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Appendix 1: Panel Recommendations

**Panel on the Cadet Discipline System**

**Night-time Environment in the Battalions:** To reduce the risks during AY 2012-2013:

1. appoint day-time TACs to serve on a rotating basis as CoC
2. install security cameras to monitor public areas in the five battalions
3. either use campus police, or hire off-duty Charleston police, or pay members of faculty, staff, and active duty military personnel to conduct unannounced night-time visits and file reports on their observations
4. locate OC rooms on fourth division with freshmen
5. direct OCs to record all comings and goings within the battalions during the evening
6. mandate strict enforcement of locked doors to rooms and current “lights-out” policies
7. direct OCs to awake company commanders and instruct them to address problems when they arise
8. conduct systematic examination of OC system during AY 2012-2013 to produce additional reforms (including those in section E below) or a fundamentally different system of night-time supervision of the barracks for AY 2013-14.

**Rules and Regulations:** Revise and reduce existing rules and regulations into a single publication of no more than 125 pages in length. Review and, as necessary, revise the publication every two years but keep its overall length at the prescribed level. Require reading of and testing on rules as part of Orientation 101 for freshman and again for cadets competing for rank.

**Record Keeping:** Create a user friendly and widely accessible electronic system for the recording, administration, and evaluation of all disciplinary actions. Use it as a central part of the process of evaluating TACs, OCs, cadet rank holders and all others who administer discipline in the barracks. At a minimum, the new system should support comparisons by battalion, company, academic class, race, gender, and participation/non-participation on intercollegiate athletic teams.

**Class Absence System:** Afford cadets more latitude in making decisions about the best use of their time for academic development by imposing no penalty on cadets until they miss 7% (one third of the maximum allowable) of the scheduled meetings of a particular course. Thereafter, confine all disciplinary actions for additional class absences to mandatory, proctored study halls on Wednesday afternoons or the weekends—thereby remediating the academic deficiency created by missing too many classes. Discontinue altogether the practice of imposing non-academic punishments for missing class.

**Position Descriptions/Training/Evaluation:** Draft clear and specific description of duties of all cadet leaders, TACs, and OCs (or their successors who may be assigned duties in the barracks at night). Specify goals for the academic, leadership, physical, and military development of their units. Provide training targeted toward how best to achieve the goals that are established. Implement regular (quarterly for TACs and OCs; perhaps less frequently for cadet commanders and top NCOs) evaluations of performance. Evaluations
should include comparisons with the performances of like units within the Corps and written evaluations of superiors, peers, and subordinates within the chain of command.

Create a More Positive and Uniform Cadet Culture that Emphasizes the Corps as a whole, rather than Individual Companies: There is a strong consensus that TACs, OCs, and a significant percentage of cadets should be rotated between companies on an annual basis to create stronger identification with the Corps as a whole, reduce the distinctiveness of individual companies, and—most importantly—expand opportunities for cadets to bond closely with, and learn how to exercise leadership skills among, a larger number of their peers.

Positive Training Methods: Instruct cadet leaders and TACs in the use of encouragement, rewards, and other positive motivational techniques as primary instruments of leadership. Ensure that these methods, not intimidation and punishment, are the central features of the college’s disciplinary system.

Supervisory Body: Use a college-wide committee comprised of representatives of the faculty, administration, staff, and ROTC departments to supervise the implementation and monitoring of reforms to address problems identified in this report.

Panel on the Cadet Honor System

New SOPs: The principal recommendation of this panel is that the President adopt the new documents: 1) “Standard Operating Procedures for Advisors to the Honor Committee,” 2) “Standard Operating Procedures for Honor Committee Nomination Election and Service,” and 3) “Policy and Procedure for Cadet Appeals of Honor Decisions.”

Honor System Records: A data collection plan should be developed by the Faculty Advisor and Honor Committee officers to ensure that statistics are valid, reliable and accurate. All records, documents, tape recordings, and materials associated with any phase of Honor System operations should be given to the Secretary of the Honor Committee and the Faculty Advisor for secure storage in the Krause Center for Leadership and Ethics for a minimum of 3 years. An end-of-year analysis of Honor System operations should be completed by Honor Committee officers with supervision by the Faculty/Staff Advisors and briefed to the President and senior staff of the college.

Education and Training Programs: The Krause Center for Leadership and Ethics should be designated as the office of responsibility for all Honor System education and training programs. A review of all Honor System education and training programs should be initiated. A Faculty/Staff Manual that parallels the Honor Manual should be composed, and regular training of all faculty/staff members to include adjuncts concerning the guidelines on plagiarism and possible honor violations should be conducted. This training should be completed at New Faculty and Staff Orientation and by each Department on an annual basis. An annual review should be conducted of all cadet education and training.
programs with supervision of training sessions to include attendance by Krause Center personnel, Faculty/Staff Advisors, or TAC Officers. Training program completion and compliance with SOP requirements should be certified before election of new Honor Committee members.

**Recommendation for Further Review:** A comprehensive review of Honor System processes and procedures was beyond the scope of this Panel. A thorough study of the Citadel’s Honor System should be completed by an independent committee with the capabilities to research and analyze historical data, review current Honor System operations, and provide recommendations on changes to ensure the viability of the Citadel’s Honor System. Among the issues such a committee should consider are the following:

- **Amendments and Changes to the Honor System:** There should be a regular review of the Honor Manual by Faculty/Staff Advisors and current Honor Committee members at the end of each academic year. The Honor Manual for the following academic year must be ready to publish before the rising Honor Committee departs on summer furlough. There should be a provision for routine administrative changes to the Honor Manual. These changes should be limited to Krause Center personnel, current Faculty/Staff Advisors, and current Honor Committee officers. Current Honor Manual procedures to make substantive changes to the Manual are too restrictive and should be revised. Members of the Honor Committee represent the SCCC and should have the authority to vote on and approve changes to the Manual and Honor System operations.

- **Honor and Discipline System Overlap:** Testimony to the IPAC Honor Panel strongly suggested that current practices within the cadet discipline system are contributing to honor violations. For example, the most recent Faculty Advisor to the Honor Committee told the Panel that roughly half of a typical year’s accusations are a result of cadets untruthfully asserting by their signatures that they had completed assigned punishments. Professor Sinisi suggested that virtually every sign-in sheet in every company on every day was likely to have “problems,” although most of these are not reported or investigated. Professor Sinisi’s predecessor as Faculty Advisor, BG Barrett, told the Panel that such cases had not been so prevalent in his years as Advisor because cadets did not have to sign in at the end of their punishments. During his tenure, it was up to the cadets on guard to ensure that those who were being punished fulfilled the requirements of their punishments. The Panel recommends that the Commandant, the Faculty Advisor to the Honor Committee, and the Deputy Director of the Krause Center work together to identify and eliminate practices within the cadet discipline system that are unnecessarily creating honor issues. The goal should be a clear line of demarcation between the cadet honor system and the cadet discipline system.

- **Additional Issues for Further Review:** 1) Targeting individual cadets or groups such as Corps Squad, minorities, or females. 2) Potential for a cheating scandal. 3) Loss of benefit to attend and complete college and resultant consequences or actions. 4) Leniency policy and procedures. 5) Amnesty for 4th-class cadets
during first semester freshman year. 6) Plagiarism and the Honor Code. 7) Requirement for a comprehensive SOP similar to VMI and Service Academies.

**Panel on Hazing and Training Abuses**

*Summerall Guards:* Based upon what the panel learned from interviewing parties connected with the Summerall Guards, together with the information contained in the Commandant’s investigation, the Panel has made the following recommendations with regard to that organization:

1. Until further notice, all off-campus performances/trips for the 2013 Summerall Guard be hereby suspended; on-campus performances at Parents’ Day and Homecoming will proceed as usual, provided that adequate progress is being made in the areas outlined in point #2 below. The resumption of off-campus performances will be considered only after the activities in point #2 below have been accomplished.

2. Working with a select group of faculty, staff, and alumni the following activities should be conducted.
   a. Redefine the mission and culture of the SG…represent the “best of The Citadel…professionalism”
   b. Redefine the selection process using only objective criteria to include the following:
      i. Physical fitness
      ii. Drill proficiency
      iii. Conduct proficiency
      iv. Military proficiency
      v. Academic proficiency
   c. Eliminate all servitude (“roaching”)
   d. Define the training period, training activities, and training supervision
   e. Redefine the governance model to be a command and control model as follows: President, Commandant, OIC (direct report to Commandant), Cadet Commander [Note Officer in Charge (OIC) rather than “Advisor”]
   f. Establish accountability within this command and control model

3. Provided that these activities are completed during AY 2012/13, select and train the 2013/14 SG.

*Fourth-Class System:* Considering the recommendations contained in three previous studies of the fourth-class system and the experience of the panelists themselves, the Panel makes the following recommendations regarding the fourth-class system:

- Eliminate all Fourth Class System activities in the Mess Hall other than instruction in good table manners.
- Reduce the length of time for the Fourth Class Training Period, having freshmen be recognized at Corps Day at the latest, but possibly even as early as the beginning of the second semester.
• Limit sophomore rank to administrative positions only, but allow sophomores to have no interaction with or authority over freshmen. [NOTE: This is one of two recommendations that did not have unanimous panel support. Our TAC officer member disagrees, saying that this is in conflict with our current Leadership Development Model.]

• Consider using teams of Seniors selected in their companies through secret ballot to administer the Fourth Class System in a manner similar to that suggested in the Whitmire Report.

• Consider annual “scrambling” of company assignments in an effort to (1) promote Corps identity and loyalty over Company identity and loyalty, and (2) widen the circle of a cadet’s friendships over the course of four years.

• Eliminate morning PT for all freshmen – and perhaps for all cadets, moving that activity to afternoons if ROTC programs require it. [NOTE: This is the other recommendation not unanimously supported. Our TAC Officer member believes this recommendation is an unnecessary interference with ROTC business and that cadets ought to be able to get enough sleep and also participate in morning PT if their ROTC program requires it.]

• Consider implementing some degree of rank rotation within the school year.

• Restrict physical exercise as a form of punishment to groups no smaller than a squad, to be held only outdoors in the daytime under the direct supervision of at least three responsible upperclassmen.

• Consider scrambling the Cadre, i.e., don’t assign them by company. Cadre would be centrally managed within the battalions, and members would be assigned to companies other than their own.

Comprehensive Study of the Corps: The Panel believes that the persistence of “pre-coeducation” attitudes persist within the Corps, despite the passage of fifteen years. To address this problem, the Panel suggests that it is time for the college to commission another Committee to study the Corps as a whole. The Panel suggests that such a Committee should be staffed more like the Whitmire Committee (a majority of students) than the other two groups (primarily faculty, staff, or alumni, with little cadet membership).

Panel on Alcohol and Substance Abuse

New Alcohol & Substance Abuse Program: The committee recommends that The Citadel move to establish an office specifically charged with developing a comprehensive alcohol and substance abuse program for The Citadel, including establishing a campus philosophy on alcohol and substance abuse. This philosophy would include the buy-in from faculty, staff, students, administration, and alums. The committee further recommends that staff for this office be hired from outside the Citadel.

Continuing Education: The committee recommends continuing education for all students on Citadel policies and rules and the consequences involved beginning with the Alcohol.edu E-Learning survey for entering freshmen through all appropriate campus
training for undergraduate student. The committee would recommend that the training sessions contain information highlighting the consequences for alcohol and substance abuse in detail.

_Counseling Center:_ The committee recommends the Counseling Center continue its program for alcohol violations. Students must attend an initial meeting at the Center and take the Substance Abuse Subtle Screening Inventory (SASSI) that is designed to help identify individuals who have a high probability of acquiring, or already have substance dependence. The student than attends a second session at the Center and also must go through an educational online program. The committee would like to see the required program completion dates tightened and enforced.

**Panel on Sexual Assault & Harassment and Gender & Racial Bias**

_Youth Related Activities:_ The panel’s review revealed a number of areas of weakness in The Citadel’s policies and procedures as they relate to child protection. We recommend that

- One person be responsible for coordinating training, background screenings, policy development and compliance related to child protection.
- The Citadel engage an outside consultant to examine and consolidate policies related to child protection.
- All adults on campus go through a SLED background check, receive and commit to child protection policies, and complete the Darkness to Light Stewards of Children program.
- The Citadel form an official partnership with Darkness to Light.
- Procedures for approving youth-serving programs on campus be overhauled to strengthen child protection in such programs.
- Contracts with organizations using Citadel facilities for programs including youth should be written in such a way as to place the burden of responsibility on the organization if at all possible.

_Sexual Assault:_ The area of sexual assault prevention and response is one with which most colleges and universities struggle. Most of the findings of this committee are positive in terms of the quality of policies, the attention to education of the cadets over the course of their time here, and the commitment of a number of individuals to reducing the risk of sexual assault on campus. Change over the past six years has been considerable. Victims on campus know that they have a safe place to report and be supported. However, policies can only go so far when the environment fosters secrecy and the culture among cadets minimizes the problem. We are moving in the right direction and this panel believes that the following recommendations would help to keep us on the right track:

1. The Blue Book and Guidon on the website were dated when reviewed. They need to be modified and posted yearly.
2. Reports that cadets have been encouraged to withhold the truth about experiences of sexual violence should be associated with consequences for the offending cadets.

3. Add one staff person as well as one or two graduate assistants to work with Ms. Shealy. This will free her up for the significant administrative work that comes with her position and will allow her to further refine and improve the sexual assault prevention response program. It will provide sufficient resources to expand advocacy, response, and education efforts to include all students on campus. Ms. Shealy can be even more effective than she has been if she is not seen as working in isolation on this issue.

4. Following the first year presentation, which is necessary to establish that students have all been given standard information about sexual assault and proper “do’s and don’ts” it might be preferable to incorporate information into academic courses rather than having Ms. Shealy be the primary voice emphasizing the importance of treating others with respect in the area of sexual assault. In particular, the case study format used in LDRS 201 is well suited to include one or two scenarios that present ambiguous dating/sexual situations for instruction and discussion.

Sexual Harassment: A negative climate with regard to gender persists fifteen years after the first women were admitted to the Corps of Cadets. Almost 50% of the male cadets do not agree that women should be part of the Corps and about the same percentage does not believe that male and female cadets are equally effective leaders. These percentages have been stable over the past few years. This panel sees this as a serious problem that cannot be changed simply by bringing more women onto campus. Rather, this suggests that there are systemic elements that need to be changed. The climate on campus, negative views expressed by vocal alumni, and tacit acceptance by many others must change. Otherwise, the Corps will continue to be divided and act in ways that are inconsistent with the institution’s core values.

Based on our review, this panel is recommending efforts to change the climate from top to bottom.

1. As this panel’s report on workforce/student diversity indicated, we have few women in leadership positions across campus or within the Corps of Cadets. Therefore, we recommend enhanced deliberate efforts for recruiting fully qualified women in administration, on the faculty, within the staff, within the military academic departments, and among tactical officers and OC personnel. Those who recruit cadets should clearly be supportive of women on our campus.

2. We need to assist administration, faculty, staff, and students to become aware of their own gender biases, to commit to eliminating these, and to develop skills to address harassing behavior in a non-blaming manner. Such an approach would reduce tolerance for such behaviors across the campus. The Citadel is fortunate to have a team trained by the National Coalition Building Institute (NCBI) to offer leadership programs that encourage inclusion and
respect while developing a sense of one’s personal identity. Programs are designed to raise knowledge and awareness, while teaching skills that foster an inclusive environment as we develop leaders who can be effective in a diverse society. NCBI training is recommended for administrators, faculty, staff, and students. In particular, given their involvement in day-to-day activities with cadets, all Tactical Officers, OC’s, cadet leadership, cadre, and Human Affairs Officers should experience the NCBI “Welcoming Diversity” workshop to help them to a) give voice to their concerns, b) become aware/knowledgeable about each other, c) become aware of their own biases with regard to gender, and d) learn strategies for addressing comments and behaviors by cadets (male or female) that inappropriately relate to gender. The latter will assist the more than half of male cadets who do support the presence of women in the Corps.

3. Make greater efforts to highlight the military and academic achievements of women by integrating existing programs and developing new programming (e.g., Women’s History Month offerings) to highlight women’s leadership in a manner that is visible across the campus community.

4. Ensure that images presented on The Citadel website depict women more frequently.

5. Ensure that mandated programs that feature speakers include presenters who are female and/or of minority status.

6. Ensure that multiple perspectives regarding gender and racial issues are presented to cadets. For example, anecdotal reports suggested that at least some cadets were offended by comments made recently by Phyllis Schafly about “feminists” without having the opportunity to hear a different perspective.

7. Continue the Commandant’s evaluation of Tactical officer’s leadership skills with regard to cadets’ ability to “train, educate, and challenge all cadets regardless of race, religion, ethnic background, or gender” as well as serving as role models for other cadets. If the TACs are being evaluated under these criteria, they can only be successful if they hold their cadet leadership to the same standards.

8. Continue the Commandant’s evaluation of attitudes towards women as part of the objective evaluation criteria used when making decisions about leadership and rank.

9. Address attitudes towards women as a leadership issue. Respect for others garners respect and loyalty from others.

Employee and Undergraduate Student Body Diversity: To reverse a long record of failure in attracting a diverse workforce and undergraduate student body to The Citadel, the Panel makes the following recommendations:

1. HR, academic departments/schools, workplace units must examine their current recruitment methods to identify approaches that work and those that don’t work with regard to attracting fully qualified women and minority
faculty, staff, and administrators. Those that continue to be unsuccessful should be replaced.

2. A different, integrated/proactive plan to ensure more effective recruitment of fully qualified women and minority faculty and staff is necessary to develop a workforce that more closely reflects the characteristics of society. This should be developed over the next year by a committee with outside consultation to develop a plan that is specific to the characteristics and needs of The Citadel. A cursory look at the literature in this area indicates that this is a very complex issue and The Citadel should engage a consultant who has been a part of a successful workforce transformation.

3. Departments/schools/units that are recruiting new employees should ensure that search committees are diverse.

4. Search committees should extend their searches until the best candidates are women and minorities.

5. The admissions office must examine their current recruitment methods to identify approaches that work and those that don’t work with regard to attracting fully qualified women and minority students. Those that continue to be unsuccessful should be replaced.

6. Reportedly, the Fall, 2012 class includes a higher percentage of women than in previous years. This is encouraging and reasons for success should be identified and replicated in order to reach a minimum of 15% of women in the Corps of Cadets.

7. A different, integrated/proactive plan to ensure more effective recruitment of women and minority students is necessary to develop a student body that more closely reflects the characteristics of society. This should be developed over the next year by a committee with outside consultation to develop a plan that is specific to the characteristics and needs of The Citadel. A cursory look at the literature in this area indicates that this is a very complex issue, and we should engage a consultant who has been a part of a successful student body transformation.

8. Volunteer recruiters should be screened in terms of their attitudes towards women in the Corps of Cadets and should receive training with regard to recruiting prospective women and minority students.

9. Involve diverse alumni in recruitment of female and minority students.

10. Recruiters for student admission should participate in a National Coalition Building Institute (NCBI) “Welcoming Diversity” workshop to learn about their own biases as well as perspectives of diverse individuals. Increasing knowledge, awareness, and skill in this area is expected to improve recruiters’ ability to engage effectively with fully qualified, prospective female and minority students.

