Prioritized Faculty and Staff with Extended Observations Yielding Possible Insight on My Character

In my March 15, 2017 submission, I provided a list of faculty and staff with whom I have worked in a variety of capacities. As the FRB requested last week, I prioritized this list to emphasize those who I consider most informative, based on a combination of the scope of my interaction with them, the recency, and the nature and subject.

In the reworked list below, I mark with asterisks the people whose assessments I think would be most informative, and I resequence entries to begin with those I'd consider the highest priority. I also add a bit of additional discussion, marked in underline, where there are relevant new developments or other clarifications, but I also removed some suggestions (and some details) that now seem less important. I retain the separation between faculty and staff, as I sense the FRB seeks to talk to members of both groups. I hope these expanded annotations can give additional context to help the FRB assess which perspectives would be most useful.

Where I present multiple faculty and staff in the same paragraph, I intend to convey that they know me from the same context—for example, two senior colleagues who jointly led a focused Exec Ed program in which I taught. I don't presume that they have the same view of me merely because we interacted in the same context, but that's one natural possibility. Given the limited time available to the FRB, it might be natural to choose (at most) one person from within each of these groups.

Faculty:

Tom Eisenmann* ran a teaching group as Peter Coles and I took over his EC course in 2008-2009. We also worked together on questions of Independent Project structure and overlapping students, EC courses for "tech tribe" students, skills-based teaching (particularly software design), faculty rights in case publications, online distribution of cases, and the joint HBS-SEAS degree program. We often discuss research due to overlapping interests. From dozens of discussions going back to the very beginning of my time at HBS, I think Tom has a full sense of who I am, what I'm interested in, and what I'm likely to do in the future. I suggest that Tom is a particularly appropriate person for FRB to interview based on the duration of our interactions and wide range of subjects discussed including research, teaching, school policies, and efforts to adjust school policies.

John Deighton* and Sunil Gupta led focused Exec Ed programs in which I taught perhaps half a dozen times, often with one of them observing. John and I also presented jointly at faculty reunions on approximately a dozen occasions—offering provocatively opposite assessments of the effectiveness of online marketing. From these sessions, as well as overlapping research interests which we've also discussed at some length, I think John and Sunil are particularly well positioned to assess who I am and where I'm headed.

Marco Iansiti* and Shane Greenstein* lead the Digital Initiative, in which I have participated as a regular and active seminar participant (among other things). We often discuss research due to overlapping interests. From these activities, I think Marco and Shane are well positioned to assess my approach and my prospects.

Joe Badaracco* is the Course Head of LCA, in which I am currently teaching. Even before I joined LCA, I had interacted with Joe repeatedly including on my first interview/job-talk visit (when I spent half a day with LCA faculty), to discuss his suggestions for Participation Tracker improvements (as early as fall 2007), and to discuss shared research interests. As the course-head of the course I now teach, and the de facto leader of the hallway where I now reside, Joe is uniquely positioned to assess my contributions and my interaction with the teaching group and others.

In the LCA teaching group, I have also worked closely with Lena Goldberg* on developing new teaching materials. Within the teaching group, I worked most closely with Nien-hê Hsieh on teaching plans and pedagogy. In the first few weeks of teaching, I was pleased to see that David Fubini* substantially adopted my one-page bring-to-class teaching plan for the second day of the Enron case, and we continued to collaborate closely on teaching plans and action questions, more so as the semester continued. I think all will report that I am an effective and well-liked member of the teaching group. I hope they'll also report that my technical contributions have improved the group's operations. Given the stated purpose of my move to LCA—for others in the school to get to know me and be able to assess me—I particularly hope that the FRB will speak with at least some of the other LCA instructors with whom I taught this fall.

Joshua Coval*, ████████ and ████████ are familiar with my ongoing efforts to integrate my software with built-in classroom hardware (specifically, polling buttons) both to assist sight-impaired instructors (████████) and to facilitate market-based call prioritization (Coval). I think they're all pleased that the software now exists and provides the features we discussed at length. I think ████████ who in winter 2017 used the software intensively, will report that it transformed her approach to teaching and increased her confidence in the classroom. I know the FRB is interested in views from faculty outside my unit, and Josh seems to me a strong candidate in that respect. I recognize that the FRB probably hesitates both to consult junior faculty and also probably hesitates to consult further faculty inside NOM. Nonetheless, given the scope of my work with ████████ and the unusual nature of the work, I hope the FRB will consider trying to speak with her.

Jeff Polzer* was FIELD 3 course-head when I taught in that course during winter 2015. Other senior ladder faculty in the FIELD 3 teaching group included Mike Toffel (2015) and Cynthia Montgomery* (2016). I think they would report that I made substantive contributions relating to my skills and research (for example, strategies and guidance for teams working on software-based businesses and particularly marketplaces) as well as administrative contributions to facilitate delivery of a complex, logistics-intensive course. As course-head, Jeff was uniquely positioned to assess my contributions and my interaction with the teaching group. I know the FRB is interested in views from faculty outside my unit, which I take to signal interest not just in views that cross unit boundaries but also spanning research methods and overall approach. In those regards, Cynthia might be a particularly useful person to talk to.

