]: By whom? Does this mean by the complainant? Or the deans office?

Commented [JC4]: Would be one of the first tasks of the FRB? Allegations until that time may be a bit more nebulous, and there may be some initial discussion to make sure the allegation has merit. But the FRB would determine its scope of work (e.g., which allegations were within or out of bounds), and the written allegation would reflect that.

³ See the section on "Notes on Promotions, Reviews, and Reappointments" for a fuller description of how collegiality will be assessed when faculty members are under review by an Appointments Subcommittee or Standing Committee.

Unit Head or senior colleagues), staff members (e.g., in Human Resources), other Harvard offices (e.g., the General Counsel), students, and alumni.

The report, including recommendations, will be considered final once the FRB has reviewed written responses and once modifications and edits, if the FRB deems them appropriate or necessary, have been made. Once the report is finalized, it will be submitted to the Office of the Dean, along with any responses (to the allegation and to the report) that have been received.

The Office of the Dean is responsible for implementing any recommendations and sanctions and will maintain records of the proceedings.

Notes on Promotions, Reviews, and Reappointments

- The Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Development will meet annually or as otherwise needed with the Chair of the FRB to review whether there is evidence that upcoming candidates for promotion, review, and reappointment have persistently disregarded the School's Community Values and might therefore fail to satisfy the School's promotion standards upcoming candidates for promotion, review, and reappointment.
- In this meeting, the FRB would report on any earlier complaints raised against the candidates and the outcome of its investigations. In addition, To prepare for this meeting, the FRB may seek and report on confidential input—from senior colleagues, administrative leadership, or others—about any concerns about violations of Community Values by the candidates that were not reported collegiality and contributions to the HBS community.
- If no serious questions of violations of Community Values are raised by the FRB, For candidates who meet the School's standards, the promotion, review, and reappointment process will begin proceed to the Subcommittee or Standing Committee review. For all other candidates—in other words, for those for whom cases where previous or current behaviors or actions raise questions about their collegiality and contributions to the HBS community violations of Community Values, the FRB will be asked to undertake a review, beginning with drafting an allegation as outlined above. In these cases, the Subcommittee or Standing Committee will begin its work evaluating the candidate on the criteria *excluding* collegiality.
- The FRB's conclusions on whether the School's Community Values standards for collegiality have been upheld and met will be provided to the Appointments Subcommittee or Standing Committee, and included with that group's report to the full Appointments Committee. In these cases, the Subcommittee or Standing Committee will prepare its report and recommendation, including its vote, based on the criteria *excluding* collegiality.

Commented [JC5]: I continue to pause on Community Values and collegiality, and wonder if both still are too narrow (and generally how we think about the relation between them). Should we be introducing somewhere in the document a phrase like "academic standards" or allude to the School's policies and procedures more generally? One important category of misbehavior is of course how you interact with others. But what about people who consistently violate either the letter or the spirit of the Outside Activities or FCOI policy, or other policies? Thinking ahead here, and could a candidate based on the existing wording say that such review would be outside the scope of the FRB? Or do you think that falls under the broader "advances the School's mission and those activities that support and foster it" from the green book language?

Commented [JC6]: One thing to note here: this language does not indicate whether the subcommittee in this instance would still be asked to evaluate whether the candidate has satisfied the criteria of "effective contributions to the HBS community." Put another way, are violations of Community Values and effective contributions the same thing? Could someone *not* have violations of Community Values, and *still* not pass the bar here -- they haven't, for example (and drawing on the language of the green book) accepted their fair share of the School's administrative, mentoring, and teaching responsibilities? Or contributed to the teaching and research environment of the School? I think what the policy currently says is that the presence of significant Community Values violations may be enough to preclude this criterion from being met, even without considering these other aspects. But is the absence of Community Values violations enough to say that someone meets them?