Other Recommendations: The Panel made a number of other recommendations that it believes would improve the social climate of our campus:

- Develop a Diversity Council that addresses diversity beyond simply gender and race. The purpose of the Council would be to
Conduct ongoing evaluation of diversity issues campus-wide
Make recommendations to promote continued improvement in recruiting and retention of a diverse workforce and student body
Make recommendations to promote inclusiveness across campus.

Create an Office or Center for Global Diversity that implements recommendations of the Diversity Council and integrates diversity-related programs/initiatives across the campus, to include the CGC as well as the undergraduate programs. At a fundamental level of efficiency, a centralized approach would serve the purpose of integrating and supporting existing institutional efforts, thus improving communication/collaboration within the campus as well as with external entities. The purpose of such an office would be to

- Promote diversity-related programs that are on campus at present (e.g., Office of Multicultural Student Services and International Studies)
- Provide information and expertise on new initiatives
- Facilitate NCBI training and workshops identify and negotiate consolidation of overlapping programs
- Act as a focal point for new initiatives
- Support the best practice of maintaining affinity groups (e.g., African American Society, WASA) on campus
- Seek funding from corporate and foundation sources.

Continue to evaluate and refine training and assessment of Tactical officers with regard to equitable practice

Enhance the academic curriculum by

- Having schools/departments continue to address relevant multicultural content in coursework and encouraging them to add such content where relevant
- Developing a regularly scheduled course in gender studies
- Developing a course in comparative religions

Develop a metric for evaluating cadet companies in terms of their treatment of women and minority students within the context of being fair to all. The objective should be to pull women and those of minority status of all types up, not to bring those with majority status down. Companies that do well in this area should be rewarded.

Utilize NCBI training programs and principles to help students become aware of their own social identities as well as the experiences of a diverse campus family. This helps to bring people together, to understand the challenges that each faces, and to build skills to address inequality, however it appears.

Continue to request female and minority instructors and professors for the ROTC departments. To enhance involvement of women and minorities in these departments, the panel recommends broadening the criteria to include graduates of any service academy or senior military college. We recognize that this is a complex issue that The Citadel has limited control over, but recommend that The Citadel make requests in an attempt to enhance diversity in these departments.

Educate alumni about the importance of developing a campus culture that must be modified from the time when they attended. This is needed not only to address
the changing demographics of students, but also to address the changing nature of the college student population.

**Panel on Campus Security and Student and Employee Welfare and Morale**

*Weapons Security:* All cadet-issued weapons should be demilled. This would enhance the safety of the campus community, obviate the need to enforce the two-lock rule, and reduce the security issues with the Jenkins Hall arms room. Or, as another alternative, The Citadel should consider replacing the M-14s with the Army-issued replica weapons now produced at Ft. Jackson. These replicas have the feel of real weapons and are used by opposing forces in training, but they are not functional.

The Panel recommends updated education of the cadets on the college’s current policy regarding privately owned weapons, enhanced inspection of cadet rooms for weapons, random inspection of cadet cars and the warehouse cadet storage area to ensure that cadets are following current policies.

There seems to be no college policy regarding faculty, staff and visitors who may have weapons on campus. The college needs to study all laws associated with this issue. Then the college must develop a policy to address this issue and ensure appropriate promulgation and education regarding the policy.

*Faculty and Staff Morale:* In response to the 2012 Faculty and Staff Social Climate Survey, the Panel makes the following recommendations:

- Use focus groups of faculty and staff to explore the issues that surfaced in the survey and ensure the confidentiality of comments.
- Improve the accuracy and completeness of communications between administration and faculty & staff.
- Improve employee recognition.
- Senior staff needs to genuinely seek advice & input from their deans and directors.
- Above all the administration must set the example in upholding our core values and guard against saying one thing and doing another.

*Disaster Preparedness and Crisis Management:*

- Provide one central space where all the plans are located. Currently there are plans at Bulldog alert, Public Safety’s web page, and on the College Policies & Procedures pages.
- Ensure that all groups who have a part in the plans are versed and understand their roles. During the review of the plans for Physical Plant, for instance, some requirements of these plans were not known by PPLT personnel.
- Conduct regular tests of the critical, high profile plans at more than the senior staff level so that others who have significant roles can participate. A majority of the plans are currently exercised at Senior Staff or one-office (Public
Safety) level. Tests of the plans need to involve all levels that have significant responsibility for actions.

- Ensure “cross-training” of key individuals so that if one person is not present the plan can still be executed effectively.
- Public Safety needs to have more involvement in day to day campus disaster preparedness and emergency management activities.
I. **MEMBERSHIP:** The members of the sub-committee were Lisa Blake (Associate Registrar), Tom Clark (Professor of Naval Science), Dean Easterlin (Project Coordinator, Office of the President), Ron Hemingway (Professor of Chemistry), Bo Moore, Chair, (Dean of Humanities & Social Sciences), John Powell (Director of Admissions), and Chip Taylor (Professor of Psychology). David Allen (Head, Department of English) served as an *ex officio* member and coordinator with the main IPAC committee.

II. **CHARGE:** This sub-committee was asked to examine the current operation of The Citadel’s disciplinary system for cadets with particular attention to issues of “consistency, loss of benefit to attend, role of TACs [tactical officers] and OCs [officers-in-charge], conceptual base (punish versus teach/coach/mentor), targeting of cadets, overlap with Honor System, current policies and practices, compliance, appeal policy and procedures, [and], impact of BOV [Board of Visitors] in the appeal process.”

III. **PROCESS:** The committee first gathered and examined available documents dealing with the subjects of its charge. Those documents include the following: *Citadel Blue Book* (Regulations for the South Carolina Corps of Cadets, 2008-2009); *Citadel White Book* (Organizations, Functions, and Standard Operating Procedures, 2011-2012); *Citadel Red Book* (The Fourth Class Manual); The Citadel *Guidon*, The Citadel Honor Manual, *Citadel TAC Handbook*; *Citadel OC Handbook*; Citadel Social Climate Surveys conducted in 2009 and 2011 and Citadel Sleep Study conducted in 2012 by The Citadel’s Office of Assessment; The Citadel Commandant of Cadet’s Power Point Briefings to The Citadel’s Board of Visitors (2009 through 2012); and copies of the comparable rules and regulations for cadets at the Virginia Military Institute, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Norwich University, and the United States Military Academy at West Point, New York.

Next, interviews were conducted (usually by different two-member teams from the committee) with persons in position to have first-hand knowledge of, and experiences with, the issues and practices under review. Notes of the interviews were taken and shared among all members of the group.

The persons interviewed include the following: Sylvan Bauer (Command Sergeant Major); Keith Brace (2nd BTN TAC); Mark Brandenburg (General
Counsel, The Citadel); Kevin Dopf (Assistant Commandant for Personnel and Logistics); Charles Graham (1st BTN TAC); Tom Harris (5th BTN TAC); Arthur Hopkins (Mike Company TAC); Dennis Lane (3rd BTN TAC); Wendell McMillan (4th BTN TAC); Leo Mercado (Commandant of Cadets); Christopher (“Hawk”) Moore (Deputy Commandant/Assistant Commandant for Discipline); Tony Phinney (Night OC), Paul Plunkett (Senior Associate Athletic Director), Janet Shealy (Sexual Assault Response Coordinator), John Smith (Night OC), Steven Smith (Band Company TAC); Joe Trez (Director of The Citadel Staff. Former Commandant of Cadets); and Alece Wood (Alpha Company TAC); Eight cadets were also interviewed. Names of those cadets are available on a confidential, “need to know” basis.

In addition, three members of the committee conducted two separate, unannounced visits to the barracks to experience conditions on randomly selected evenings and to speak with night OCs. The first visit took place on April 19, 2012 from 2030-2100. The second occurred on April 27, 2012 from 0300-0400. All five battalions were visited. Summaries of both visits are appended as official parts of this report.

While gathering this information, the committee met on a weekly basis to discuss it from late March through early May. The product of those discussions was the preliminary report filed on May 7.

With the benefit of input from the June meeting of The Citadel Board of Visitors and subsequent meetings of the main IPAC committee and committee chairpersons, the sub-committee resumed discussions in late June. From then through mid-July, the committee worked to revise, polish, and expand upon its preliminary report with particular attention to sharpening recommendations and providing an overall summary of, and conclusions drawn from, its work. The product of that work appears below.

IV. FINDINGS

A. Current Policies: The Citadel has three, separate publications with rules and regulations for cadets. They are the White Book (Organizations, Functions, and Standard Operating Procedures, 2011-2012 which is 258 pages long), the Blue Book (Regulations for the South Carolina Corps of Cadets, 2008-2009 with 101 pages), and the Red Book (The Fourth Class Manual at 18 pages). In comparison to selected colleges with a comparable Corps of Cadets, the combined length of The Citadel’s written rules and regulations (377 pages) is 237% greater than those in place at Norwich University (159 pages), 256% larger than Virginia Tech’s (147 pages); 279% longer than VMI’s (135 pages), and 400% bigger than West Point’s (94 pages). It is difficult to escape the conclusion that The Citadel’s published regulations are much longer and more complex than they need, or ought, to be to serve as an effective constitution for the governance of cadet life.
B. **Current Practices:** The administration of the current disciplinary system is cumbersome and slow. When a “Performance Report” (PR) alleging disciplinary violations is written, it is sent to the Commandant’s Office to be recorded. The PR is then returned to the accused cadet who has the opportunity to respond with an “Explanation Required in Writing” (ERW). The documents then flow to the Company Commander, the Company Tactical Officer, the Battalion Tactical Officer, and then back to the Office of the Commandant before implementation. The interval between the writing of a PR, the determination of the disciplinary action to be taken, and the implementation thereof is significant—not infrequently a period of two weeks.

One reason for the inefficiency is the large number of people who currently are required to be involved in even the most minor of disciplinary matters. Another is the lack of a computerized system of recording, storing, and disseminating information about disciplinary actions in a timely manner. Testimony indicates that most disciplinary record-keeping is still done by pencil and paper.

An exception to that rule is the computerized system that records class absences. It is perhaps in part for that reason that this primarily academic matter is the source of what seems to be a disproportionately large percentage (about 40%) of all disciplinary actions. Moreover, the large number of punishments assigned for class absences are essentially military (e.g. walking tours) in nature, do not in any meaningful way help to redress the nature of the harm done by missing class. This form of punishment puts additional strains on an already unwieldy disciplinary system that makes it more difficult to deal efficiently—and effectively—with improper behavior outside the classroom.

The disciplinary system’s current practices need to be streamlined, guided by a better and more comprehensive record-keeping system, and aimed more toward remedying the specific nature of the offense committed.

C. **Compliance:** Widespread testimony documents that very few (if any) people try to read, much less understand and follow, the intimidating volume of written rules in anything close to its entirety. Indeed, the difficulty in mastering the mountain of existing rules may be a major reason why the much simpler and more easily communicated and comprehended common law practices (“traditions”) within individual companies—many of which violate either the spirit or the letter of the written rules—appear to have far greater power in actually shaping and governing cadet behavior. Perhaps not surprisingly, then, there appears to be a fairly widespread lack of compliance with many of the college’s published rules and regulations—especially those that deal with cadet training, use of alcohol, and prescribed activities of the
“Night OCs.” The evidence also suggests that there is significant underreporting of breaches of rules and regulations in these areas.

D. **Consistency:** Social climate surveys indicate that cadets perceive there to be significant differences in the way that athletes and women are treated. Strong and persistent anecdotal evidence provided by people from all sectors of The Citadel community testify to significant differences between companies based on the distinctive sub-cultures that exist in many of them. The atmosphere within the companies is commonly compared to that of fraternities and sororities at other institutions. Many of the persons who spoke to members of this committee expressed the strongly held view that loyalty to the company is stronger than that to the Corps or to The Citadel as a whole. Many also noted significant differences in the ways in which existing rules, policies, and procedures are interpreted and enforced by “Tactical Officers” and “Officers in Charge” during the evenings.

It is not possible objectively to assess in many key areas of student life how valid the above stated perceptions are or how consistently policies and practices (both written and unwritten) on discipline are administered throughout the Corps of Cadets. Most disciplinary actions are, as noted above, recorded only with pencil and paper. There is no centralized, electronic data base that lends itself to making systematic comparisons and evaluations between major administrative units (i.e. companies and battalions); academic classes (freshman through senior); demographic groups (race, gender, ethnicity, etc.); and members and non-members of intercollegiate athletic teams.

E. **Conceptual Base:** The available evidence suggests that there is far more use of intimidation and punishment than encouragement and reward in the training of cadets throughout the Corps as a whole. Emphasis on the former type of training is not consistent with what the best psychological literature and the current doctrines of the U.S. Armed Forces have determined to be the most effective way to develop the internally driven value system that is necessary to optimize personal growth and to generate the most principled and successful leaders.

One of the units in which intimidation does not appear to be the norm is Alpha Company. Its tactical officer uses a variety of more positive techniques to cultivate and reward good performance. This trend appears to be indicative of First Battalion as a whole. The more positive techniques used in that company and that battalion seem to have helped to instill within their cadets a greater sense of common purpose and commitment to each other’s development that, in turn, optimized performance of the group as a whole. During AY 2011-12, Alpha Company had no commandant’s board/administrative disciplinary hearings, no accusations of hazing, no violations of the fourth class system, and a 100% retention rate of freshmen. First Battalion as a whole retained all
but 8 freshmen after matriculating well over one hundred. Additionally, of the 400+ cadets in first battalion, none of them faced disciplinary action that warranted a commandant's board/administrative hearing.

Many of the positive techniques used to achieve these results were either suggested by the *Blue* and *White* books or learned from Citadel faculty who teach courses leading to graduate certificate in student affairs. We think it is reasonable to believe that greater use of these techniques could be introduced into other companies and battalions with relative ease and with similarly positive results. For that reason, we are appending a summary of them to this document as a formal part of our report.

F. **Targeting of Cadets:** Anecdotal evidence suggests that it happens now as it has throughout much of the college’s history. The most common method appears to be subjecting the targeted cadets to a level of scrutiny and enforcement of rules far beyond that visited on most cadets. Freshmen generally choose not to report such targeting by upperclassmen for fear of becoming targets themselves. Arguably more insidious, however, is when upperclassmen encourage targeting of knobs by their own classmates.

G. **Overlap with Honor System:** This phenomenon exists to a significant extent—particularly on misrepresentations of performance of punishments and reasons for absences at accountability formations. A widespread impression exists that the honor system is used too much for discipline and has become too complex.

H. **Appeal Policy and Procedures:** It is slow and cumbersome, particularly for lesser offenses.

I. **Role of TACs:** It needs to be more clearly defined. Many persons with whom we spoke believe that TACs are underutilized. Others, however, spoke of companies in which TACs were overly active, leaving little room for cadets to exercise responsible leadership. There appears to be a general consensus that TACs would benefit from being given a more specific mission statement, annual training oriented toward how best to achieve that mission, and more frequent evaluations comparing the performance of their units with others in the Corps. These types of evaluations will require the creation of a better and broader computer database that supports comparisons by company, battalion, race, gender, and academic class. Greater use of peer and cadet evaluations of TACs would also be beneficial.

J. **Role of OCs:** Members of the committee made two separate, unannounced visits at night to the battalions. Observations made during those visits are attached. Collectively, they suggest that the current OC system is in need of major change and perhaps ought to be eliminated altogether and
replaced with something different. Interviews with the people referenced in section III above lend additional weight to that conclusion.

There is an interval of two or more hours between the time TACs leave for the day and OCs arrive to assume their duties in the barracks. The gap is four hours on Saturday and Sunday evenings. There is little interaction between TACs and OCs, and neither is there much interaction between some OCs and cadets. Some OCs arrive late and rarely leave their rooms. OCs are provided no training, paid minimum wage, drawn from a rotating pool of people (rather than being the same person each night), exercise little authority, and are not well respected by cadets. Existing policies prescribing locked doors and lights out do not appear to be effectively monitored and enforced. The night-time opportunities for violation of rules—to include easily observed cases of improper entry into the battalions, breaches in prescribed security for weapons, disregard of locked door and lights out policies, consumption of alcoholic beverage, abusive language, excessive noise, and other types of serious misbehavior by cadets—are great. So, too, are the attendant risks to the college. Of the several issues assigned to our committee, this is the one, in our estimation, that poses the greatest immediate risk to the college. We, therefore, believe that it is the one most in need of attention prior to the beginning of AY 2012-2013.

K. Impact of BOV in Appeal Process: the consensus of those persons who spoke with members of our committee is that it is best for the BOV not to be involved in disciplinary matters.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. NIGHT-TIME ENVIRONMENT IN THE BATTALIONS: To reduce the risks during AY 2012-2013: (1) appoint day-time TACs to serve on a rotating basis as CoC (2) install security cameras to monitor public areas in the five battalions (3) either use campus police, or hire off-duty Charleston police, or pay members of faculty, staff, and active duty military personnel to conduct unannounced night-time visits and file reports on their observations (4) locate OC rooms on fourth division with freshmen (5) direct OCs to record all comings and goings within the battalions during the evening (6) mandate strict enforcement of locked doors to rooms and current “lights-out” policies (7) direct OCs to awaken company commanders and instruct them to address problems when they arise (8) conduct systematic examination of OC system during AY 2012-2013 to produce additional reforms (including those in section E below) or a fundamentally different system of night-time supervision of the barracks for AY 2013-14.

B. Rules and Regulations: Revise and reduce existing rules and regulations into a single publication of no more than 125 pages in length. Review and, as necessary,
revise the publication every two years but keep its overall length at the prescribed level. Require reading of and testing on rules as part of Orientation 101 for freshman and again for cadets competing for rank.

C. **Record Keeping:** Create a user friendly and widely accessible electronic system for the recording, administration, and evaluation of all disciplinary actions. Use it as a central part of the process of evaluating TACs, OCs, cadet rank holders and all others who administer discipline in the barracks. At a minimum, the new system should support comparisons by battalion, company, academic class, race, gender, and participation/non-participation on intercollegiate athletic teams.

D. **Class Absence System:** Afford cadets more latitude in making decisions about the best use of their time for academic development by imposing no penalty on cadets until they miss 7% (one third of the maximum allowable) of the scheduled meetings of a particular course. Thereafter, confine all disciplinary actions for additional class absences to mandatory, proctored study halls on Wednesday afternoons or the weekends—thereby remediating the academic deficiency created by missing too many classes. Discontinue altogether the practice of imposing non-academic punishments for missing class.

E. **Position Descriptions/Training/Evaluation:** Draft clear and specific description of duties of all cadet leaders, TACs, and OCs (or their successors who may be assigned duties in the barracks at night). Specify goals for the academic, leadership, physical, and military development of their units. Provide training targeted toward how best to achieve the goals that are established. Implement regular (quarterly for TACs and OCs; perhaps less frequently for cadet commanders and top NCOs) evaluations of performance. Evaluations should include comparisons with the performances of like units within the Corps and written evaluations of superiors, peers, and subordinates within the chain of command.

