



From: Cunningham, Jean
Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2017 3:56 PM EDT
To: Edmondson, Amy
Subject: Re: FRB Update and Request

Amy,

Apologies at the start for the long email... but you seem particularly adept at diving into these and offering thoughts along the way, so I thought I could at least begin to tee up a conversation. If it's easier to talk or meet, that of course too would be fine. But I am heading out for vacation on Saturday for two weeks (!) and didn't want to be remiss in helping to keep this process moving forward.

After seeing Ben's email, next steps, I think, will be:

- (1) For the members of the FRB to divide up the folks who need to be interviewed;
- (2) To develop an interview protocol/set of at least starting questions;
- (3) For me to get the group back together for meeting dates in August -- both so that you can collectively meet with/interview Ben, and so that you can begin to discuss your findings and recommendations.

Diving into each:

(1) For the members of the FRB to divide up the folks who need to be interviewed.

So let's take Ben's list:

Tom Eisenmann

John Deighton

Marco Iansiti

Shane Greenstein

Joe Badaracco

David Fubini (Ben has suggested Lena Goldberg; I think the FRB indicated [REDACTED] might be a more interesting option)

Joshua Coval

Christine Exley (I know Ben has identified her as important, but I am pausing on a junior faculty member, and if so, who should meet with her -- you?)

Jeff Polzer

Cynthia Montgomery

Willis Emmons (CCTL)

Paul Craig (IT)

Jeanne Po (IT)

Matthew Briggs (IT)

Paul Shoemaker (IT)

Niel Francisco (IT)

Julianne Nolan (FSS)

The FRB also had identified (from Ben's list, but not now starred):

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

And then there are the senior NOM faculty:

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] (inclined to leave off; not sure a strong presence)

[REDACTED] (I'm inclined to leave him off, as I don't get the sense he spends a ton of time here, but let me know if you feel differently)

This is 28 people (without [REDACTED]), divided among 4 FRB members, which means 7-8 meetings per person. Is this doable? Desirable? It's not much feeling pared down. Going down this path, I could see a breakdown of:

Crispi = [REDACTED] basically all the staff... that gives her 9, and I'm guessing she'd be able to narrow this down to [REDACTED] and then 2-3 more from IT... enough to be representative and to feel reasonable to Ben, but not all of them)
Edmondson = [REDACTED]
Gilson = [REDACTED]
Schlesinger = [REDACTED]

This divides the NOM unit across the FRB and (I think) leverages some existing connections (e.g., you with fellow TOMers)... but let me know if you'd prefer to mix those up.

Another alternative I'll toss out there is to have each FRB member interview 2-3 people so as to experience first hand how people talk about Ben and the types of comments that arise... but then (for example) have me interview everyone else using a defined protocol. This is what's done for MBA cases. Pro is that it saves each of you from a fair amount of time and scheduling. Potential con is that it may feel insufficient... that this work should be undertaken by peers rather than by staff. I feel a need to at least toss it out there, though. Generally it's that point of not just being thorough, but feeling thorough, and passing a reasonableness test.

And of course there's also the alternative of paring down the list... but I found myself challenged because each clumping seems to represent very different vantage points. And I think the unit will be very unhappy if they're not (largely) all asked.

Whatever the path, as a reminder, if it is the former, I'm happy to do note taking for any of the sessions to the extent it's helpful.

At a minimum, perhaps we could communicate these assignments to the other 3, and at least ask them to begin? Thoughts?

(2) To develop an interview protocol.

Here's a starting point:

Preface: We are here because, two years ago, questions arose as to whether Ben's conduct as a faculty member met the School's standards for promotion (specifically, colleagueship) 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 incidents occurred to assess whether Ben 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.

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?
- + 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 colleagueship 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?

(3) For me to get the group back together for meeting dates in August -- both so that you can collectively meet/interview Ben, and so that you can begin to discuss your findings and recommendations.

Off hand I'd lean toward trying for something in mid-August and then in late August. For the first meeting, perhaps 2 hours, with 30 minutes first to discuss and share observations about the interviews, 30-45 minutes with Ben, and then the remaining time to take stock and potentially begin to frame the elements of a report? And then in late August to (hopefully) have a draft report, and use a 60-90 minute for discussion and comments?

Again, sorry this is so long, but wanted to tee up some options. Let me know what you think.

Thanks,

Jean

From: Amy Edmondson <aedmondson@hbs.edu>
Date: Wednesday, July 12, 2017 at 7:33 PM
To: Jean Cunningham <jcunningham@hbs.edu>, Angela Crispi <acrispi@hbs.edu>, Stuart Gilson <sgilson@hbs.edu>, Leonard Schlesinger <lschlesinger@hbs.edu>
Subject: FW: FRB Update and Request

FYI....

Amy C. Edmondson
Novartis Professor of Leadership and Management
HARVARD BUSINESS SCHOOL
Boston, MA 02163

**Author of Building the Future: Big Teaming for Audacious Innovation (Berrett-Koehler, 2016);
Teaming: How organizations learn, innovate and compete in the knowledge economy (Jossey-Bass, 2012)**

From: "Edelman, Benjamin" <bedelman@hbs.edu>
Date: Tuesday, July 11, 2017 at 8:28 AM
To: "Edmondson, Amy" <aedmondson@hbs.edu>
Subject: RE: FRB Update and Request

Amy,

As you requested, attached is a prioritized and reworked list of faculty and staff whose perspectives I think might be useful to FRB.

You also requested an expanded "how" document to clarify some aspects of my March "reflections" submission. I'll get this to you before the end of the month, as you proposed.

Thanks,

Ben Edelman