
From: Crispi, Angela
Sent: Monday, July 17, 2017 2:01 PM EDT
To: DiCicco, Elizabeth
Subject: FW: Confidential: next steps on FRB

I have a bit of a load to think through. Hmm...

From: Cunningham, Jean
Sent: Friday, July 14, 2017 1:08 PM
To: Crispi, Angela <acrispi@hbs.edu>; Gilson, Stuart <sgilson@hbs.edu>; Schlesinger, Len <lschlesinger@hbs.edu>
Cc: Edmondson, Amy <aedmondson@hbs.edu>
Subject: Confidential: next steps on FRB

Good afternoon, everyone.

Amy and I touched base yesterday, and I'm reaching out on her behalf to suggest next steps based on BE's Wednesday response. **Action items/questions are in bold.**

(1) Setting up interviews

Even the pared down listing is extensive, and while Amy wonders about diminishing returns (e.g., how much new information will be gleaned from the 6th or 7th discussion), because the individuals represent different facets/aspects of BE's activities, the proposal is to go ahead and divide up the list across the 4 of you. From a timing perspective, it will be important to sustain momentum, so simply beginning is key. Also, knowing people have different vacation schedules, it may not be that all the matches happen anyway.

Taking up all the names that Ben suggested as well as a few added by the FRB *and* using the assumptions that staff likely will feel most comfortable speaking with Angela and that it's probably wise to have the NOM senior faculty largely covered, a proposed set of groupings for interviews would be:

Crispi = Briggs, Craig, Emmons, Francisco, Gallagher, Limmer, Nolan, Po, Shoemaker (Angela, the suggestion here is to focus on Emmons, Limmer, Nolan, and Gallagher, plus 1-2 other IT representatives rather than all of them)

Edmondson = Bazerman, Eisenmann, Gino, Greenstein, Iansiti, Toffel

Gilson = Badaracco, Coval, Hall, Montgomery, Oberholzer-Gee, Sebenius

Schlesinger = Applegate, Deighton, Fubini, Malhotra, McGinn, Polzer

Please go ahead and begin working to set up time to talk with each of these individuals, ideally between now and 14 August. (Reminder: If you're asking your assistant to help with the scheduling and need to provide a reason for the meeting, you might indicate, and have your assistant indicate, "seeking input on a matter being evaluated by the Faculty Review Board" -- best not to provide BE's name or other information). If you're able to send me the names of any individuals where your schedules simply don't align, or if for some reason one of these pairings is problematic, I'll keep tabs of where the gaps are and we'll see if a plan B is needed. If you'd like me to join any of these sessions as a

note taker, please send the meeting times/locations to Rosemary Lombardo (rlombardo@hbs.edu) and she'll add them to my calendar.

Is there anyone you think has been missed?

(2) Potential interview protocol

As the FRB discussed, this would be a potential framing for and set of questions to guide your discussions.

Preface: We are here because, two years ago, questions arose as to whether BE's conduct as a faculty member met the School's standards for promotion (specifically, collegueship) and was consistent with the School's community values. After a review by the Faculty Review Board (FRB) in 2015, it was felt that insufficient time had passed since the relevant incidents occurred to assess whether BE had learned from his experiences and modified his conduct, and his promotion case was delayed. The FRB now is tasked with that assessment, and specifically, with evaluating his conduct these past two years.

So you understand the process and confidentiality: The FRB will draft a report with its findings, a copy of which will be shared with BE and, ultimately, with the dean. The report will include a listing of interviews. We will strive in the report to provide feedback in the aggregate, and to avoid comments or quotes that can be directly ascribed back to an individual. We do not think this will be difficult, as more than two dozen interviews currently are scheduled. As a reminder, HBS/HU has a non-retaliation policy, and it would be a violation of that policy to take any form of action against any member of the community who participates in an investigation.

Within that framework,

- + Please describe how long you have known Ben, how often you interact with him, and in what contexts.
- + What are the positives about your interactions with him? Are there any negatives? Do you have any concerns about your interactions?
- + Have you ever provided Ben with feedback? If so, do you feel that he listened to and tried to incorporate it? If not, why?
- + Have you observed him interact with others? Is his conduct consistent with others, whether staff or faculty? Has it been consistent with the School's community values of honesty, integrity, and respect for others? Recognizing that not everyone is perfect, how would you consider Ben relative to others at HBS in this regard -- about the same as, better than, or worse than, others?
- + The green book standards for collegueship speak to, beyond upholding the School's community values, accepting a fair share of School responsibilities and contributing to the community and to the research and teaching environment. Can you provide examples of how you think Ben has done this?
- + What else would you like to tell me about Ben and your interactions with him?

Does this background and set of questions feel appropriate to the group?

(3) Scheduling next meetings for the FRB

Amy has suggested 14 August; I'd generally like to explore your availability on that day, and during the final 2 weeks of the month. Might you send me along a sense of your schedule during that time?

The goal is to find one two-hour meeting for the FRB to meet -- perhaps 14 August -- and do an initial debrief on interviews, hopefully interview BE as well, and then recap/begin to formulate a position.

A second meeting would then be for follow-up and to discuss a draft report -- perhaps end of August.

Please chime in if you have any questions, concerns, or sense of anything being missed.

Thank you.