F. **Create a More Positive and Uniform Cadet Culture that Emphasizes the Corps as a whole rather than Individual Companies:** There is a strong consensus that TACs, OCs, and a significant percentage of cadets should be rotated between companies on an annual basis to create stronger identification with the Corps as a whole, reduce the distinctiveness of individual companies, and—most importantly—expand opportunities for cadets to bond closely with, and learn how to exercise leadership skills among, a larger number of their peers.

G. **Positive Training Methods:** Instruct cadet leaders and TACs in the use of encouragement, rewards, and other positive motivational techniques as primary instruments of leadership. Ensure that these methods, not intimidation and punishment, are the central features of the college’s disciplinary system.
H. **Supervisory Body**: Use a college-wide committee comprised of representatives of the faculty, administration, staff, and ROTC departments to supervise the implementation and monitoring of reforms to address problems identified in this report.

VI. **SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:**

The Citadel’s disciplinary system is broken. Its written rules for cadets are too long and complex to serve as an optimally effective code of conduct. Few, if any, people read all of them. Many read virtually none of them. Common law “traditions”—many of which violate either the spirit or the letter of the written rules—within individual companies exercise greater power over cadet behavior. TACs, OCs, and cadet leaders are given vague mission statements, no measurable goals to achieve, no targeted training on how to accomplish them, and no regular evaluations of their performance in comparison to their peers. Most record-keeping is done with pencil and paper. Administration of the system is cumbersome and inefficient. **There is no electronic database with all of the readily accessible information necessary for an empirical assessment of how well the college is performing the various missions it has undertaken within the Corps of Cadets. There is a wide variation in the manner in which rules are interpreted, followed, and enforced.** Intimidation and punishment—rather than encouragement and more positive motivational techniques—appear to be the norm. Opportunities for serious misbehavior are much greater than they should be—especially during the understaffed evening hours when there are real and present dangers of catastrophic incidents. But even absent the occurrence of such incidents the wide gap that exists between stated principles and actual practices steadily harms the college, undermines its credibility, and if permitted to continue poses no less a threat to its vital interests. Broadly based and well-integrated reforms should be pursued immediately to reduce present risks, reverse existing trends, and create a new disciplinary system that is better suited to achieving The Citadel’s mission of producing enlightened, principled, and successful leaders for the increasingly diverse and globalized society of the twenty-first century.
Most of the rewards used in Alpha Company are already included in cadet regulations (blue book and white book). I simply used them as tools to gain the best outcome for developing individual cadets on their journey to become a principled leader. Much of my understanding with maintaining a rigorous but positive environment was the knowledge gained from obtaining the Certificate in Student Affairs from the Citadel Graduate College. Understanding the needs of the current generation enabled me to use positive motivational techniques and strategies that fostered behavioral change. All Alpha Company cadets were awarded merits for above average behavior (outstanding room during inspections, outstanding appearance, outstanding physical fitness test scores, dean’s list and gold stars). All cadets were encouraged to earn individual and team incentives. All cadets were expected to use my 24/7 cell phone policy if they were in trouble or had a dilemma that may get them in trouble during leave, general leave, weekends or holidays. This allowed me to engage or prevent a bad situation that could be worse or cost them their cadet career i.e. alcohol related incidents. All cadets were acknowledged on their birthday and offered 3-4 hours of special leave for themselves and a limited number of friends if their birthday fell on a weekday. All cadets were given a pat on the back or a high five if they did something positive that did not warrant merits or leave, but was worthy of acknowledgment of personal progression. At the conclusion of academic year 2011-2012 Alpha company had ZERO commandant’s boards/administrative disciplinary hearings, ZERO hazing accusations, ZERO violations of the 4th Class system, and retained ALL freshmen for the entire year. Listed below are the positive motivation techniques and rewards used that varied for upper class cadets and freshmen.

**Upper class cadets**

- Established trust by showing genuine interest in their individual success as a cadet and their personal lives. I acted as a confidant when necessary. (*positive motivation*)

Examples: I kept up with their relationship status, did not share information they deemed confidential (i.e. if a cadet was gay, lesbian, transgender or bi-sexual), difficult family situations, I talked to them about off campus and hometown community activities they were involved in, supported any positive behaviors, wrote letters of recommendations for scholarships, law school and job obtainment.

- Impressed on them that there were good things about rules, regulations and structure. I taught them how to use the regulations to get what they
wanted/needed to improve their quality of life as a cadet\-college student.

(rewards)

- Cadet of the Month Program
  - One cadet from each class freshmen, sophomore, junior & senior was selected and awarded an overnight for positive contributions to the company or Corps
- Sleep Ins (Cadet does not have to participate in morning formation; able to get an extra 1-2 hours of sleep)
- Merit rewards
  - Merits were given for various above average behaviors. Once a cadet reached 25 merits in one month (merit period) they were awarded an overnight

Example 1: Every squad sergeant and platoon sergeant was allowed to use incentives to encourage and motivate his/her squad or platoon. The plan must be approved by the Platoon Leader, XO and Company Commander who will bring their incentive plan to me for review and final approval. This gave cadet rank holders a feeling of empowerment and sparked productive competition. Once the cadets competed for who had the best shined shoes and brass. This was a win-win situation!

Example 2: I also allowed the Company Commander some leeway with incentives. He had complete control over the Cadet of the Month program where he submitted names and brief summary to me of why his candidates deserved the award. This forced him to look for positive behaviors from his subordinates. My only rule was that he could not selected the same cadet twice. I encouraged him to look for contributions to the company from non rank holding cadets as well. One month he selected a senior cadet with no rank (senior private) and that one cadet alone showed the best informal leadership characteristics (within the company) I’ve seen in years!

Cadets of the Month were announced by the company commander, given a certificate in front of the entire company, had their names posted on my door for a week, and was awarded an extra overnight (leave).

Example 3: Advertised that the company with the highest freshmen retention rate received a block overnight

- All cadre members set goals for their position at the start of the year. Goals were emailed to me so that I could monitor their progression (positive motivation)

Example: Cadre Platoon Sergeant set a goal for the designated freshmen squad to win the Kelly Cup competition. One of the company commander’s goals was that all seniors and freshmen passed the PT test.

- I acted as a catalyst to develop non adversarial relationships between the upper class cadets and freshmen (positive motivation)

Example: A freshman cadet had to pick up a new pair of glasses after breaking them during cadre training. The freshman could have used the transportation system provided by the infirmary. Instead, I encouraged the upper class cadets to “take care of their own.” Special leave was granted to an upper class cadet to take the freshman to the optometrist.
**Freshmen Cadets**

- Immediately (training day #1) open the lines of communication and I made it known that I was neutral and my role was as a counselor, coach, and mentor to ALL cadets assigned to Alpha Company (*positive motivation*)

Example: I formally counseled the freshmen 2-3 times per semester as a group. I set up meetings during lunch with no upper class cadets present. After a 15-20 minute counseling session we took time for team building exercises than the freshmen were allowed to speak freely, ask questions, and vent (non attribution).

- Freshmen were empowered by giving me the names of their most admired upper class cadet. I asked them to tell me what this upper class cadet did to coach, mentor and teach them.
  - This created a checks and balances system because upper class cadets craved that recognition and feeling that they were training, influencing and impacting their subordinates Citadel experience in a positive way.

- Freshmen were rewarded and given accolades the same as upper class cadets (*rewards*)

Example: Freshmen with outstanding rooms after an inspection would be given merits that would apply toward earning overnight leave. Freshmen who earned top PT scores were given merits. Those who made Dean’s List and/or Gold Stars were also given merits. This gave them something to look forward to when they were able to take leave spring semester. In addition to merits, I sent out emails to the entire company congratulating ALL cadets who earned rewards/merits.

- My office has always been a “no play/human dignity and respect zone” meaning there was NO 4th class system in my office. This gave the freshmen a feeling of safety and security. It also allowed them to be themselves so that I could get to know them as people, not knobs. (*positive motivation*)
  - I always kept juice, water, energy drinks, Gatorade and snacks in my office for freshmen. The caveat to enjoying free snacks was that they had to talk to me about their day or something that was on their mind.

- I acted as a liaison between the freshmen and the upper class. If there was something the freshman did not understand about the 4C system or a particular upper class cadet/cadre members’ personality, I would provide insight. This helped to encourage non adversarial relationships between the upper class and freshmen. (*positive motivation*)

- The upper class cadets and myself always ran with and encouraged freshmen during PT (*positive motivation*)

- Freshmen cadets who were performing well were rewarded with a pizza party sponsored by TAC (*reward*)
The outcomes in Alpha company were largely due to an overall 'firm but fair' positive environment created in first battalion. We embraced Citadel Core Values of Honor, Duty, Respect and the philosophy that laid the groundwork was one of empowering individuals and trust in decision making. i.e. My supervisor Charles Graham trusted and gave me the freedom to use incentives as a leadership tool in my assigned company. In turn, I afforded cadet leadership in Alpha Company the same level of trust.

- Empowerment also worked with the Cadet Battalion Commander; became infectious throughout all four companies and was the catalyst to cadet buy in to the structure and rigors of their Citadel experience. The TACs and cadets formed a high performance team by ensuring each and every one of us were successful in performance of our duties or lessons learned from our mistakes. As a result, not only did Alpha Company retain their entire freshmen class, the Battalion as a whole retained all but 8 freshmen after matriculating well over one hundred. Additionally, of the 400+ cadets in first battalion, none of them faced disciplinary action that warranted a commandant's board/administrative hearing. AY 2011-2012 was a phenomenal year for the first battalion team and should be benchmarked as the optimal outcome of principles that are the foundation of The Citadel.
Barracks Visit: 27 April 2012 (0300-0400 hours) by Col Tom Clark and Professor Chip Taylor

Sequence of visit:
- Second Battalion (2BN): OC Capt Meyers, USAF (In uniform w/out cover)
- Fourth Battalion (4BN): Capt _______ , USAF(Broken uniform; t-shirt & trousers)
- Third Battalion (3BN): Sheriff John Smith (Not in uniform)
- First Battalion (1BN): SSgt Bryant, USAF (In complete uniform)

Observations:
- Each BN was locked upon our arrival
- Each BN was opened promptly by the OC when we knocked
- With the exception of 1BN, our authority for entry was never questioned by the OC. In 1BN, after we verbally indicated that we were authorized, we were allowed entry.
- Our IDs were never asked for or checked by the OC; however in 1BN and 3BN, our names (as listed on our name tags) were copied down
- In each BN, we were allowed to wander freely throughout the BN, unescorted. In 1BN and 3BN, we were watched by the OC while he stood in the quad; however, in 2BN and 4BN we were not observed as we moved about the BN.
- In 2BN, we arrived soon after an incident occurred where an unidentified person threw three laundry bags from a third division window to a waiting car below. We were told by C/Capt Shaw (G Company commander) that there had been a recent rash of thefts, to include laptops and iPads. He and his staff that were present (about 4 cadets) thought that this might be related. We also spoke with the BN commander who was discussing the situation with the OC, Capt Meyers. We were later told that the bags were legitimate laundry and that a sponsor Dad in a car waiting below was picking them up to wash. While unconfirmed, we thought this an odd occurrence at 0300 in the morning.
- In 4BN, a cadet (C/Capt Smith, O Co Cmdr) entered the BN sally port via bicycle at approximately 0330. He indicated that he had been working on a Senior Project in one of the academic buildings and had been doing so every night for about a week. He was not challenged or questioned by the OC as to why he was out of the barracks after all-ins.
- In general, the barracks had trash strewn about and trash cans overflowing (see attached pictures). 1BN was the cleanest; 4BN the dirtiest
- There were numerous cadets awake and moving about in each of the barracks. We observed cadets walking on the galleries only in towels in 3BN
• In general, there was no way to know if doors were open or locked; there was little monitoring.
• Music was playing in 3BN loud enough to be heard on nearby floors, but we were unable to locate its source
• We casually questioned all the OCs when departing. In general, they concurred that:
  - the OC duty was a non-sleeping post
  - they did not feel empowered to deal with extreme discipline problems that might arise
  - they would contact the Cadet chain of command first in the event an incident arose in the BN
  - they did not feel comfortable calling the Commandant or SgtMaj if a problem arose
  - they did not feel that there was adequate communication between the Day TACs and the night OCs
• The OCs role appeared to be reactive vice proactive, except possibly in 1BN where the OC mentioned that he routinely walked the area, both inside and outside the BN
• The OCs were not aware who their peers were in the other Battalions nor did they know the name of the COC on duty

![Image of a messy room]
Night OC Personnel Interviews
Thursday, April 19, 2012

Report: Between 2030 and 2100

Tony L. Phinney (OC)

- Appearance: jogging shorts and sweatshirt
- Tact - COC - OC - COC - Tact
- Do not hand out any white slips. Will leave a note for the tact. Blank sheet of paper with lines. Would prefer to email rather than hassle with paper trail.
- Most of the discipline issues [hazing] happens off campus.
- Hazing: Encouraged by victim participation
- Good point: No quad sports. Game of soccer vs. wood pallets on railing with basketball hoop
- Recommendations: Improve communication. Only get told of things that are issues and often times it is too late.
- “Let’s be honest. We are here because women are here. I mean, come on. Before women were here, we didn’t have this issue at all.”

John J. Smith (OC)

- What he was doing: Watching a movie on the computer.
- Smooth talker – would have fallen for what he was saying.
- Cadets in PTs saying they just finished walking tours and asking him to sign off Honor Violation!
- Does not hand out any white slips. I don’t want them to get in trouble while “at home”
- Biggest discipline issue: alcohol
- If they can walk and state who they are, he tells them to go to bed. If they can’t. sends them to infirmary
- Recommendation: Cable or big screen TV
- “I don’t know the rules” so I use common sense

Cadet interview: (female African American)

“There’s a backdoor for everything”
I. INTRODUCTION: The Cadet Honor Code “is the heart of the Honor System, and its purpose is to maintain honor and integrity within the Corps.” The Citadel’s Honor System represents the moral and ethical values integral to the Citadel Experience and the education and development of principled leaders. Consequently, alumni and cadets protectively guard the Honor System and changes to the System or its processes should only be implemented after thorough consideration. The IPAC Honor Panel addressed numerous issues throughout the review process, but changes to Honor Code were not among them. Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) written by the Panel and additional recommendations are administrative in nature and are designed to improve Honor Committee operations and to help ensure a sense of equity throughout Honor System processes.

II. CHARGE: The Honor Panel was specifically tasked to review policies and procedures associated with Honor Committee membership, Faculty Advisors to the Honor Committee, and Honor Boards of Review. The panel was tasked to develop an SOP for each issue and to make additional recommendations as necessary.

III. IPAC Honor Panel:
Col. Doug Fehrmann, Deputy Director, Krause Center, Citadel Class of 1983
Col. David Allen, Department Chair and Professor of English
Mr. Jimmy Kerr, Citadel Class of 1965
Mrs. Mary Ellen Huddleston, Department of Health, Exercise and Sports Science
Lt. Col. Chris Fudge, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs
Dr. Don Sparks, Professor of International Economics, School of Business Administration

IV. INTERVIEWS:
Members of the faculty, staff and the South Carolina Corps of Cadets conducted numerous discussions, and this report includes information from the following sources:
Mr. Mark Brandenburg, General Counsel
Lt. Col. Kyle Sinisi, Faculty Advisor to the Honor Committee
BGen. Michael Barrett, Faculty Advisor to the Honor Committee
Coach Kevin Higgins, Head Football Coach
V. METHODOLOGY: The Panel reviewed files provided by the Director of Staff and the Executive Assistant to the President of The Citadel as both officials have been involved with the Honor System and its administration for several years. The Panel formed its agenda after careful review of the following items:
A. Yearly statistics containing inconsistencies with minimum analysis.
B. The Mood Report from 27 October 1995, requested by Lt. Gen. Watts and completed on 19 August 1996, which addressed the accusations and investigations process, trial conduct, and procedures to appeal Honor Court findings. This Report provided excellent historical background and information used to write the SOPs.
C. Current Honor Committee trial procedures observed by Panel.

The Citadel’s General Counsel appeared before the Committee to discuss several cases that provided valuable information on the risk of litigation in civilian courts based on Honor System operations at The Citadel. Cases reviewed by the Committee included:
A. Henson vs. the Honor Committee of U. VA., 1983
B. Just vs. The Citadel, 1997
C. Bishara and Bishara vs. The Citadel, 1998
D. Carter vs. The Citadel, 2011

A phone discussion with VMI Honor System Advisors enabled the Panel to compare Systems and procedures. Although the processes differ, the discussion provided several “best practices” that were used in SOP formulation. Of note is VMI’s use of defense advocates to assist accused cadets throughout Honor System proceedings. VMI uses multiple advisors and “term limits” to avoid loss of advisor objectivity. In addition, VMI has written a lengthy SOP that details every phase of Honor System processes and procedures.

The Panel reviewed:
A. The United States Air Force Academy Honor Code Reference Handbook which provided valuable information concerning education programs, the structure of an Honor System at a Federal Academy, and the checks and balances used in the USAFA Honor System. Although the scope is different and resources are much greater, this review provided useful information included in the SOPs.
B. The Clery Act for applicability to Honor System operations and found no grounds to highlight its requirements as an issue of concern. A brief discussion with the Citadel’s General Counsel revealed no reason to further investigate compliance with federal, state, or local laws in relation to Honor System operations at The Citadel.
BGen. Michael Barrett and Lt. Col. Kyle Sinisi met with the Panel to discuss their role as Faculty Advisors to the Honor Committee. Their insights were invaluable to the Panel and extremely helpful in discussions that shaped SOP completion.

Coach Kevin Higgins provided his perspective on Honor Committee operations in relation to his experience as Head Football Coach and as a representative of the Athletic Department. His concerns are addressed in the recommendations for further study.

VI. FINDINGS

A. RISK ASSESSMENT
The Panel concluded that the risk of financial loss or negative consequences to The Citadel posed by lawsuits resulting from actions by the College regarding Honor System determinations is low. Courts grant college administrations significant leeway to address violations of college policies and regulations as long as college policies are clearly stated, provided to students, and a student’s rights are not violated. The Citadel’s Honor System complies with these requirements through Honor System education processes, briefings, and a system of checks and balances as honor accusations proceed according to established procedures in the Citadel’s Honor Manual and associated Standard Operating Procedures.

B. STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES FOR ADVISORS TO THE HONOR COMMITTEE
The Honor Committee has been advised by one member of the faculty since its formation. There have been no term limits and little supervision by a senior member of the administration. The Faculty Advisor position is time intensive as well as multi-faceted and requires an uncompromising sense of objectivity. The Faculty Advisor is charged to provide counsel and advice to members of the Honor Committee, faculty, staff, and accused cadets. The Faculty Advisor must perform his/her duties without forming relationships or opinions that influence decisions or deny due process to participants in honor system processes. The SOP, attachment one, addresses the following issues:

1. Defines the duties of Krause Center personnel.
2. Defines the duties, qualifications and terms of service of members of the faculty or staff selected to advise members of the Honor Committee.

RECOMMENDATION: SOP approval by the President.

C. STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES FOR HONOR COMMITTEE NOMINATION, ELECTION AND SERVICE
The expectation of senior administration officials, faculty, staff and alumni is that Honor Committee members are positive role models for the SCCC and exercise
their duties with the utmost humility, judgment, and maturity. The Honor Manual identifies qualifications for nomination and election to the Honor Committee, but in general, terms that are not always observed or enforced. The SOP, attachment two, addresses the following issues:

1. Clarifies training timelines for second-class cadets before nomination.
2. Establishes clear eligibility standards for nomination and election to the Honor Committee and requirements for service after election.
3. Holds the Faculty Advisor and Chairman responsible for compliance.

