



Dear Ben,

I am writing on behalf of the Faculty Review Board (FRB) – comprising Angela Crispi, Stu Gilson, Len Schlesinger, and myself (chair) – to let you know that we met last week to review your "Reflection on Feedback from Faculty Review Board" dated March 15, 2017.

As you know, in 2015, at the request of Paul Healy in his role as Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Development, the FRB was tasked with assessing your ability to meet the standards outlined in the *Policies and Procedures with Respect to Faculty Appointments and Promotions*. As articulated in our October 2015 report, the FRB found that your conduct in the Blinkx and Sichuan Garden incidents, as well as in interactions with staff, did not uphold the School's Community Values and did not meet the School's green book criteria for "Effective Contributions to the HBS Community." We recommended that these concerns be taken into account during the promotions process. In November 2015, the Standing Committee then recommended deferring your case for two years to enable you to demonstrate whether you had indeed internalized lessons learned, anticipating that the FRB would again be activated during summer/fall 2017 to review your conduct.

The FRB now must assess:

- whether you understand the aspects of your conduct – regardless of your intent – that made them problematic;
- whether there is sufficient evidence of changed behavior; and
- whether there is a reasonable expectation that your changed behavior will be sustained in the future.

With appreciation for the thought you have put into drafting your initial reflection, after reviewing the document, we would like to ask for your thoughts on these and the following questions:

1. Your response provided examples of outcomes you believe to be more in line with the School's Community Values and with the guidance you received from the FRB report and from a number of senior colleagues. Your reflection focuses more on the "what" than the "how." We would find it helpful if you might comment or provide (more detailed) examples that give us a better window into *how* you thought about your activities and how you interacted with staff. Put differently, if a previous challenge was the disconnect between your perception of your actions and behaviors, and how others perceived your actions and behaviors, how have you gained confidence that you now are on a better path? What does it mean to pick projects "with significantly greater care"?
2. You have provided a comprehensive listing of suggested individuals to whom the FRB might speak. While we will make every effort to be thorough, with the passage of time since your reflections were submitted in March, are there individuals you would prioritize who may be best able to speak to your conduct?

It would be helpful to receive your response before the end of July and, ideally, your prioritized listing earlier if possible. Our plan is to schedule conversations over the next few weeks and,

after your additional input, with you as well. We aim to have a draft report for your review as the new term begins.

As a reminder, consistent with the FRB principles and procedures (attached), you are able to designate an advisor who might join you for meetings or interviews, or review any written materials. To be clear, we will be letting Brian Hall know about the upcoming work from a logistics and process perspective, but we will not be sharing documents or information with him.

If you might let me know when we can reasonably expect to hear back from you – we are mindful of the potential for longstanding summer plans – it would be helpful; we want to move forward expeditiously and thoroughly but thoughtfully. We then can schedule time for you to meet with the FRB.

Ben, please don't hesitate to reach out with any questions. I look forward to hearing from you.

Best,

Amy Edmondson