Mike Toffel, in his capacity of TOM course-head, in fall 2016 inquired about a random-call tool I had made previously, as he thought that tool could help add excitement to the final day of TOM. In a quick discussion, we concluded that a new tool would be even more effective. I wrote it quickly, and I understand that he and some other members of the teaching group used it the next day. I think Mike would report that he was pleased to receive a tool that did everything he wanted, reliably and easily, on an unusually tight timetable.

Youngme Moon led the MBA program during the period in which I first raised concerns about proposed reduction in classroom projector screen size. I think she'll report that she was alarmed by the changes, all the more so because changes were made without IT telling her or seeking or receiving her approval.

She may remember thanking me for discovering the problem before the semester began, with enough time left for her to undo the change without impact to a single class (and indeed without most faculty learning about the issue or needing to spend a moment thinking about it). Some of her contemporaneous emails on this subject are in Exhibit 2 to my Reply to FRB (November 6, 2015).

Arthur Segel and John Macomber led a focused Exec Ed program in which I taught once, and we have repeatedly discussed overlapping research interests as well as connections between our courses and research. I think they'll report that I was an effective instructor and that we have enjoyed exploring related interests.

David Parkes (the George F. Colony Professor of Computer Science and Area Dean for Computer Science) leads the SEAS expansion into Allston. For several years, we have discussed transportation options to link the Allston and Cambridge campuses, drawing on my research and casewriting as to certain transportation innovations. I think David will report that my remarks changed the way he thinks about transportation options.

Shawn Cole teaches a required course for HBS-HKS joint degree candidates, and in both 2016 and 2017 invited me to guest-teach in that course. I think Shawn will report that my sessions were effective and well-received.

Mitch Weiss and I have repeatedly discussed a range of overlapping research and course development interests at the intersection of technology and public policy, as well as course development associated with technological skill-building and entrepreneurship (grounded in our joint FIELD 3 teaching in 2015). I think Mitch will report that in FIELD 3 I was a full contributor, and that our subsequent discussions have helped guide some of the most challenging aspects of his course development.

Staff:

Willis Emmons* (and historically Tara Abbatello) of the Christensen Center can assess my efforts in software to measure and analyze participation, including the groups I interacted with in designing and improving this software and my approach to feedback and requests. I think Willis will report that my participation tracker implemented a vision he had articulated for years, but that he had been unable to obtain for lack of technical resources. I think Willis will report that I was respectful and easy to work with, and that I went above and beyond to provide the best possible features to all faculty and staff. Willis can also discuss our shared work on other aspects of academic technology, and most recently our overlapping time on the Academic Technology Steering Committee; he can report how he saw me interact with committee staff.

Paul Craig* of HBS IT can assess my work on campus-wide educational software, including my efforts on Learning Hub specifications and requirements, finding and documenting bugs, suggesting improvements, and devising workarounds for key limitations. I think Paul will report that I was respectful, easy to work with, and appropriately focused on obtaining the best possible outcomes for all users. More recently, my primary contact for such matters has been Jeanne Po*, and I hope she will convey a similar assessment.

Media Services classroom technicians, including Matthew Briggs* and Paul Shoemaker*, can assess my work with the technicians assigned to my classrooms, including my responses to occasional failures in classroom technology and my classroom technology innovations now used by others. I think they'll

report that despite my unusual classroom equipment, I was respectful, easy to work with, and accepting of the inevitable glitches.

Niel Francisco* and Michael Soulios of HBS IT can assess our joint work on various desktop support anomalies such as computer encryption complexities and support for faculty with special needs, as well as routine matters such as desktop support and loaners. I think they will report that I was respectful, easy to work with, and appropriately focused on obtaining the best possible outcomes for all users. I marked Niel with a star because our interactions were more recent.

Julianne Nolan, my current FSS as well as the LCA course assistant, can assess my current workplace approach, my style in requests to her, and my overall approach in the office suite and teaching group.

FSSs and their managers, including Imelda Dundas, can assess my work with the FSSs to whom I was assigned. I think they will report that I was able to work productively with all the FSSs assigned to me.

Jenny Sanford, my FSS during 2015-2016, and later my part-time RA, can assess the way I conducted myself in response to media coverage in 2015, as well as my interactions with FSSs.

Lee Gross in the MBA Registrar's office can assess our interactions as we coordinated my software's efforts to gather course and enrollment information from Registrar systems. I think Lee will report that I was respectful and easy to work with, and that I was careful not to intrude on her time or make unwarranted special requests of the Registrar. Lee may recall that when she occasionally needed to confirm the way IT systems presented information to faculty (to troubleshoot displays seen by other faculty), she contacted me, and I always promptly and happily provided the information she requested.

FIELD 3 staff, including Kari Limmer and historically Annie Hard (now at HKS Center for Public Leadership) and Greg Freed, can assess my participation in the FIELD 3 teaching group, including the software I built to improve productivity for faculty and staff as well as to streamline activities within the classroom. I think they will report that I was respectful and intently focused on improving systems for students, faculty, and staff. Kari may remember that Greg used some of my tools even outside of FIELD 3, finding that my tools could equally be applied in other parts of FIELD to streamline work by faculty as well as FSSs and especially FIELD staff.

JA-0738