RECOMMENDATION: SOP approval by the President.

D. POLICY AND PROCEDURE FOR CADET APPEALS OF HONOR DECISIONS
The purpose of this memorandum is to describe the policy and procedures for cadets to appeal Honor Court decisions. The President of The Citadel is the appellate authority for honor cases. This memorandum follows procedures in Citadel College Regulations published in August 2011 and builds on the General Counsel’s draft memorandum titled “Policy and Procedure for Cadet Appeals of Honor Decisions.” The intent is for the honor appeals process to correspond with the discipline appeals process in Memorandum Number 2-18, “Policy and Procedure for Cadet/Student Appeals of Disciplinary Decisions.” The memorandum and annexes, attachment three, address the following issues:

1. Provide a cadet found “in violation” of the Honor Code with equitable assistance throughout the appeals process.
2. In addition to college Vice-Presidents, recommend Department Heads to Chair Honor Boards of Review.
3. Transfer appeals process duties from the Executive Assistant to the President to the Deputy Director of the Krause Center.

RECOMMENDATION: SOP approval by the President.

E. HONOR SYSTEM RECORDS
A review of current and historical data revealed numerous inaccuracies and inconsistencies among existing briefings and statistics. The Panel did not have the time or resources to conduct a comprehensive study of yearly honor system statistics to assemble an accurate report on accusations, violations, and demographic information so that a meaningful analysis could be completed.

RECOMMENDATIONS:
1. A data collection plan should be developed by the Faculty Advisor and Honor Committee officers to ensure that statistics are valid, reliable and accurate.
2. All records, documents, tape recordings, and materials associated with any phase of Honor System operations should be given to the Secretary of the
Honor Committee and the Faculty Advisor for secure storage in the Krause Center for Leadership and Ethics for a minimum of 3 years.

3. An end-of-year analysis of Honor System operations should be completed by Honor Committee officers with supervision by the Faculty/Staff Advisors and briefed to the President and senior staff of the college.

F. EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS
A renewed and sustained emphasis on Honor System education and training programs must be the goal of the Krause Center, Faculty/Staff Officers, and the Honor Committee. Although not quantified in this report due to time limitations and lack of statistical analysis, it is the opinion of the Panel that there appears to be a disconnect between what the SCCC believes the Honor Code represents and how the SCCC actually observes and enforces the code. Hypocrisy is an often-mentioned term when the principles and requirements of the Code are compared to individual actions and the perception of uneven enforcement. This disconnect also applies to faculty and staff and is apparent in varying degrees of understanding, application, and enforcement of the Honor Code. An example is inconsistent treatment of alleged violations such as plagiarism.

RECOMMENDATIONS:
1. Designate the Krause Center for Leadership and Ethics as the office of responsibility for all Honor System education and training programs.
2. Initiate a review of all Honor System education and training programs.
3. Write/update a Faculty/Staff Manual that parallels the Honor Manual.
4. Conduct regular training of all faculty/staff members to include adjuncts concerning the guidelines on plagiarism and possible honor violations. This training should be completed at New Faculty and Staff Orientation and by each Department on an annual basis.
5. Ensure annual review of all cadet education and training programs and supervision of training sessions to include attendance by Krause Center personnel, Faculty/Staff Advisors, or TAC Officers.
6. Certify training program completion and compliance with SOP requirements before election of new Honor Committee members.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER REVIEW
The work of the IPAC Honor Panel was guided by the IPAC charge. A comprehensive review of Honor System processes and procedures was beyond the scope of this Panel. A thorough study of the Citadel’s Honor System should be completed by an independent committee with the capabilities to research and analyze historical data, review current Honor System operations, and provide recommendations on changes to ensure the viability of the Citadel’s Honor System.

A. AMENDMENTS AND CHANGES TO THE HONOR SYSTEM
(Section VIII, Paragraph 36)
1. There should be a regular review of the *Honor Manual* by Faculty/Staff Advisors and current Honor Committee members at the end of each academic year. The *Honor Manual* for the following academic year must be ready to publish before the rising Honor Committee departs on summer furlough.

2. There should be a provision for routine administrative changes to the *Honor Manual*. These changes should be limited to Krause Center personnel, current Faculty/Staff Advisors and current Honor Committee officers.

3. Current *Honor Manual* procedures to make substantive changes to the *Manual* are too restrictive and should be revised. Members of the Honor Committee represent the SCCC and should have the authority to vote on and approve changes to the *Manual* and Honor System operations.

**B. HONOR AND DISCIPLINE SYSTEM OVERLAP**

Testimony to the IPAC Honor Panel strongly suggested that current practices within the cadet discipline system are contributing to honor violations. For example, the most recent Faculty Advisor to the Honor Committee told the Panel that roughly half of a typical year’s accusations are a result of cadets untruthfully asserting by their signatures that they had completed assigned punishments. Professor Sinisi suggested that virtually every sign-in sheet in every company on every day was likely to have “problems,” although most of these are not reported or investigated. Professor Sinisi’s predecessor as Faculty Advisor, BG. Barrett, told the Panel that such cases had not been so prevalent in his years as Advisor because cadets did not have to sign in at the end of their punishments. During his tenure, it was up to the cadets on guard to ensure that those who were being punished fulfilled the requirements of their punishments. The work of the IPAC Panel on Discipline has corroborated Professor Sinisi’s view of problems with cadets signing in after punishments. In fact, a staff member serving on that Panel actually witnessed what, in retrospect, seems to have been an honor violation in progress. This staff member was interviewing an OC for the Discipline panel, when they were interrupted by a cadet dressed in robe and slippers who was coming to sign that he had “just finished” walking tours. The staff member thought that this was odd because she had been speaking to the OC on the quad for quite a while, and this cadet had certainly not been walking tours during that time.

The Panel recommends that the Commandant, the Faculty Advisor to the Honor Committee, and the Deputy Director of the Krause Center work together to identify and eliminate practices within the cadet discipline system that are unnecessarily creating honor issues. The goal should be a clear line of demarcation between the cadet honor system and the cadet discipline system.

**C. ADDITIONAL ISSUES FOR FURTHER REVIEW**

1. Targeting individual cadets or groups such as Corps Squad, minorities, or females.
2. Potential for a cheating scandal.
3. Loss of benefit to attend and complete college and resultant consequences or actions.
4. Leniency policy and procedures.
5. Amnesty for 4th-class cadets during first semester freshman year.
7. Requirement for a comprehensive SOP similar to VMI and Service Academies.

VIII. CLOSE
The Panel complied with the IPAC charge to complete the SOPs. The SOPS address the following issues in the charge:
   A. Current policies and practices.
   B. Compliance with and enforcement of established procedures.
   C. Honor Committee eligibility and service requirements.
   D. Consistency of Honor System operations.
   E. VMI and other Academies.
   F. Additional faculty/staff involvement.
   G. Appeal policy and procedures.
   H. Assistance for the accused cadet.

Attachments:
1. Standard Operating Procedures for Advisors to the Honor Committee
2. Standard Operating Procedures for Honor Committee Nomination, Election and Service
3. MEMORANDUM # 2-xx, Policy and Procedure for Cadet Appeals of Honor Decisions
   A. Annex A to Memorandum 2-xx, Honor Board of Review – Standard Operating Procedures
   B. Annex B – Template for Report of Honor Board of Review
4. Accusations and Appeals Process Flowcharts
STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES FOR
ADVISORS TO THE HONOR COMMITTEE

27 July 2012

1. PURPOSE: The purpose of this Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) is to define the duties, qualifications and terms of service of Krause Center personnel and members of the faculty or staff selected to advise members of the Honor Committee.

2. APPLICABILITY: The procedures outlined in this SOP apply to all faculty/staff and cadets involved in daily operations of the Honor Committee.

3. DIRECTOR, KRAUSE CENTER FOR LEADERSHIP AND ETHICS
   a. DUTIES:
      - Act as Senior Advisor on the Honor System
      - Conduct liaison with the Office of the President, the Office of the Provost and senior members of the college faculty/staff
      - Recommend/nominate faculty/staff members for vacant advisor positions to the Provost for consideration and approval by the President
      - Supervise the Faculty Advisor to the Honor Committee (FAHC) and complete an annual performance evaluation
      - Coordinate funding for Honor Committee operations

4. DEPUTY DIRECTOR, KRAUSE CENTER FOR LEADERSHIP AND ETHICS
   a. DUTIES:
      - Perform duties of the Krause Center Director as required
      - Supervise Honor Committee training and education programs
      - Advise the Honor Committee Vice Chairman for Education (VCE) on Honor Committee and SCCC training, education, and testing programs
      - Approve honor cases for investigation
      - Coordinate with the FAHC on all matters pertinent to scheduling and closing trials
      - Coordinate with the FAHC to brief the President on Honor Committee operations and trial proceedings/results
      - Brief cadets found “in violation” on the appeals and Honor Board of Review (HBOR) process after the President meets with the cadet
      - Select and notify HBOR members
      - Manage all matters pertinent to completion of Honor Court and HBOR proceedings
5. **FACULTY ADVISOR TO THE HONOR COMMITTEE (FAHC):** The President shall appoint a faculty member to serve as overall Advisor to the Honor Committee for a five-year term. The FAHC, who represents the SCCC and the Citadel’s faculty/staff, will advise the Honor Committee on interpretation of the Honor Code and coordinate all changes to the Honor Manual. This person reports to the Director of the Krause Center and will be evaluated annually.

a. **DUTIES:**

- Provide advice and counsel to faculty, staff and Honor Committee members on the Honor Code, the Honor Manual and Honor Court proceedings
- Monitor cadet nominees/selectees for compliance with standards in the Honor Manual and this SOP; before each Honor Court, confirm court members meet service standards in the Honor Manual and this SOP
- After an accusation has occurred, consult with the Advisor for Investigations/Prosecution (AIP) and the Vice Chair for Investigations (VCI); approve the case for presentation to the Deputy Director of the Krause Center for a decision to start an investigation
- Approve all cases for trial after consultation with the AIP, the Advisor for Investigations/Defense (AID) and the Honor Court Chair
- Assist Honor Court members, prosecution and defense with a request to summon a witness other than a cadet
- Be present in the court for each trial except when the court is closed for deliberation and voting (AID or AIP can substitute, advise Krause Center)
- Consult with the Chair of the Honor Court and Honor Committee Officers on an accused cadet’s petition for admission of a non-cadet to court proceedings
- Provide notice to the faculty when trials are lengthy so that cadets acting in an official capacity are exempted the following day from papers and tests
- At the conclusion of each trial in which a cadet is found “in violation” of the Honor Code, advise the cadet of his/her rights of appeal as provided for in College Regulations
- Present the results of all cases to the President as soon as possible after Honor Court decisions
- Coordinate all changes to the Honor Manual
- Provide annual reports and briefings to the President and faculty/staff on Honor Committee operations and Court determinations; report must include statistical data on accusations, violations, and a breakdown of demographics
- Supervise AIP and AID
- Represent faculty/staff concerns and coordinate suggestions for improvement to the Honor System
b. QUALIFICATIONS:
   • Full-time, permanent faculty member with minimum employment of five years
   • At least a Master’s Degree or equivalent
   • Extensive knowledge of the Citadel Honor System
   • Knowledge of Citadel regulations, undergraduate issues, and educational sanctions

c. TERM OF SERVICE:
   • 5 years with option to extend or rotate to Advisor positions

6. ADVISOR FOR INVESTIGATIONS/PROSECUTION (AIP): Faculty or staff member appointed by the Director of the Krause Center. The AIP will assist the VCI and the investigations/prosecution team throughout the investigation and trial process. The AIP upholds and enforces the integrity of the Honor System, the SCCC, and the Citadel’s core values.
   a. DUTIES:
      • Perform duties of the FAHC as required
      • Provide advice and counsel to the VCI, the Secretary of the Honor Committee, the prosecution team, and witnesses throughout all honor system proceedings
      • Review accusation statements and advise the VCI on merits of accusations
      • Assist the VCI with case presentation to the Deputy Director of the Krause Center for approval to investigate honor accusations
      • Advise the VCI and Investigation Committee during case investigation and preparation for trial
      • Consult with the FAHC and AID as necessary on the decision to approve cases for trial
      • Monitor compliance with all Honor Manual rules and procedures
      • Assist with training a pool of cadets to perform prosecutor duties
      • Attend Honor Court proceedings as necessary
      • Consult with faculty/staff, FAHC, and AID as required

   b. QUALIFICATIONS:
      • Full-time, permanent faculty/staff member or visiting professor with minimum employment of three years
      • Bachelor’s Degree
      • Extensive knowledge of the Citadel Honor System
      • Knowledge of Citadel regulations, undergraduate issues, and educational sanctions

   c. TERM OF SERVICE:
      • Three-year term with option to extend or rotate to Advisor positions
6. ADVISOR FOR INVESTIGATIONS/DEFENSE (AID): Faculty or staff member appointed by the Director of the Krause Center. The AID will assist the accused cadet and the defense team with case investigation and preparation for trial. The primary duty of the AID is to advise accused cadets during Honor System proceedings. The AID upholds and enforces the integrity of the Honor System, the SCCC, and the Citadel’s core values.

   a. DUTIES:
      - Perform duties of the FAHC as required
      - Provide advice and counsel to the accused cadet, the defense team, and witnesses throughout all honor system proceedings
      - Monitor compliance with all Honor Manual rules and procedures
      - Assist with training a pool of cadets to perform defense counsel duties
      - Attend Honor Court proceedings as necessary
      - Consult with faculty/staff, FAHC, and AIP as required throughout Honor System proceedings

   b. QUALIFICATIONS:
      - Full-time, permanent faculty/staff member or visiting professor with minimum employment of three years
      - Bachelor’s Degree
      - Extensive knowledge of the Citadel Honor System
      - Knowledge of Citadel regulations, undergraduate issues, and educational sanctions

   c. TERM OF SERVICE:
      - Three-year term with option to extend or rotate to Advisor positions

7. This SOP is maintained by the Deputy Director of The Krause Center.

   John W. Rosa
   Lieutenant General, USAF (Retired)
   President
I. PURPOSE: The purpose of this Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) is to establish eligibility standards for nomination/election to the Honor Committee and expectations for service after election.

II. APPLICABILITY: The procedures outlined in this SOP apply to all faculty, staff, and cadets involved in the election and approval of cadets to serve on the Honor Committee.

III. PROCEDURES:
A. No later than mid-September of each year, second-class cadets will be briefed by the Faculty Advisor to the Honor Committee (FAHC), the Chairman of the Honor Committee, and the Vice Chair for Education on eligibility and training requirements for Honor Committee selection.
B. Second-class cadets will complete training and be nominated for the Honor Committee in accordance with established procedures in the Honor Manual.
C. Upon completion of honor training but before the election of Honor Committee members the following steps will take place:
   1. The list of second-class cadets who have completed honor training and desire consideration for election to the Honor Committee will be reviewed by the Citadel Registrar to determine academic eligibility. The academic eligibility requirement is a cumulative GPA of 2.30 and the appropriate academic classification at the time of election (2A if elections are held in the fall semester and 2B if elections are held in the spring semester).
   2. The list of academically eligible cadets will be reviewed by the Commandant’s Office to determine conduct and physical fitness eligibility.
      a. Conduct: The expectation is that Honor Committee members are positive role models for the SCCC. Cadets who have committed a Class I offense during the current or previous year are ineligible for nomination/election. Cadets who have been suspended or dismissed from the college for any type of disciplinary offense and subsequently readmitted are ineligible for nomination/election to the Honor Committee.
b. Physical Proficiency: Honor Committee members must be physically proficient at the time of nomination and election. If a member subsequently becomes physically deficient, the member will be suspended from the Committee until proficiency is attained.

3. Only those second-class cadets who are eligible as stated above may stand for election.
   a. Cadets can only be elected as honor representatives in their current company. They will not be elected in anticipation of a company or battalion transfer.
   b. Each company will be briefed prior to election of the eligible nominees. A vote for anyone who was not trained and vetted in accordance with paragraph III.B and III.C and subparagraphs will be discarded.

D. The following procedures will be followed for all cadets who have been elected or are serving on the Honor Committee:
   1. Any time after election, any member of the Honor Committee who receives punishments as the result of a Class I offense will forfeit his/her elected position on the Honor Committee.
   2. At the beginning of the fall semester of senior year, the Registrar will review the academic classification of all Honor Committee members to determine if they are “1A.”
   3. Any cadet who does not have a “1A” classification will be suspended from their duties on the Honor Committee until the appropriate academic classification is attained (“1A” fall semester or “1B” spring semester).

E. If first-class cadets are nominated and/or elected to the Honor Committee during senior year to replace a member who can no longer serve, the cadet must meet eligibility requirements outlined in this SOP and complete required training in accordance with established procedures in the Honor Manual.

IV. The FAHC and Chair of the Honor Committee will be responsible for compliance with this SOP.

V. The procedures outlined in this SOP will supplement the 2012-2013 Honor Manual and be included in the 2013-2014 Honor Manual with concurrence of the Honor Committee.

John W. Rosa
Lieutenant General, USAF (Retired)
President
MEMORANDUM
NUMBER 2-xxx

POLICY AND PROCEDURE FOR CADET APPEALS OF HONOR DECISIONS

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of this Memorandum is to describe the policy and procedures to appeal Honor Court decisions. The President of The Citadel is the appellate authority for honor cases.

II. REFERENCES:

United States Constitution, Amendments IV and XIV

III. POLICY

A. The President will only consider a grant of relief from a Honor Court decision on the following grounds:

1. New evidence, available since the Honor Court trial, which would indicate the findings of the court are in error;

2. Evidence that a cadet’s rights were not protected, jeopardizing that cadet’s right to a fair and impartial trial;

3. An error in the trial proceedings of such magnitude as to jeopardize the fairness of the trial.

B. A cadet may appeal an honor decision by preparing an appeal to the President. The preparation and submission of the appeal, which must include grounds on which relief is being sought, is exclusively the responsibility of the cadet.

C. An appeal must include all materials necessary for the President to fully evaluate the appeal.

D. In cases in which an appeal alleges that significant evidence has been discovered since the Honor Trial that was not available at the time the decision was reached, the appeal must include that
evidence, or, if unavailable, a written description of such evidence in sufficient form as to fully apprise the President of the nature of the evidence and the material impact it would have had on the proceedings.

IV. PROCEDURE

A. The cadet must present the appeal to the Office of the President within five (5) working days of the receipt of the President’s decision that announces punishment. Requests for extensions beyond the five (5) working days are at the discretion of the Deputy Director of the Krause Center, or his designee, and may only be granted in extraordinary cases. Requests to accommodate the schedule or other needs of anyone involved in the preparation of the appeal are not considered “extraordinary cases.” Requests for extensions must be submitted in writing to the Deputy Director of the Krause Center by the cadet and must include the justification for the extension.

