



Meeting of the FRB – 28 June 2017 (Crispi, Edmondson, Gilson, Schlesinger)

Gilson: Comes into the report with priors – had followed earlier situation, interaction more recently with staff member in EE who was emotional about difficulty of working with him on a program. Thinks Blinkx alone should have been enough to fire him. NBER-like qualities of arrogance; behavioral extreme is the norm among this cohort, but inability to consider other viewpoints, destructive, corruptive – this is typical for this group. So seething while coming into the report; thinks it does a masterful job of striking a very careful balance. Understand need to be thoughtful from a legal perspective, but think he's irredeemable. Response is just as arrogant as the original report... that Brian and Deepak had to browbeat him into an apology says it all. "The issues" and "the matter" when referring to Blinkx and Chinese restaurant. Tried to give him the benefit of the doubt – but new report is dismissive and arrogant; sense that he feels contempt for others.

Schlesinger: Transition from the report from 2 years ago to where we are now.

Edmondson: You've echoed how this group experienced him and felt 2 years ago. Helpful to have your perspective as a member of the Finance unit – you didn't find this overblown, which is reassuring.

Gilson: Challenge is that there are other (senior/tenured) faculty members flaunting the rules [REDACTED] example.

Schlesinger: Taught same section as BE this past semester; students thought he did a fine job vis-à-vis the course, but the students thought his self-disclosure was odd.

Three things from the report: took a 12-second course on active listening – helpful tool, but not profound insight. So curious as to how others perceive him – is he just in remission? Or do people experience him differently? Was he just jumping through hoops?

Edmondson: Letter – he can't be wrong.

Schlesinger: Would like data from some of the instances he's raised – [REDACTED] and the IT group, [REDACTED] and the LCA teaching group over the entire semester. Calls to the Dean's Office?

Post-report menu – it can't just be absence of issue because he's avoiding opportunities.

Edmondson: Saw ^{F034} [REDACTED] earlier – question about role of subcommittee.

Gilson: Do we know how much he earned through the Blinkx work?

Crispi: A few observations based on feedback he received (move office, change teaching, etc.). Provided him with executive coaching information – not clear that he pursued (though it was characterized as optional), and interesting if he didn't.

**REDACTED PURSUANT TO
PROTECTIVE ORDER**

**CONFIDENTIAL – IDENTITY NOT TO
BE PUBLICLY DISCLOSED**

HBS0020383

IT and staff side: perception that he will perennially be a handful; if he gets tenure, we're going to have him forever. IT governance group – when Lynda and Felix are there, you see the glimmers of arrogance, but sense that he is more measured and biting his tongue. When faculty are not in the room, very much a different story – the moral certitude of "I am right and you are wrong." AppleTV, Kaltura, Canvas, rolling carts – litany of issues, and no detail is too small.

Edmondson: Essence of an organization – role clarity matters.

Crispi: Moments where [REDACTED] has given him a call to say time out – you need to stop, you need to come to me instead, you shouldn't jump to solutioning. He takes the feedback in, but doesn't stop him from doing the exact same thing again. Truly trying, but constantly needs to have people putting the boundaries around him.

Edmondson: IQ points – but he should have been able to put together a better letter.

Cunningham: Check-in on airbnb case, and check-in on a disclosure; continued issues with Financial Office.

Schlesinger: So attempts, but sense that change will never be reflexive behavior. Check-in with LCA teaching group; [REDACTED]

Cunningham: List of names from Brian and Kathleen.

Schlesinger: Understanding of AC role means we need a free-standing report, not just an update. Probably worthwhile to try to map a portfolio of connections that we'll try to engage.

> What is the new evidence?
> Do we now have compelling information?
> Want affirmative evidence that he has changed his behavior, not just that he has stayed out of the papers.

At face value, we don't see the evidence.

Edmondson: At some level, it is obvious that we shouldn't have him on the senior faculty; but our process doesn't make it easy for that to happen.

Gilson: Participation tracker – does he take credit for work that isn't actually his?

Schlesinger: How do we get at character? Most of the names Ben has provided are tied to a faculty role, not to his behavior, so not clear how to assess their relevance.

Crispi: What if we put it to Ben and ask him to prioritize from whom we get the feedback?

Schlesinger: Want to be sure we are specific about the domain of our work – utility to reminding his colleagues, and him, about what we're looking for, and invite them to revisit their lists.

**REDACTED PURSUANT TO
PROTECTIVE ORDER**

**CONFIDENTIAL – IDENTITY NOT TO
BE PUBLICLY DISCLOSED**

HBS0020384

Edmondson: Intrigued by [REDACTED] – senior folks who could provide helpful input.

Crispi:

- > Is there an understanding of what went wrong?
- > Is there evidence of changed behavior?
- > Do we believe it will be sustained/maintained in the future?

> Devise a script for questions; divide and conquer and have folks go out and do conversations, either taping or creating audio scripts.

Know we need [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] know [REDACTED], get [REDACTED] from FIELD 3 teaching group; potentially Youngme.

> Letter to Ben: Ask him to revisit his listing as well as the specific questions; looking for the "hows" of what happened, rather than just his sense of the results.

Edmondson: Stu's brief and unidentified example – pains me to think about the number of people whose work life has been affected by him.

Gilson: Sense that he is mean-spirited to those who are beneath him.

Schlesinger: Think we'll get this through the [REDACTED] conversations. [REDACTED] also could be interesting – what he's seen at McKinsey.

Crispi: Still struck that there's no peer group – no contemporary.

Schlesinger: Mike Luca seems to be the one example.

Edmondson: I can generate a handful of questions as an interview protocol.

Schlesinger: Would like everyone to have the same understanding of what we're trying to assess.

**REDACTED PURSUANT TO
PROTECTIVE ORDER**

**CONFIDENTIAL – IDENTITY NOT TO
BE PUBLICLY DISCLOSED**

HBS0020385