B. The Deputy Director of the Krause Center, on behalf of the Office of the President, will send the appeal to the Honor Committee through the Faculty Advisor to the Honor Committee. The Committee will, within five (5) working days, review the appeal and prepare a response (“the Committee Response”). The Office of the President will provide a copy of the Committee Response to the cadet.

C. The Deputy Director of the Krause Center, on behalf of the Office of the President, will appoint a Board of Review in accordance with Annex A, consisting of a senior college administrative officer or department head (to serve as Chair of the Board of Review), a senior member of the Office of the Commandant, and a senior member of the faculty. Additionally, a recorder, selected from the faculty or staff, and a cadet, selected from members of the Honor Committee who did not participate in the trial of the cadet making the appeal, will be appointed. These two individuals will serve as non-voting advisors to the Board of Review.

D. Upon receipt of the Committee Response, the Deputy Director of the Krause Center will submit the appeal, the Committee’s Response, and the Honor Court file (collectively, “the Materials”) to the Board of Review.

1. Initial Review: The Board of Review will review the Materials and decide whether the appeal warrants formal review by the Board, in accordance with the procedures prescribed in the HBOR Standard Operating Procedures, attached hereto as Annex A. If the Board determines a formal review is warranted, the recorder will notify all
parties. If the Board determines a formal review is not warranted, the Chair of the Board will forward this decision in writing to the President.

2. **Formal Review**: If the Board elects to hold a formal review, it will do so in accordance with the HBOR Standard Operating Procedures.

3. Upon conclusion of the formal review, the HBOR Chair will present the findings of the Board of Review to the President in writing, in accordance with the template at Annex B.

E. The President will review the materials and the Review Committee’s recommendation. The President may:
   a. Grant the appeal
   b. Modify the finding or punishment imposed
   c. Reject the appeal

F. The decision of the President will be final.

V. **COMPLIANCE**

A. A cadet’s failure to timely submit an appeal will result in imposition of punishment, which will constitute the final action of the College in the matter at issue. The College will not consider or take action on any further requests by the cadet.

B. Any other failure to adhere to the procedures contained herein will not constitute grounds for reversal or other modification of the punishment, or dismissal of the appeal.

VI. **NOTES**

A. **Dates of official enactment and amendments:**
   Approved by the Executive Director, Krause Center for Leadership and Ethics

B. **Responsible Department:**
   The Krause Center for Leadership and Ethics

C. **Responsible Official:**
   Deputy Director, The Krause Center for Leadership and Ethics

D. **Cross Reference**
   College Regulations, The Citadel, 4 August 2011
   Memorandum 2-18, The Citadel, 12 September 2011
   Annex A to Memorandum 2-18, The Citadel, 12 September 2011
VII. RESCISSION

Standard Operating Procedures, Boards of Review for Honor Court
Hearings, dated 11 February 2010, approved August 2003

FOR THE PRESIDENT: OFFICIAL

Attachments
Annex A – Honor Board of Review Standard Operating Procedure
Annex B – Template, Honor Board of Review Report
Annex A to Memorandum 2-xxx

Honor Board of Review – Standard Operating Procedures

I. Composition. A Honor Board of Review (HBOR) will be composed of:

A. A senior administrative officer of The Citadel or department head, who will serve as Chair.
   1. The Chair will be responsible for convening the HBOR in an expeditious manner, ruling on all substantive and procedural issues raised during the Appeal Process, and delivering the HBOR report to the President.

B. A senior member of The Office of the Commandant

C. A senior member of the faculty

D. A member of the faculty or staff of the College to serve as a non-voting Recorder.
   1. The Recorder will assist the Chair, as directed. Such assistance may include scheduling the Initial Review, scheduling the Hearing, notifying all the parties of various HBOR actions, preparing correspondence to include the final report, and recording the Hearing.

E. A non-voting member of the Honor Committee who did not participate in the honor proceedings at issue in the appeal.
   1. The role of this cadet advisor is to provide explanation of Honor Court and Honor Committee procedures to the HBOR.

II. Procedure

A. Appointment. Upon receipt of an appeal from a cadet, the Deputy Director of the Krause Center will appoint an HBOR. The HBOR will be provided with copies of the file of the Honor Court, the appeal, and the Committee’s Response.

B. Initial Review. The Chair will convene the HBOR after its appointment to determine if the appeal warrants a hearing before the HBOR. Board members will focus on the issues raised by the appellant and whether or not these fit the grounds for an appeal as outlined in the Honor Manual. After review and discussion of the materials, the HBOR will vote to either hold a formal hearing or report to the President that there are insufficient grounds for an appeal. The voting members of the HBOR will each have an equal vote in determining the merits of the appeal.

   1. If the HBOR determines a Formal Review is warranted, it will identify, in writing, the issues to be considered. The Recorder will
deliver this identification of issues to the appellant and the Honor Committee, through the Faculty Advisor to the Committee.

a. If the HBOR determines a Formal Review is not warranted, the Chair will forward this decision in a report prepared pursuant to II.D, below, to the President.

C.  **Formal Review.** If the HBOR determines that a Formal Review is warranted, it will conduct the hearing in the following manner:

1. The Chair, through the Recorder, will notify all parties of a convenient time and location.
   
a. The appellant will attend the hearing. The appellant may be assisted by up to two representatives throughout the appeals process, as provided in *College Regulations*.

b. The Chair of the Honor Committee, or his/her designee, (hereafter “the Committee’s Representative”), will attend to present the Committee’s response to the appeal, and to answer any questions concerning the case as it relates to the issues raised in the appeal.

c. Should one of the issues to be considered be the introduction of new evidence, the HBOR will rely solely on the written materials submitted with the appeal. The Committee’s Representative may present written descriptions of evidence in response no later than two business days prior to the hearing.

d. Except in extraordinary circumstances, as determined by majority vote of the HBOR during the Initial Review, the hearing will not include the questioning of live witnesses. Rather, the hearing will only consist of argument by the appellant and the Committee’s Representative, and questions by the HBOR, as provided herein.

2. After opening the hearing, the Chair will allow the appellant to present and make argument on the issues in dispute. Members of the HBOR may ask questions of the appellant.

3. The Committee’s Representative will make argument in response to the appellant’s argument. Members of the HBOR may ask questions of the Committee’s respondent.

4. Either party may submit questions to the HBOR to be asked of the other party; the Chair of the HBOR will decide whether to ask the proposed question(s).

5. After each party has been heard in full, at the discretion of the Chair, the HBOR will enter into closed session to conduct deliberations. This session will not be recorded. The findings and
recommendation of the HBOR will be sent to the President in writing.

D. Report. Upon conclusion of the Final Review hearing, the HBOR will prepare a report to the President. The report must address the issues raised by the appellant, the findings and supporting rationale of the HBOR on each of the issues, and a recommendation for action on the appeal by the President. The HBOR may attach a minority report on any or all issues if the HBOR’s findings or recommendations are not unanimous.

E. Action by the President. The President will receive the Report of the HBOR and take action as he deems fit. The President is not bound by the findings, rationale, or recommendations of the HBOR; he may make his own determinations on each.

III. BASIS FOR APPEAL: The Honor Manual, Section VII paragraph 35b, permits only three grounds upon which an Appeal may be granted:

A. New evidence, available since the Honor Court trial, which would indicate the findings of the court are in error;

B. As defined in Paragraph 17 of the Honor Manual, evidence that a cadet’s rights were not protected, jeopardizing that cadet’s right to a fair and impartial trial; or;

C. An error in the trial proceedings of such magnitude as to jeopardize the fairness of the trial.

IV. GENERAL GUIDANCE FOR THE CONDUCT OF THE HBOR:

A. The HBOR does not provide a second forum to retry each case; rather, it sits as an Administrative Board to address the issues raised by the cadet in the written appeal, provided those issues are within the guidelines of Paragraph III of this SOP. As a general rule, external courts are reluctant to interfere with the self-governance of colleges. Before taking serious disciplinary action against a student, a college must provide the student with notice of the charges against him or her and an opportunity to contest those charges. Furthermore, the college’s decision must be based on ample evidence such that the decision is not arbitrary. The charge of the HBOR is to determine if the College has met those obligations.

B. The primary questions for the HBOR to answer are as follows:

1. Did the college (in this case, the Honor Court) follow its rules, and in so doing, did it afford the appellant a fair hearing? This question deals only with how a decision has been reached, and not with the decision itself.

2. Was there evidence of substance that supports the Honor Court’s decision?
3. Is there new information that was not available at the time the hearing took place? If so, is that information of such substance that it would likely produce a result more favorable to the cadet if heard by the Honor Court?

C. Attorneys and other attendees:

1. Cadets who are facing honor proceedings for an act which is also the subject of an off-campus criminal proceeding may request that one of his or her advisors be an attorney. A request to have an attorney present must be made in writing to the Chair two days in advance of the hearing. An attorney may only act in an advisory role to the cadet. An attorney may not make argument at the hearing, ask questions of witnesses or board members, or in any other way actively participate in the hearing process. If the student has an attorney present as an advisor, the College may, at the discretion of the board Chair, have legal counsel present to advise the Board.

2. Upon request and consent of the appellant, the HBOR, in its discretion, may permit other persons to be present during the hearing.

D. Timeliness: The HBOR should keep in mind the importance its findings will have upon the cadet. Cadets accused and found in violation generally suffer a decline in academic and military performance, therefore, a timely resolution of the appeal benefits all parties. The cadet has five business days to prepare an appeal after the decision by the President. The HBOR will conduct an Initial Review within five business days of its receipt of the case. If the HBOR elects not to hold a Hearing, it will submit its report to the President within two business days of its decision. If the HBOR elects to conduct a Final Review, it will hold the hearing within five business days after this decision. The final report of the HBOR will be sent to the President within two business days after the hearing.
REPORT OF HONOR BOARD OF REVIEW

To: Lt Gen John W. Rosa, USAF (Ret.), President, The Citadel

Date:

Subject: Appeal of Cadet __________________ (CWID-______________)

1. **Introduction:** On ______________, (day) (month) (year), an Honor Board of Review met to consider the appeal filed by Cadet ________________. The Board did / did not elect to hold a Formal Review the appeal. The Board of Review conducted the Formal Review on ____________.

2. **Findings:** The Board concluded there were / were not grounds to recommend altering the decision in this case.

3. **Issues:** Cadet _____ raised ____ issues in his / her appeal. The Board concluded the following merited consideration:

4. **Discussion:**

5. **Recommendations:** (If applicable).

___________________________
(Name)
(Rank), (SCM or Service)
Vice President, (Title)
Chair

___________________________
(Name)
(Rank), (SCM or Service)
(Title), (Department)
Member

___________________________
(Name)
(Rank), (Service)
Tactical Officer, (Unit)
Member

___________________________
(Name)
(Rank), (Service)
(Title), (Department)
Recorder (*non-voting*)

___________________________
(Name)
(Rank), SCCC
Honor Representative, (Unit)
Cadet Advisor (non-voting)

**Action by the President:** Having considered all materials and the Board of Review’s recommendation in the appeal of Cadet _________________, I:

- **Approve**
  - ____ Signature ____________________________
  - Date:

- **Disapprove**
  - ____ Signature ____________________________
  - Date:

Comments:
I. CHARGE: the sub-committee was asked to look into the two broad areas of the fourth class system and other cadets groups, specifically the Summerall Guards, to see if we could find evidence of any persistent problems with hazing or training abuses. Because of rumors of some bizarre behavior involving the 2011 and 2012 Summerall Guards, our group decided to tackle that issue first. We then turned our attention to the fourth class system.

II. PROCEDURES USED: We began by having members of our panel conduct several one-on-one interviews with key personnel having direct knowledge of activities of the Summerall Guards over the past year. In addition, the Commandant first shared the contents of an investigation into this group conducted by Col. Bob Sberna; Col. Mercado then came and met with our panel to answer questions about that investigation. When our attention shifted to the fourth class system, we began by looking at the three majors studies of that system which the institution had conducted since 1968. The Panel was struck by the fact that all three of these studies repeatedly identified some of the same concerns (for example, an atmosphere of stress in the Mess Hall which prevents Freshmen from eating properly, and a variety of factors that lead to sleep deprivation for Freshmen), even though the studies collectively covered the period from 1968-1991. We have included a summary of the findings of all three of these reports as Appendix A. The panel also relied upon experiences we have had in working with freshman cadets inside and outside of the classroom.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS: Based upon what we learned from our conversations with parties connected with the Summerall Guards, together with the information contained in Col. Sberna’s investigation, our Panel made the following recommendations with regard to that organization:

1. Until further notice, all off-campus performances/trips for the 2013 Summerall Guard be hereby suspended; on-campus performances at Parents’ Day and Homecoming will proceed as usual, provided that adequate progress is being made in the areas outlined in point #2 below. The resumption of off-campus performances will be considered only after the activities in point #2 below have been accomplished.

2. Working with a select group of faculty, staff, and alumni the following activities should be conducted.
   a. Redefine the mission and culture of the SG…represent the “best of The Citadel…professionalism”
   b. Redefine the selection process using only objective criteria to include the following
      i. Physical fitness
ii. Drill proficiency
iii. Conduct proficiency
iv. Military proficiency
v. Academic proficiency

c. Eliminate all servitude (“roaching”)

d. Define the training period, training activities, and training supervision

e. Redefine the governance model to be a command and control model as follows: President, Commandant, OIC (direct report to Commandant), Cadet Commander [Note Officer in Charge (OIC) rather than “Advisor”]

f. Establish accountability within this command and control model

3. Provided that these activities are completed during AY 2012/13, select and train the 2013/14 SG.

During the time our panel was at work, the Commandant’s Office was also addressing the matter of the Summerall Guards based upon what they had learned as a result of Col. Sberna’s investigation. The Commandant established three Working Groups (Command and Control, Training, and Culture) charged them with helping develop the Commandant’s “Summerall Guards Transformation Plan.” The Chair of our IPAC Panel was asked to be a member of the “Culture” working group. Our panel was not privy to the final version of the “Summerall Guards Transformation Plan,” nor do we know about any decisions the President has made regarding that Plan.

Further recommendations of our panel concern the Fourth Class System:

4. Eliminate all Fourth Class System activities in the Mess Hall other than instruction in good table manners.

5. Reduce the length of time for the Fourth Class Training Period, having freshmen be recognized at Corps Day at the latest, but possibly even as early as the beginning of the second semester.

6. Limit sophomore rank to administrative positions only, but allow sophomores to have no interaction with or authority over freshmen. [NOTE: This is one of two recommendations that did not have unanimous panel support. Our TAC officer member disagrees, saying that this is in conflict with our current Leadership Development Model.]

7. Consider using teams of Seniors selected in their companies through secret ballot to administer the Fourth Class System in a manner similar to that suggested in the Whitmire Report.
8. Consider annual “scrambling” of company assignments in an effort to (1) promote Corps identity and loyalty over Company identity and loyalty, and (2) widen the circle of a cadet’s friendships over the course of four years.

9. Eliminate morning PT for all freshmen – and perhaps for all cadets, moving that activity to afternoons if ROTC programs require it. [NOTE: This is the other recommendation not unanimously supported. Our TAC Officer member believes this recommendation is an unnecessary interference with ROTC business and that cadets ought to be able to get enough sleep and also participate in morning PT if their ROTC program requires it.]

10. Consider implementing some degree of rank rotation within the school year.

11. Restrict physical exercise as a form of punishment to groups no smaller than a squad, to be held only outdoors in the daytime under the direct supervision of at least three responsible upperclassmen.

12. Consider scrambling the Cadre, i.e., don’t assign them by company. Cadre would be centrally managed within the battalions, and members would be assigned to companies other than their own.

Our Panel understands that we can make all of the recommendations that we’d like to, and the administration can even decree that our suggestions be implemented; but any real changes in cadet life will have to be embraced by the cadets themselves. Despite the fact that we are now fifteen years into a coeducational Corps, some “pre-coeducation” attitudes exist among some of our male students. For these reasons, it may be time to consider one additional recommendation:

13. Appoint another Committee to study the Corps as a whole – and our thought is that such a Committee should be staffed more like the Whitmire Committee (a majority of students) than the other two groups (primarily faculty, staff, or alumni, with little cadet membership).

IV. PANEL MEMBERS: Mark Bebensee (Chair), Tom Harris, Laurence Hutto, Nancy Mace, Peter Mailloux, and Jack Rhodes.
Attachment A. Summary of Previous Studies of the Fourth Class System, 1968-1991

I. The Whitmire Report (1968)

Of the three studies, the first one (Whitmire in 1968) is the most exhaustive. The fifteen members of that study committee included ten cadets and five members of the faculty or staff. In his charge to that group, then-President Gen. Hugh P. Harris said he wanted to insure that The Citadel had “a Plebe System which makes a positive contribution to the New Cadet’s leadership development, one that is compatible with his need to study, eat, and sleep, and one that is not demeaning with respect to his dignity, attitude, and morale.”

One of the first findings of the Whitmire Committee was that fourth class training had evolved over time into “seventeen major and around fourteen hundred minor Plebe Systems which grew and flourished depending upon the degree of personality, initiative, imagination, ingenuity, and leadership possessed by the Company Commander in the one case and the individual Cadet Upperclassmen in the other.”

After a comprehensive study of how the nation’s other military schools administer their fourth class training programs and extensive consideration of the unique nature of The Citadel, this committee unanimously concluded that overall supervision of the new cadet training program should be a responsibility of the Senior Class of cadets. They went on to propose an innovative reorganization in which each cadet company would have a Fourth Class System Panel consisting of five Seniors, elected by secret ballot by the rising First Class members of that Company, “based on their intelligence, judgment, maturity, fairness, courage, and positive interest in the Plebe System.”

Their recommendations for change were summed up this way: “There needs to be a reorientation away from the idea of having the toughest Plebe System in the country to one of pride in having the most meaningful and best to be found anywhere.” In addition to their detailed proposals for a system of company, battalion, and regimental “Fourth Class System Panels,” their specific recommendations for change also included:

1. Removing all military activities, including what we know today as “Knob Knowledge Questions” and “Mess Facts,” from the Mess Hall in order to allow freshmen to eat and digest their food in peace;
2. Strict enforcement of Evening Study Period to make certain freshmen were not disturbed while in their rooms trying to study, along with strictly enforcing a “lights out” policy for freshmen.
3. A system of regular rank rotation in order to give more upperclassmen the opportunity for leadership development.
II. The Mood Report, 1980

In 1980 the Board of Visitors appointed a committee composed of six alumni, one staff member, and one cadet. This study was conducted because the BOV felt that “it has become increasingly apparent to those sensitive to the traditions of The Citadel that the nature of the Fourth Class System was undergoing a gradual and undesirable change.” Among the findings of this study were these:

1. “Unfortunately, it appears that The Citadel Fourth Class System has, for a variety of reasons, strayed from the fine line of gentlemanly toughness into a series of immature, sophomoric routines which miss the mark by any measure of leadership development. Significantly, almost all of the abuses of the system involve the resort to punishment, which is the last resort of a competent leader. Such abuses can only have a negative effect on recruiting, retention, and morale.”
2. “Numerous practices have crept into the system over the past 10-15 years which could best be described as “instant traditions”: sweat parties; excessive pushups; devious ways to get around excessive exercise rules; constant demand for recitation of mess facts, with resultant interference with eating; and racking (mass punishment).”
3. “Unfortunately there are members of the present Corps and of recent graduating classes who are convinced that the purpose of the Fourth Class System is to introduce stress. To them, it is a “trial by fire” and, in some cases, almost pure ritualism. In the minds of some, this greater testing and trial are what separate Citadel men from graduates of other military institutions.”
4. “One other critical flaw of the Fourth Class System as currently practiced is the apparently effective code which forbids openly complaining against or reporting harassment. Thus, the system often fails to bring legitimate grievances up for review.”
5. “Many of our Committee’s findings have been found before. … The conclusion thus must be reached that previous recommendations were either not implemented or, having been implemented, were ignored.”

Among the Mood Committee’s specific recommendations were these:

1. Study the length of the present cadre period with a view to reducing it as much as possible and having the fourth class join the remainder of the Corps at the earliest possible date. The formality of having this done on Parents’ Day should be foregone in order to achieve the earliest reasonable joinup of the fourth class with the rest of the Corps.
2. Terminate the Fourth Class System at Corps Day and incorporate a formal recognition ceremony as a part of Corps Day activities.
3. Completely eliminate rank for the third class, and review all remaining responsibilities of rank to assure that they are, in fact, meaningful responsibilities and not just to justify rank or make work. (This recommendation does not preclude selection of sophomores for administrative duties such as those of a company clerk.)
4. Institute a system of partial rank rotation on a pilot basis, maintaining full-year rank for cadet captains and above, and placing all others on a twice-a-year rotation system, assuming competent performance of duties by individuals concerned.
5. Completely eliminate racking.
6. Eliminate all Fourth Class System activities in the Mess Hall, with the exception of instruction in good manners. We consider that the upperclass/fourth class relationship in the mess hall should be one which produces an atmosphere conducive to relaxed dining.
7. Firmly establish all prescribed study periods and sleeping periods as absolutely free from Fourth Class System activities.
8. Eliminate the requirement for a “baldy” haircut for fourth classmen and instead require a neat military haircut.
9. Require that in each and every instance where a fourth classman is required to go to the infirmary because of overexertion, heat fatigue, or similar complaint, that he be accompanied by either the cadet company commander or the cadet company executive officer who should be required to explain the circumstances of the case.

Also included in this report is a section entitled “Submitted by a prospective Commandant of Cadets on 19 February 1980” with no other attribution. We found several of his observations to be most pertinent:

1. At the present time, it would appear that the enforcement of the Fourth Class System is accomplished through a variety of means: profanity, physical abuse, harassment, denial of food, and sometimes through real leadership. The examples are set by the upperclassmen and are often precisely contrary to what is expected of Fourth Classmen. Often the motivation of upperclassmen is to ensure that the Fourth Classmen suffer as did the upperclassmen (when they were freshmen). It is less a training program than a hazing session.
2. The Fourth Class System should be tough, demanding, and educational. It should give the Fourth Classman self-discipline, self-confidence, and self-respect. It should give the upperclassmen an opportunity to learn and practice leadership. Its practices should be those that can be used or followed after graduation.
3. The Fourth Class System should be designed so that young people learn. It should have designed in it safeguards against abuse. That is, it should be designed to preclude acts that lend themselves to abuses done by less than mature cadets. On the other hand, effective measures to enforce the system must exist. An indifferent performance by a Fourth Classman of his duties within the System must be corrected. Ideally, these measures should closely follow the measures that a graduate would use in his profession after graduation, whether it be military or civilian.

III. The Lane Report, 1991
In making their recommendations, the Lane Committee said “The Committee does not feel that one’s freshman year at The Citadel should be an organized initiation into a uniformed fraternity; rather, it should be a challenging indoctrination period during which the constructive and beneficial aspects of a military system complement the true purpose of The Citadel: to provide a quality education. The design and implementation of the Fourth Class System should demonstrate to the freshman cadet that he is a student at a comprehensive liberal arts college set within a military environment, with the emphasis being on academics.” To that end, they made four general recommendations:

1. The Fourth Class System must emphasize positive leadership, gentlemanly conduct, and the mature exercising of responsibility for subordinates under one’s authority. A new tone must be created if the Fourth Class System is to be an enhancement to the academic life of freshmen rather than a hindrance… Practices which are basically demeaning to fourth classmen must be eliminated.

2. The Fourth Class System needs adjusting to ensure that freshman cadets receive ample food, sleep, and study time. The information gathered by the Committee from cadets, TAC officers, medical staff, and faculty reveals that the current system results in freshmen operating in a deficit in these important categories. [This section goes on to recommend that stress be removed from the Mess Hall, that freshmen no longer be allowed to participate in any early morning PT programs, and that “lights out” for freshmen be strictly enforced.]

3. To demonstrate the primacy of academics at The Citadel, the faculty must be encouraged to involve themselves in cadet life outside the classroom. The college must make it beneficial for faculty to be involved with cadets by (1) creating a more beneficial arrangement by which Company Academic Advisors are contracted, and (2) giving higher importance in tenure considerations for a professor’s involvement with and concern for cadets outside the classroom.

4. The Committee recommends changes within the military portion of the Fourth Class System which will improve its implementation in order to achieve its well-defined goals. [Specific recommendations for change included regulating push-ups, not allowing sophomores to have any authority over freshmen, eliminating extra duties for freshmen such as serving as a Company Runner, and eliminating Hell Night.]

The Committee said that the desired effect of these recommendations was “to create a more positive and constructive atmosphere in the Fourth Class System.”
INTRODUCTION:

Underage and excessive drinking affects virtually all college campus and their surrounding communities. In a 2002 interview, Dr. Judith Ramaley, former president of the University of Vermont stated, “When you get down to it, underage drinking to excess has a negative effect on everything we’re trying to do as a university. It comprises the educational environment, the safety of our students, the quality of campus life and our reputation” (as cited in Mara, 2002).

In 2010, The National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism posted the following statistics.

- Assault: 696,000 students between the ages of 18 and 24 are assaulted by another student who has been drinking (Hinson et al., 2009).
- Sexual Abuse: 97,000 students between the ages of 18 and 24 are victims of alcohol-related sexual assault or date rape (Hinson et al., 2009).
- Academic Problems: About 25 percent of college students report academic consequences of their drinking including missing class, falling behind, doing poorly on exams or papers, and receiving lower grades overall (Engs et al., 1996; Presley et al., 1996; Wechsler et al., 2002).
- Drunk Driving: 3,360,000 students between the ages of 18 and 24 drive under the influence of alcohol (Hinson et al., 2009).
- Injury: 1,825 college students between the ages of 18 and 24 die from alcohol-related unintentional injuries, including motor vehicle crashes (Hinson et al., 2009).

The Citadel has an alcohol and substance abuse policy that states no alcohol consumption or possession on Citadel property regardless of age. These properties include the Barracks, campus, Hagood Stadium, College Park and the Beach House. Education is provided each school year to all cadets regarding these policies and the punishments set for violations of the policy. A Brief from the Office of the Commandant shows that The Citadel has closed the gap with a National Reference Group based on the CORE Institute
Alcohol and Drug Survey (Office of the Commandant, 2012). At one point, alcohol consumption at The Citadel among cadets was higher than the National Referenced Group.

**REVIEW OF INFORMATION:**

The committee began its work by reviewing both student and employee policies on the use of alcohol and drugs. These policies were collected from various sources including the Commandant’s Office, The Citadel website, Human Resources, and the Provost’s Office (See Appendix A). The Citadel policies on Alcohol and Substance Abuse that were reviewed by the committee appear to be up to date and complete. The committee compared The Citadel’s policies to both federal and state laws and determined our policies were following the law. Our policies are also in line with those of other colleges reviewed by the committee including VMI, Clemson, College of Charleston, and USC.

A review of The Commandant’s Office alcohol related offenses from spring 2008 to May 2011 showed the following offenses other than possession of alcohol on campus which was the predominant punished offense.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFENSE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hazing</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bringing Discredit to The Citadel</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWOL</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Unbecoming a Cadet</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disrespect to a College Official</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Poor Judgment</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Judgment</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Activity on Campus</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Violation of Fourth Class</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The committee then determined the college is making a significant effort to education our undergraduate students. Cadet Affairs, The Commandant’s Office, the Director of CARE, the Counseling Center, the Chaplain, and the Athletic Department all provide educational programs. When abuses are reported, students are pulled and punishments are rewarded based on our policies.

The Citadel has a No Tolerance Drug policy both for students and employees. During this academic year, the Commandant’s Office has had 13 expulsions, 1 dismissal, and 1 suspension for drug related offenses. A review of other college drug policies also found that most have a No Tolerance Rule. The committee did not find, at the present time, that our policies and procedures in regard to Alcohol and Substance Abuse need changing.
The Citadel Counseling Center reported for the years 2010-2011 that alcohol related issues was the primary reason that 104 undergraduate cadets sought counseling. Of those 104 cadets, 89 were mandated based on an alcohol violation and 15 were voluntary. The Fall 2011 CORE Institute Alcohol and Drug Survey showing alcohol, drug, and tobacco trends at The Citadel stated that Citadel students have consistently reported higher rates of annual alcohol usage than their national reference group peers though it was noted that the gap was closing. The report also stated that 15.7% of the respondents began using alcohol while a Citadel student.

HISTORY OF ALCOHOL AT THE CITADEL:

Throughout the history of The Citadel the prohibition of alcohol on campus has been strenuously enforced. In the nineteenth century cadets were not only prohibited from consuming or possessing alcoholic beverages, they were also prohibited from entering an establishment which served intoxicating beverages without specific permission of the Superintendent. In the twentieth century, cadets were prohibited to “carry, transport, move, hold, possess, own, have…receive, accept, give, offer, sell, buy, or drinking” any intoxicating liquors. The administration went so far as to stretch chicken wire over the gates of the barracks to prevent cadets passing alcohol through the gates. The intent of the administration as voiced by then Commandant of Cadets, Lt. Colonel John W. Lang, was “every means should be resorted to in keeping liquor away from minors. Most of the boys at the Citadel are minors.” Yet, even during the prohibition era cadets went on drinking.

Times have changed. However the prohibition on the possession and consumption of alcohol on The Citadel campus has not. Cadets are disciplined for infractions. However, just like their nineteenth and twentieth century counterparts, cadets continue to drink. The punishments today however, are graduated rather than instant dismissal allowing for some behavioral modification.

Alcohol use is well documented in Citadel records. Examples from historical records include the following information:

The 1857 Journal of Cadet Tom Law reports that on June 13, 1857 he heard considerable talk of cadets who had come in drunk. He also reports the Corps head a meeting that day to come to some resolution about such conduct but not unity seemed to prevail on the subject. The President’s Report to the Board of Visitors on June 1936 stated that the number of cases of drinking has been a course of grave concern. This evil alone might well endanger the reputation and the usefulness of the college. 11 drinking violations were reported.

ROLE OF THE TACTIAL OFFICER AT THE CITADEL
The role of the TAC officer in the Alcohol and Substance abuse program is twofold. First, TACs are the faculty/staff member designated to present The Citadel’s policies concerning alcohol and drugs (i.e. “Rules of the Road”) in the Leader Education Program for all four classes. Naturally seen as the disciplinarian arm of the administration most apt to punish cadets by the majority of people on campus, the TAC officer is also the member of the faculty/staff in the best position to observe personal behavior that is alcohol related. Such behavior includes, but is not limited observations or reports of cadets who:

- Exhibit loss of control
- Experience memory loss
- Personality changes
- Drink to get drunk
- Brag about their drinking
- Use alcohol as a crutch to cope with stress
- Talk excessively about alcohol, drinking, or procurement
- Have had run-ins with authorities
- Allow drinking to interfere with studies or other activities

Second, while the above list of observed behavior has resulted in disciplinary action, generally when cadets are caught in the act of alcohol consumption on campus, or conduct as a result of off campus consumption, there have been times where cadets have self reported alcohol issues, or their friends have expressed concern to their TAC officer. This has resulted in the encouragement and facilitation by the TAC for the cadet to seek counseling or self-help programs both on and off campus before disciplinary actions are required.

The Citadel Counseling Center reported for the years 2010-2011 that alcohol related issues was the primary reason that 104 undergraduate cadets sought counseling. Of those 104 cadets, 89 were mandated based on an alcohol violation and 15 were voluntary. The Fall 2011 CORE Institute Alcohol and Drug Survey showing alcohol, drug, and tobacco trends at The Citadel stated that Citadel students have consistently reported higher rates of annual alcohol usage than their national reference group peers though it was noted that the gap was closing. The report also stated that 15.7% of the respondents began using alcohol while a Citadel student.

**REVIEW OF BEST PRACTICES:**

A review of best practices in the field of alcohol and substance abuse by college students did not reveal much information. However, in April 2002, NIAAA released a comprehensive report on college drinking. A section of that report included evidence based recommendations to colleges on ways to address problems related to college drinking. Though a decade old at this point, the report provides a plan that many colleges have including in their alcohol programs. (Clemson, Virginia Tech, College of Charleston) This report recognizes that successful intervention programs need to occur at three levels, reaching the individual student, the student body as a whole, and the greater
college community. Best practice for alcohol programs breaks the three components into related elements of a successful alcohol program.

These elements are:

- Support from the top (BOV, President)
- Commitment to a permanent program
- Shared ownership among a full range of campus constituencies, including students, staff, alumni, and faculty
- High visibility and clear goals
- A prevention program staff
- Programs tailored to the needs of a specific campus.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The committee recommends that The Citadel move to establishing an office specifically charged with developing a comprehensive alcohol and substance abuse program for The Citadel including establishing a campus philosophy on alcohol and substance abuse. This philosophy would include the buy-in from faculty, staff, students, administration, and alums. The committee further recommends that staff for this office be hired from outside the Citadel.

The committee recommends continuing education for all students on Citadel policies and rules and the consequences involved beginning with the Alcohol.edu E-Learning survey for entering freshmen through all appropriate campus training for undergraduate student. The committee would recommend that the training sessions contain information highlighting the consequences for alcohol and substance abuse in detail.

The committee recommends the Counseling Center continue its program for alcohol violations. Students must attend an initial meeting at the Center and take the Substance Abuse Subtle Screening Inventory (SASSI) that is designed to help identify individuals who have a high probability of have substance dependence. The student than attends a second session at the Center and also must go through an educational online program. The committee would like to see the required program completion dates tighten and enforced.
Attachment A:

Policies/Laws:

- Blue Book Regulations for the SCCC;
- College Regulations for The Citadel (revised 8/4/2011 by BOV)
- The Citadel Facilities Use Policy
- The Citadel Sale or Consumption of Alcohol at School Social Events involving Students/Cadets
- Drug Free Workplace Policy
- Campus Crime Act
- Applicable Federal and State Laws
- South Carolina DUI Laws: Blood Alcohol Limits
- South Carolina Board of Health Schedule One for Controlled Substances

Educational:

- Powerpoint Presentations for each class collected from Janet Shealy
- Information from Counseling Center of Alcohol Program for Cadets with Alcohol Violations
- Current Compliance Information from Counseling Center on Alcohol Program
- Office of the Commandant Brief 2/2012
- Fall 2011 CORE Institute Alcohol and Drug Survey
- Alcohol.edu E-Learning Results
- Public Safety Liquor Law Violations
- Commandant’s office report on Drug Related Punishments/2009-2012

Additional Information:

- Alcohol and Drug Policies from other Institutions
- State Brochures concerning alcohol and drug use
- Brochures/information given to cadets
REFERENCES:


*Regulations of the military academies of South Carolina: with a list of Board of Visitors and officers*. (1854). Columbia, SC: Greneker, Lamotte, & Co.
Panel Report on Sexual Assault and Harassment and Gender and Racial Bias

YOUTH-RELATED PROGRAMS

This panel was charged with examining current policies/procedures and areas of potential risk in relation to activities involving Citadel faculty/staff/students/volunteers and youth. The charge was to make recommendations to address any areas of concern moving forward. We did not look into past events or The Citadel’s response to them.

The panel cannot stress enough how concerned we are about the risk of future incidents of sexual assault by Citadel students, staff, or faculty. Based on information reviewed, we believe The Citadel is an incident waiting to happen. We have many people on campus who have contact with minor children. Many of these people likely are unaware of and unskilled in behaviors that are protective of children. No one person, with an expertise in child protection, oversees programs involving children and no one policy covers all aspects of this area. The current system for mitigating risk of child sexual assault for organized programs is not under one person’s responsibility and has a number of significant flaws that increase the risk of an incident occurring.

The panel recognizes that it is impossible to completely eliminate the risk of child sexual assault. However, we see a need for change in order to prevent harm coming to children who are involved with The Citadel, as well as to mitigate and minimize risk. **ACTION IN THIS AREA SHOULD BE CONSIDERED TO BE A HIGH PRIORITY.**

Findings, Concerns, and Recommendations

Based upon our review of current efforts to protect children from harm, we conclude that **The Citadel is at high immediate risk for inappropriate sexual behavior to occur between its representatives and minors. The risk is ongoing throughout the year, but highest during the summer.** This conclusion derives from the following findings:

1. There is no one person on campus who has the responsibility to oversee child protection. Thus, many people have a part in the current policies and procedures, but no one has primary responsibility to ensure that these are actually followed.

**Recommendation:** One full time position should be created on campus to address child protection needs. This person would coordinate training, background screenings, policy development and compliance related to child protection. Other campuses place this responsibility within those of
the Chief Compliance Officer who oversees compliance on all issues. This would be appropriate at The Citadel.

2. Policies are not clearly defined in one document and no single policy includes all aspects of conduct with minors on and off campus.

   **Recommendation:** An outside consultant with expertise in child sexual assault should be engaged immediately to examine and consolidate our policies in this area as well as to advise the institution about ways to improve its proactive stance towards child sexual assault. **The panel believes that an internal review is not adequate.**

3. Knowledge of appropriate prevention and response strategies, as well as supervision of those working with children varies widely across Citadel-sponsored activities and in other situations where The Citadel might be liable. Thus, while policy requires some people to go through training in sexual assault prevention, there are other people, places, and programs that may pose risks because they do not neatly fall under existing policies. For example, a requirement for approval of youth-related programs is that all people involved in the program go through training in child sexual abuse laws and appropriate responses. In contrast, cadets involved with the Preknob Program, which brings minor children onto campus for a visit that includes spending the night in the barracks, do not receive any training in child sexual abuse prevention.

   Concerns about knowledge and awareness extend to situations of unknown, but potentially high risk, including residential areas on campus that include families with children, families hosting cadets in private homes apart from formal programs, and off-campus situations involving Citadel students or employees. In other words, concerns are not confined to those in formal programs serving youth.

   Knowledge of laws and reporting procedures are important, but not sufficient in this panel’s opinion, to increase prevention of child sexual assault. The Citadel currently uses the Children’s Law Office program to educate people about laws and reporting procedures. Darkness to Light is an alternative program that focuses on prevention and is the only evidence-based training that has been shown to change adult behavior about the way adults care for children.

   **Recommendations:**

   Every employee, student, adult resident, and adult volunteer on campus should

   - Receive, acknowledge receipt, and commit to conform to Citadel child protection policies
   - Receive, acknowledge receipt, and commit to a Code of Conduct related to protecting children
Complete the Darkness to Light Stewards of Children child sexual abuse prevention program.

The Citadel should form an official partnership with Darkness to Light.

4. While SLED checks are required of every employee, they are not required of every student, nor others who work or live on campus.

   **Recommendation:** Require every employee, student, volunteer, resident, and other adults who use campus facilities to have a SLED background screening.

5. Organizations/groups that want to use Citadel facilities for programs involving youth must complete the “Activities Involving Children Approval Form” (often referred to as the “Camp Packet”). This is an extensive packet addressing a number of areas of risk. The applicant organization completes the packet, which then makes its way around through a long list of signatories, each of whom is reviewing the packet from a different perspective (e.g., facilities, finance, compliance with official policies, etc.). A number of flaws were noted:

   a. It is unclear who has final responsibility to review and sign off on the packet when it has been thoroughly reviewed by the many relevant people on campus. Thus, a person who gives approval based upon his/her role will be unaware if the next person down the line modifies the packet based upon a different role/perspective. More important, there is no one person at the end of the process who ensures that everything meets Citadel standards. Put simply, if everyone has partial responsibility, no one has full responsibility.

   b. Human Resources, who is responsible for conducting background checks does not appear in the list of signatories to the approval packet.

   c. The Approval Form does not request information that is essential for evaluating/minimizing risk and ensuring an appropriate response in the event of an incident.

      i. There is no section within the “Camp or Enrichment Program Risk Assessment Worksheet” that pertains to the risk of sexual assault.

      ii. There is no section within the entire packet that describes the child protection and response plan for the proposed program.

      iii. The forms do not designate a particular person in the proposed program who is identified as the point person in case of an incident of sexual assault.

   d. Accountability for completion and approval of these forms is lacking. This panel heard reports that

      i. Some applications are completed *after* a youth-related program has begun.

      ii. Some on-campus programs administered by third parties do not have their insurance in place until *after* the program has begun.
iii. Programs sometimes find ways to get around the entire process of oversight and approval.

iv. Packets may be difficult to find when they are in the process of being passed from signatory to signatory.

v. There appears to be little to no follow-up after approval to ensure that programs are following their proposed procedures for minimizing risk.

**Recommendation:** The entire process for approving youth-related programs on campus should be revised.

At minimum, the *process* should include

- One person who is clearly identified to have final approval once all relevant parties have reviewed and signed the application
- Inclusion of Human Resources in the approval process.
- A firm deadline for submission of applications at least 30 days prior to the start of the program
- Regular follow-up with the applicant program’s designated child protection person

At minimum, the *application*, should include

- designation of an individual within the applicant organization who is responsible for overseeing child protection
- a thorough assessment of risk of child sexual assault
- a clear plan for preventing the occurrence of child sexual assault
- a clear plan for responding to a report/incident of child sexual assault

6. Many time-limited events take place in Citadel facilities (e.g., Bishop England graduation) that may bring some risk to the institution.

**Recommendation:** The school needs to look into how contracts may be written with organizations wishing to use Citadel facilities for activities involving youth so that they clearly indicate that the organization assumes the risk for child protection.

In conclusion, this panel’s review revealed a number of areas of weakness in The Citadel’s policies and procedures as they relate to child protection. We recommend that

- one person be responsible for coordinating training, background screenings, policy development and compliance related to child protection.
- The Citadel engage an outside consultant to examine and consolidate policies related to child protection
• all adults on campus go through a SLED background check, receive and commit to child protection policies, and complete the Darkness to Light Stewards of Children program
• The Citadel form an official partnership with Darkness to Light
• procedures for approving youth-serving programs on campus be overhauled to strengthen child protection in such programs
• contracts with organizations using Citadel facilities for programs including youth be written in such a way as to place the burden of responsibility on the organization if at all possible

Information on which the above findings and recommendations are based:

1. Policies reviewed (may not be a comprehensive list):
   a. Children on the Citadel Campus (Memorandum number 10)
   b. Sexual Violence Prevention and Response (Memorandum number 2-25)
   c. Sexual Harassment (Memorandum number 2-26)
      http://www.citadel.edu/policies/images/files/02-president/2-26sexual_harassment_policy.01-10-12.pdf
   d. Campus Assessment Team (Memorandum number 2-23)
   e. The Citadel Ombudsperson (Memorandum number 2-6)
      http://www.citadel.edu/policies/images/files/02-president/2-6_ombudsman.08-16-10.final.pdf

2. Additional information
   b. The Policy of the Diocese of Charleston Concerning Allegations of Sexual Misconduct or abuse of A Minor by Church Personnel
   c. The list of formal activities that involve interactions between cadets/graduate students and minor children.
   d. 2009 Social Climate Survey completed by cadets
SEXUAL ASSAULT

The panel was very impressed with the quality of the sexual assault awareness, prevention, and response programs at The Citadel. Over the past six years, The Citadel has taken many steps to strengthen the institutional response to sexual assault. Janet Shealy, the director of C.A.R.E. (Cadet Advocacy, Response, and Education) has worked with others on campus to develop and implement programs designed to educate people about sexual assault, prevent the occurrence of sexual assault, and respond effectively in the case of a sexual assault incident. Programs are tailored primarily towards cadets, but reach faculty and staff. Programming to address the needs of graduate students and others on campus is under development, but requires additional personnel to fully implement. The Citadel is already doing many things that reflect recommended practices.

Current compliance with applicable policies

Karjane, Fisher, & Cullen (2005) examined what college campuses are doing about rape and sexual assault. They listed a number of suggested practices and found that a high percentage of colleges and universities fall short. In contrast to their findings, The Citadel is doing an exemplary job in the following best practice areas:

1. The Citadel’s document presenting policy related to sexual assault is lengthy, but clear. Policies and procedures comply with recommended practices.
2. The policy clearly defines sexual assault/misconduct and procedures for who is responsible for responding to reports of sexual assault.
3. The policy describes the appropriate response to a report of sexual assault.
4. The Sexual Assault Response Team (SART) includes a number of trained staff and/or faculty members as Sexual Assault Victim advocates.
5. Cadet members of the Human Affairs Team are trained to respond to reports of sexual assault.
6. Ms. Shealy coordinates the SART and is available 24/7 to respond to such reports. When she is unavailable, a member of the SART is on call.
7. The Blue Book and Guidon, issued to every cadet, include pertinent information with respect to The Citadel’s official policies on sexual assault.
8. Every cadet is required to have a copy of the Crisis Resource Directory, which offers information about what to do in the event of a sexual assault, on their desk.
9. A site for C.A.R.E. on The Citadel website is under construction. This site will organize the information on sexual assault that is already available if one searches “Sexual Assault” on The Citadel website. Information includes, among other topics, defining sexual assault, describing what to do if one is assaulted, “do’s and don’t’s” for responding to sexual assault.
10. The entire undergraduate student body, as well as new faculty, parents, tutors in the Academic Support Center and Tactical officers are exposed to state-of-the-art information about rape and sexual assault.

11. Cadets are exposed to many levels of state-of-the-art information regarding sexual assault across their four years through the C.A.R.E. program and also within their ROTC programs. Each program offers at least one lesson per year. Ms. Shealy addresses cadets twice in their freshman year, providing them with definitions, laws, and policies about rape and sexual assault and what to do if they find themselves in a situation where such conduct occurs. She coordinates presentations in subsequent years that are designed specifically for each class and are conducted by different presenters. For example, the “1 in 4” group, a group of young men committed to ending sexual assault, presents information about helping sexual assault victims and stopping this crime. In addition, female athletes receive information from Kelly Simpson, the Senior Woman Administrator.

The above activities and programs ensure that everyone on campus is aware of relevant laws and The Citadel’s policies regarding sexual assault. These actions are consistent with recommended best practices.

The Scope of the Problem

Ms. Shealy’s statistics on reports of sexual assault over the past six years show an average of 6.67 reports of sexual assault (not necessarily rape) per 12 month reporting period. While these reports reflect separate incidents, in a number of cases, multiple incidents involved the same perpetrator. Reports have increased somewhat over the past six years which is encouraging, as it indicates that more people are reporting. It is a well-established fact that rape and sexual assault are frequently unreported (e.g., see Karjane, et al., 2005), so slight increases in reporting at The Citadel likely reflect greater awareness of policies and greater trust in the system by victims rather than an increase in the actual occurrence of sexual assault.

Ms. Shealy noted that cadets of both sexes in some companies have reported they have been discouraged from reporting incidents of sexual assault. The prevailing attitude seems to be: “what happens in the company stays in the company.” This seems to be improving, but as long as it continues to occur at all, victims will be dissuaded from getting the help that they need. In addition, we will have no way of knowing the true scope of the problem if reports are discouraged. Finally, if sexual assaults go unreported, The Citadel becomes less safe for everyone.

Given the above, it is expected that the actual number of sexual assaults at The Citadel is higher than these official reporting statistics. However, these numbers are
consistent with reports of the prevalence of rape and sexual assault on college campuses in general (e.g., Karjane et al, 2005). This is encouraging.

According to Ms. Shealy, contrary to comments presented by cadets in the Student Climate Survey (2009), *there are no indications that false reporting is a concern that needs to be addressed.*

**Problems in the area of understanding sexual assault at The Citadel**

While policies are clear and accessible to everyone on campus, it is not clear that they are always followed by cadets, as noted above. Discouraging women from reporting sexual assault is a phenomenon that is not unique to The Citadel, but it should not be tolerated. As long as pressure continues to be put on victims not to report, rape and sexual assault will remain underreported and underdetected.

Ms. Shealy is responsible for directing the C.A.R.E. program, which involves education, advocacy, advising the Human Affairs Team, the 1-in-4 members, and Women Actively Seeking Achievement members, as well as being the liaison with a number of community groups. She also is The Citadel’s Title IX Compliance coordinator for cadet incidents and works in conjunction with LTC Dopf in the training and advising of the Human Affairs Team. In effect, she is on call 24/7. This is quite a lot of responsibility placed on one person.

It is not unusual for a person at the forefront of educating and responding to sexual assault to face a hostile environment. It is common for the person to be targeted by those who think the topic is unnecessary, over-discussed, or that it unfairly presents a negative image of men (which Ms. Shealy works very hard to avoid). According to Ms. Shealy, cadets do not all take the education sessions seriously and she frequently meets within a hostile environment.

As long as women remain such a small percentage of the Corps of Cadets (about 6.5%), their ability to report sexual assault to someone who can respond appropriately will be compromised.

While graduate students, active military and veteran students, faculty, and staff are exposed to important information, we need to establish programs to educate them on reporting structures and awareness of these crimes.

**Conclusions and recommendations**

The area of sexual assault prevention and response is one with which most colleges and universities struggle. Most of the findings of this committee are positive in terms of the quality of policies, the attention to education of the cadets over the course of their time here, and the commitment of a number of individuals to reducing the risk of sexual assault on campus. Change over the past six years has been considerable. Victims on campus know that they have a safe place to report and be supported. However, policies
can only go so far when the environment fosters secrecy and the culture among cadets minimizes the problem. We are moving in the right direction and this panel believes that the following recommendations would help to keep us on the right track.

5. The Blue Book and Guidon on the website were dated when reviewed. They need to be modified and posted yearly.
6. Reports that cadets have been encouraged to withhold the truth about experiences of sexual violence should be associated with consequences for the offending cadets.
7. Add one staff person as well as one or two graduate assistants to work with Ms. Shealy. This will free her up for the significant administrative work that comes with her position and will allow her to further refine and improve the sexual assault prevention response program. It will provide sufficient resources to expand advocacy, response, and education efforts to include all students on campus. Ms. Shealy can be even more effective than she has been if she is not seen as working in isolation on this issue.
8. Following the first year presentation, which is necessary to establish that students have all been given standard information about sexual assault and proper “do’s and don’t’s” it might be preferable to incorporate information into academic courses rather than having Ms. Shealy be the primary voice emphasizing the importance of treating others with respect in the area of sexual assault. In particular, the case study format used in LDRS101 is well-suited to include one or two scenarios that present ambiguous dating/sexual situations for instruction and discussion.

Information on which the above findings and recommendations are based:

Policies reviewed:


**Literature reviewed:**

**Data collected to assess compliance with applicable policies**
Official reports of sexual assault over the past 6 years provided by Ms. Shealy.
Interview with Ms. Shealy and LTC Dopf
Student Comments on 2009 Climate Survey
The Citadel Crisis Resource Directory
Cadet Advocacy, Response, and Education program description/details

**SEXUAL HARASSMENT/GENDER BIAS**

Over the past six years, The Citadel has taken many steps to strengthen the institutional response to sexual harassment. The stated policy regarding sexual harassment is clear. Emma Bennett-Williams, Chief Diversity Officer HR programs address sexual harassment education and response for every faculty and staff member. Janet Shealy, the director of C.A.R.E. (Cadet Advocacy, Response, and Education) has developed education programs about sexual harassment that are directed primarily towards cadets. Programming to address the needs of graduate students and others on campus is under development, but requires additional personnel to fully implement. Despite such efforts, sexual harassment, particularly in terms of creating a hostile environment, remains problematic, particularly with regard to female cadets. **ACTION IN THIS AREA SHOULD BE CONSIDERED TO BE A HIGH PRIORITY.**

**Current compliance with applicable policies**

As is the case for The Citadel’s Sexual Assault Policies, policies and procedures regarding sexual harassment are clear and consistent with best practices.

12. The document presenting policy related to sexual harassment is lengthy, but clear and complies with recommended practices. Furthermore, many findings listed below reflect recommended practices for disseminating information and responding to reported harassment.
13. The policy clearly defines sexual harassment, identifies to whom a victim can report, and describes the appropriate institutional response.
14. The Blue Book and Guidon, issued to every cadet, include pertinent information with respect to The Citadel’s official policies on sexual harassment.
15. Every cadet is required to have a copy of the Crisis Resource Directory, which offers information about what to do in the event of sexual harassment, on their desk.

16. A site for C.A.R.E. on The Citadel website is under construction. This site will organize information about sexual harassment to make it more accessible to everyone on campus.

17. The entire undergraduate student body, as well as new faculty, parents, tutors in the Academic Support Center and Tactical officers are exposed to state-of-the-art information about sexual harassment.

18. Cadets are exposed to many levels of state-of-the-art information regarding sexual harassment across their four years through the C.A.R.E. program.

19. The Human Affairs Teams (HAT) are trained to respond to reports of sexual harassment.

The above activities and programs ensure that everyone on campus is aware of relevant laws and The Citadel’s policies regarding sexual harassment. These actions are consistent with recommended best practices.

Scope of the problem

According to Ms. Bennett-Williams, HR has received only a few complaints regarding sexual harassment from faculty/staff over the past several years.

In contrast to the situation amongst faculty and staff, according to Ms. Shealy, sexually harassing behaviors by male cadets occur at a significant level and include male-towards-female, male-towards-male, and male-towards-female harassment that does not involve women on campus, but those off campus. In addition to what is considered to be traditional types of harassment that are clearly sexual in nature, some of our cases are more accurately defined as gender-based and reflect the attitude revealed in the 2011 Climate Survey showing that a significant percentage of male cadets do not accept women as members of the Corps of Cadets. This behavior is of considerable concern, not only to those on this IPAC panel, but amongst many on campus.

The members of the IPAC panel cannot stress enough their concern about the continuing attitude by male cadets that women do not belong in the Corps of Cadets. This is clearly demonstrated by the finding of the 2011 Cadet-completed Climate Survey that **45% of male cadets do not agree that women belong in The Citadel Corps of Cadets**. Data obtained across cadets’ time at The Citadel indicate that the **negative attitudes are strengthened the longer a student is enrolled**. Furthermore, almost the same percentage of male cadets (42.7%) **does not agree that women can be effective leaders.** These numbers have not improved, suggesting that the approaches taken by The Citadel to change the climate have been ineffective.

A number of sources on campus that the Panel interviewed expressed the belief, that virtually every woman cadet has been harassed at least once during their time at The...
Citadel and many experience harassment on an ongoing basis. Many of these incidents go unreported for fear of reprisal from male cadets and because the victims do not want to be perceived as being unable to “take it.” Until people on campus feel that it is safe to report such behavior, it cannot be addressed directly.

We have an example of a well-written policy that frequently is violated. Formal and informal discussions with many members of The Citadel community indicate that most people are aware of male cadets’ disrespectful behavior towards women. Some try to do something about it, but the situation persists. As women continue to experience a hostile environment, it is clear that the approaches taken by The Citadel to change cadet behavior have not been as effective as we would like. A new approach is needed.

The negative attitude towards women is not confined to men in the Corps of Cadets. Reports have been made to IPAC panel members (generally through third parties) that Tactical officers, OC personnel, coaches, faculty, staff, and alumni have been heard/observed to respond negatively towards female cadets. Many examples were provided of behaviors that are disrespectful and leave women feeling that they are not accepted as part of The Citadel family.

Additional relevant issues

**Question of whether double standard exists.** Comments on the Climate Surveys suggest that many male cadets believe that a double standard exists on campus whereby women are given special treatment with regard to punishments, the Honor Code, and are assigned to leadership positions over other, more deserving male cadets. Such concerns were very difficult to analyze, as it appears that many responses to possible infractions and influences about rank take place before any official report is made. Official statistics regarding punishment obtained from The Commandant’s Department do not reveal racial or gender bias in punishments assigned. However, comments by a number of people interviewed by this committee suggested that decisions regarding punishments are made well before any official report is made regarding a cadet’s behavior and that bias may come into play here. Interestingly, staff comments most frequently suggested that bias may not be along gender/racial lines, but along lines of favoritism played towards men. This is a very challenging issue to disentangle.

Data regarding punishments were readily available, but not in a form that allowed for easy analysis of trends. We recommend developing a system that allows for more streamlined analysis of important information related to cadet performance.

**Persistently small number of women students.** This panel’s analysis included an examination of the distribution of women throughout the Corps of Cadets. While SGM Bauer carefully assigns women to companies to ensure that there are no male only companies, the number of women in any company typically is quite small. In addition, as a result of attrition, the number of women may dwindle over the course of the school year. This creates an environment whereby women will invariably be isolated, which leaves them vulnerable to mistreatment with little recourse to find support within their
chain of command. We stand by recommendations included in this panel’s report on Workforce/Student Diversity to grow the percentage of women to a target level of 15%.

**Lack of women in leadership positions:** This panel’s work included analyses of women in leadership positions. All areas reveal a lack of presence of women

- only one of 14 Greater Issues speakers in the past five years was a woman.
- there are only two female tactical officers
- senior leadership within all the military departments are men. No women above the rank of Lt. were found listed, nor were there any pictures of women in leadership positions on any of the ROTC department webpages.
- Women tend to be overrepresented in some positions of leadership but are nearly absent in other areas, particularly those at the company and battalion levels, as well as within the Honor Court
- As noted in the report on workforce diversity, there are few women administrators, faculty members, and senior staff members

Without women in positions of leadership, our female students have few role models. Within The Citadel’s leadership development model, it is essential that they be exposed to women who are successful in a variety of career paths. The presence of strong women in leadership positions will reinforce the confidence amongst our female students that they are capable of succeeding.

It also is important for male cadets to see successful female leaders throughout the campus, not simply at the lowest ranks of faculty, staff, and the military. All of our graduates will be entering a workforce, whether civilian or military, business or service, that is increasingly made up of women. All of our graduates will find themselves working with or for a woman at some point in their careers. The Citadel’s current demographic composition and prevailing attitude against women in the Corps of Cadets leaves a gap in the leadership program by failing to develop skills for being successful in a workforce that increasingly includes women in positions of authority.

**Academic performance by gender.** Women cadets, as a group, consistently achieve higher GPA’s than their male counterparts. This indicates that our female students, as a group, are succeeding academically despite functioning in an unwelcoming environment.—imagine the heights they could attain if they were accepted by their peers in all aspects of their cadet life. Furthermore, the benefit of women’s achievement within the Corps would extend beyond their personal development; it would improve the overall learning experience for all students. It is well established that diverse organizations offer superior opportunities for individual development and growth as compared to non-diverse organizations.

**Retention.** Retention rates depend on when they are measured. Reportedly, a higher rate of women than men leave The Citadel within the first week of arrival. However, retention rates reported for women cadets from the date of matriculation historically have been consistent with, and in some cases substantially higher than that of men.
Importantly, this latter trend did not continue in the 2010-11 cycle, where there was a 15% decrease in retention of women from the prior year. We need to keep an eye on that number to ensure that it does not continue. In general, however, despite the negative environment, women who make it through the training week are succeeding at The Citadel. Clearly we are admitting women who have strong leadership and academic capabilities; we should recruit more just like them. Imagine what they could do if they were accepted by their fellow cadets.

**Socialization by upperlevel male cadets that maintains hostile environment.**
Information obtained from cadets over the course of their time at The Citadel reveals a very disturbing trend. While most male freshmen hold positive views regarding women’s leadership abilities at The Citadel, the percentage of cadets who do so decreases over the course of the next three years. Thus, upperlevel cadets, are, in effect, teaching younger cadets to disrespect women. This is antithetical to The Citadel’s core values and leaves many on campus wondering whether the institution’s goals are really being met.

**Role of Alumni in perpetuating a negative attitude towards women.** Many of the people interviewed in the course of this analysis commented on the embarrassing and disrespectful behavior observed by alumni in relation to women cadets. The most striking example of this was the report that the class of 1999 wore t-shirts proclaiming “Last All-Male Class at The Citadel” during their 10th reunion weekend. These men paraded their anti-female sentiment around campus. Such behavior among alumni must not be tolerated. Male leaders within The Citadel (and preferably alumni) must communicate that such displays of negative attitude are contrary to the school’s core values and harmful to its mission. Such displays communicate loud and clear that women are an unwanted part of The Citadel. They leave the general public with a negative impression of The Citadel.

**Consequences of persistent negative attitudes towards women**

This IPAC panel is very concerned about the inconsistency between the espoused core values of The Citadel and the actual behavior that is occurring at the institution. Persistent negative attitudes towards women undermine the core values of The Citadel and the integrity of its leadership development program. There cannot be a strong, cohesive, “One Corps,” when some of its members are targeted for just being who they are. Rather than fostering an attitude that engenders support, encouragement, and respect for all who go through the rigorous training program, the current climate fragments the Corps and fosters an attitude that engenders conflict, resentment, and disrespect for women cadets who aspire to the same types of leadership positions as men. In short, there are many people on campus who question this as a leadership development program for all. It seems to foster abuse of power rather than true leadership.

**Honor**

Honor, as defined on The Citadel’s website emphasizes the importance of integrity, and commitment to moral and ethical behavior, not just while on campus, but throughout a
cadet’s life. Hostile behavior towards women is not moral, it is not ethical, and clearly is not **honorable**.

**Duty**

As stated on The Citadel’s website, the definition of Duty includes the statement that a cadet’s “primary duty is to perform academically and then to perform as a member of the Corps of Cadets and the campus community.” We would argue that a cadet is unable to perform his duty if he has the attitude that other, fully qualified cadets, by virtue of their sex, should not be members of the Corps. Furthermore, the definition of **Duty** as presented in the Blue Book indicates that “Cadets have the moral and ethical responsibility to report offenses affecting good order and discipline including sexual discrimination and harassment.” Thus, when male cadets harass female cadets or tolerate such behavior, they are violating the core value of **Duty**.

**Respect**

It seems self evident that harassing behaviors towards women are **disrespectful**.

**Recommendations**

A negative climate with regard to gender persists 15 years after the first women were admitted to the Corps of Cadets. Almost 50% of the male cadets do not agree that women should be part of the Corps and about the same percentage does not believe that male and female cadets are equally effective leaders. These percentages have been stable over the past few years. This panel sees this as a serious problem that cannot be changed simply by bringing more women onto campus. Rather, this suggests that there are systemic elements that need to be changed. The **climate** on campus, negative views expressed by vocal alumni, and tacit acceptance by many others must change. Otherwise, the Corps will continue to be divided and act in ways that are inconsistent with the institution’s core values.

Based on our review, this panel is recommending efforts to change the climate from top to bottom.

10. As this panel’s report on workforce/student diversity indicated, we have few women in leadership positions across campus or within the Corps of Cadets. Therefore, we recommend enhanced deliberate efforts for recruiting fully qualified women in administration, on the faculty, among the staff, within the military academic departments, and among tactical officers and OC personnel. Those who recruit cadets should clearly have an attitude of acceptance towards women cadets.

11. We need to assist administration, faculty, staff, and students to become aware of their own gender biases, to commit to eliminating these, and to develop skills to address harassing behavior in a non-blaming manner. Such an
approach would reduce tolerance for such behaviors across the campus. The Citadel is fortunate to have a team trained by the National Coalition Building Institute (NCBI) to offer leadership programs that encourage inclusion and respect while developing a sense of one’s personal identity. Programs are designed to raise knowledge and awareness, while teaching skills that foster an inclusive environment as we develop leaders who can be effective in a diverse society.

NCBI training is recommended for administrators, faculty, staff, and students. In particular, given their involvement in day-to-day activities with cadets, all Tactical Officers, OC’s, cadet leadership, cadre, and Human Affairs Officers should experience the NCBI “Welcoming Diversity” workshop to help them to a) give voice to their concerns, b) become aware/knowledgeable about each other, c) become aware of their own biases with regard to gender, and d) learn strategies for addressing comments/behaviors by cadets (male or female) that inappropriately relate to gender. The latter will assist the more than half of male cadets who do

12. Make greater efforts to highlight the military and academic achievements of women cadets by integrating existing programs and developing new programs (e.g., Women’s History Month offerings) to highlight women’s leadership in a manner that is visible across the campus community.

13. Ensure that mandated programs that feature speakers include presenters who are female.

14. Ensure that images presented on The Citadel website depict women more frequently.

15. Ensure that multiple perspectives regarding gender and racial issues are presented to cadets. For example, anecdotal reports suggested that at least some cadets were offended by comments made recently by Phyllis Schafly about “feminists” without having the opportunity to hear a different perspective.

16. Continue the Commandant’s evaluation of Tactical officer’s leadership skills with regard to cadets’ ability to “train, educate, and challenge all cadets regardless of race, religion, ethnic background, or gender” as well as serving as role models for other cadets. If the TACs are being evaluated under these criteria, they can only be successful if they hold their cadet leadership to the same standards.
17. Continue the Commandant’s evaluation of attitudes towards women as part of the objective evaluation criteria used when making decisions about leadership and rank.

18. Address attitudes towards women as a leadership issue. Respect for others garners respect and loyalty from others.

Information on which the above findings and recommendations are based:


Data collected to assess compliance with applicable policies in relation to students

Official reports of sexual harassment within the Corps of Cadets over the past 6 years provided by Ms. Shealy.
Interview with Ms. Shealy and LTC Dopf
Student Comments on 2009 Climate Survey
Data from 2011 Climate Survey
Interview with Emma Bennett-Williams

GENDER/RACIAL DIVERSITY IN COMPOSITION OF FACULTY, STAFF, STUDENTS

This panel’s assessment of gender/racial diversity in the workforce and student body revealed that there are few role models for women/minorities within administration, faculty, staff, tactical officers, O’C’s, cadet leadership, senior military faculty, and speakers at mandatory events. The Citadel historically has been made up of a homogeneous faculty, staff, and student body. With respect to faculty and staff composition, the institution consistently demonstrates a level of diversity that is below its own established goals within strategic initiative seven of The Blueprint. It remains at the bottom of the list of SC state agencies with regard to meeting diversity goals.
The Citadel has made no meaningful progress in diversifying its workforce over the past 10 years. The following excerpt from The Citadel Office of Equal Employment and Diversity, 2012 SC Human Affairs Committee Report to the General Assembly sums up the problem:

_Not only has The Citadel consistently failed to effectively utilize females and minorities in employment but for the past ten years, The Citadel has also failed to attain a minimum of 70% of its affirmative action goals. The Citadel is the only state agency with a ten year history of consistently failing to attain a minimum of 70% of its affirmative action goals._

The panel strongly encourages The Citadel to examine and modify its recruiting methods. If the institution is to stay relevant in a world that is becoming more diverse, it must make efforts and use methods that have not been used before to truly diversify its workforce and student body. There is more to it than this, however. The fact that the institution has tolerated a lack of progress in this area over at least a decade suggests that there is a systemic problem that must be addressed.

Best practices suggest that the diversity of the workforce and student body has a positive effect on the work and learning environment. Furthermore, if the institution is to remain relevant in a diverse and globalized society, it must itself undergo change in terms of its faculty staff and student body. If the institution chooses otherwise, it will likely remain at the bottom of the list of SC public schools. More importantly, without exposure to diverse faculty, staff, and peers, graduates of The Citadel are more likely to find themselves out of synch with a changing world. Such changes will only occur if different approaches are adopted to find and recruit fully qualified people.

**ACTION IN THIS AREA SHOULD BE CONSIDERED TO BE A HIGH PRIORITY.**

Findings and Concerns

**Faculty/staff**

1. As noted above, _The Citadel has failed to meet 70% of its affirmative action goals for the past 10 years in a row._ Thus, the workforce does not reflect the Citadel’s own desired diversity with respect to women and minorities.
2. At every level, except clerical, The Citadel has a significant deficiency of women in the work force.
3. Minorities are underrepresented in all but the lowest pay grades.
4. _The Citadel uses the same recruitment approaches to attract minority and women faculty staff that have always been used, regardless of the fact that they have not resulted in meaningful change in the composition of the faculty._
5. The Citadel does not present a welcoming atmosphere for potential women and minority candidates. For example, search committees themselves often are not diverse with respect to gender and/or race.
6. Tactical Officers and OC’s are almost exclusively white males.
7. There is evidence that the few women and minorities that are hired are not always treated respectfully. Since September, 2011, there have been a significant number of formal complaints to the EEOC officer related to racial discrimination, sexual harassment and/or Title IX violations. The number of complaints from previous years is unknown.

Recommendations

11. HR, academic departments/schools, workplace units must examine their current recruitment methods to identify approaches that work and those that don’t work with regard to attracting fully qualified women and minority faculty, staff, and administrators. Those that continue to be unsuccessful should be replaced.
12. A different, integrated/proactive plan to ensure more effective recruitment of fully qualified women and minority faculty and staff is necessary to develop a workforce that more closely reflects the characteristics of society. This should be developed over the next year by a committee with outside consultation to develop a plan that is specific to the characteristics and needs of The Citadel. A cursory look at the literature in this area indicates that this is a very complex issue (see resources below for examples of the detailed recommendations) and The Citadel should engage a consultant who has been a part of a successful workforce transformation.
13. Departments/schools/units that are recruiting new employees should be certain that search committees are diverse.
14. Search committees should extend their searches until the best candidates are women and minorities.

Undergraduate admissions

1. The percentage of women cadets has remained relatively stable at 5.8 – 6.5% over the past five years. Until we are able to boast a group of women that comprises about 15% of the total Corps of Cadets, we are likely to continue to struggle with issues of sexual harassment as described in a separate document produced by this committee.
2. The percentage of African American cadets has risen only slightly from 6.8 – 8.4% over the past five years.
3. The total number of all minority students has risen from 15 – 19% over the past five years, which appears to indicate some success in recruiting minority students. However, combining all minority students in a single statistical category may obscure important differences such that it is not clear that the needs of distinct
minority groups, each present in the Corps of Cadets at a level less than 15%, are adequately met.

4. Many of the same issues noted above with regard to the workforce are relevant to recruitment of students. The Citadel continues to operate with unsuccessful policies and procedures despite little change in the percentage of women/African Americans enrolled each fall.

5. Some recruitment of students is conducted by alumni volunteers. There does not appear to be significant training or supervision of these recruiters’ activities, particularly in relation to their approach towards recruiting women and minority applicants. Shamus Gillen in the Admissions Office estimated that of approximately 80 active volunteers, 8 are African Americans and 3 are women.

Recommendations

1. The admissions office must examine their current recruitment methods to identify approaches that work and those that don’t work with regard to attracting fully qualified women and minority students. Those that continue to be unsuccessful should be replaced.

2. Reportedly, the Fall, 2012 class includes a higher percentage of women than in previous years. This is encouraging and reasons for success should be identified and replicated in order to reach a minimum of 15% of women in the Corps of Cadets.

3. A different, integrated/proactive plan to ensure more effective recruitment of women and minority students is necessary to develop a student body that more closely reflects the characteristics of society. This should be developed over the next year by a committee with outside consultation to develop a plan that is specific to the characteristics and needs of The Citadel. A cursory look at the literature in this area indicates that this is a very complex issue (see resources below for examples of the detailed recommendations) and we should engage a consultant who has been a part of a successful student body transformation.

4. Volunteer recruiters should be screened in terms of their attitudes towards women in the Corps of Cadets and should receive training with regard to recruiting prospective women and minority students.

5. Involve diverse alumni in recruitment of female and minority students.

6. Recruiters for student admission should participate in a National Coalition Building Institute (NCBI) “Welcoming Diversity” workshop to learn about their own biases as well as perspectives of diverse individuals. Increasing knowledge, awareness, and skill in this area is expected to improve recruiters’ ability to engage effectively with fully qualified, prospective female and minority students.

Information on which the above findings and recommendations are based:

2. Interview with Emma Bennett-Williams, Chief Diversity/EEO Officer
3. Interview with Lt Col John W. Powell, Jr., Director Admissions
4. Official statistics regarding gender/racial breakdown of faculty/staff/students

A sample of resources found on line with very detailed recommendations for recruiting a diverse workforce/student body (or both):
www.ewu.edu/groups/academicaffairs/BestPractices.ppt
http://med.stanford.edu/diversity/recruiting/
http://equity.arizona.edu/tips_for_recruiting_diverse_faculty
http://www.iwu.edu/diversity/
http://www.marshall.edu/coe/peu/recruiting_plan.pdf

General Issues related to gender/racial bias at The Citadel

As noted in another document submitted by this IPAC panel, The Citadel’s workforce and student body are not diverse. Additionally, female cadets often experience a hostile environment. While several people who were interviewed noted that racial tensions seem to have improved over the past few years, comments also were made that the campus is not particularly welcoming to minorities. Our mission is to educate principled leaders – female as well as male leaders, black as well as white leaders. In order to do this, the entire climate of The Citadel must change. Best practices suggest that it often takes a concerted effort over a period of 5 – 10 years for such change to occur. The Citadel should develop and administer programs that ensure that everyone who is qualified, regardless of gender, race, country of origin, or sexual orientation, has the opportunity to develop him or herself into a leader we can be proud of.

The findings and recommendations listed below are derived from this panel’s work. They either cut across areas evaluated or do not fit neatly into any one category.

Findings and recommendations

1. Citadel programs addressing diversity are spread across campus and do not necessarily communicate regularly or share resources.

Recommendations

Develop a Diversity Council that addresses diversity beyond simply gender and race. The purpose of the Council would be to

- conduct ongoing evaluation of diversity issues campus-wide
- to make recommendations to promote continued improvement in recruiting and retention of a diverse workforce and student body
- to make recommendations to promote inclusiveness across campus
Create an Office or Center for Global Diversity that implements recommendations of the Diversity Council and integrates diversity-related programs/initiatives across the campus, to include the CGC as well as the undergraduate programs. At a fundamental level of efficiency, a centralized approach would serve the purpose of integrating and supporting existing institutional efforts, thus improving communication/collaboration within the campus as well as with external entities. The purpose of such an office would be to

- promote diversity-related programs that are on campus at present (e.g., Office of Multicultural Student Services and International Studies)
- provide information and expertise on new initiatives
- facilitate NCBI training and workshops
- identify and negotiate consolidation of overlapping programs
- act as a focal point for new initiatives
- support the best practice of maintaining affinity groups (e.g., African American Society, WISE) on campus
- seek funding from corporate and foundation sources.

2. Many reporters commented on the quality of the training for Tactical officers. They are seen as the gatekeepers in many different ways, from determining which rule violations go forward to the Commandant’s Department to ensuring that they support the policies of The Citadel. The panel is encouraged by seeing the Commandant’s current approach to training and evaluating Tactical officers.

**Recommendation**

Continue to evaluate and refine training and assessment of Tactical officers with regard to equitable practice.

3. A perusal of the course offerings at The Citadel reveals quite a few courses that have significant content addressing international studies, which, by definition, will include focus on multicultural issues. Additionally, many courses address issues relevant to race and/or gender as a part of their focus. There is an African American studies minor, which, again, by definition, addresses cultural issues. The Leadership minor as well as the Southern minor also appear to have multicultural focus. Noticeably absent is a regularly offered course in women’s studies and one in comparative religion.

**Recommendations**

Enhance the academic curriculum by

- having schools/departments continue to address relevant multicultural content in coursework and encouraging them to add such content where relevant
- developing a regularly scheduled course in gender studies
- developing a course in comparative religions
4. Interviews with a number of people on campus suggested that many of the questions we are attempting to answer simply cannot be quantified, as so much goes on behind closed doors and cadets remain loyal to their companies rather than reporting inappropriate/unacceptable behavior. A number of staff members suggested that particular battalions/companies are more problematic than others. Companies frequently were referred to as “fraternities.” Comments were made that some companies appear to be more inclusive with respect to women and minority students. Many people commented that they believed that behavior that cadets display when they are in public is quite different from what they engage in behind the sally port of the barracks. Finally, the responses of white male students on the Climate survey suggest that they also feel that they are discriminated against because of the school’s focus on multicultural and gender issues.

Recommendations

While this may not completely address the above findings, the panel encourages The Citadel to develop a metric for evaluating companies in terms of their treatment of women and minority students within the context of being fair to all. The objective should be to pull women and those of minority status of all types up, not to bring those with majority status down. Companies that do well in this area should be rewarded.

Utilize NCBI training programs and principles to help students become aware of their own social identities as well as the experiences of a diverse campus family. This helps to bring people together, to understand the challenges that each faces, and to build skills to address inequality, however it appears.

5. There is little diversity within the Military departments, particularly at the senior levels.

Recommendation

The Citadel should continue to request female and minority instructors and Commanders. To enhance involvement of women and minorities in these departments, the panel recommends broadening the criteria to include graduates of any service academy or senior military college. We recognize that this is a complex issue that The Citadel has limited control over, but recommend that The Citadel make requests in an attempt to enhance diversity in these departments.

6. Many people interviewed by this panel expressed the view that alumni contribute to a climate that is not welcoming of women and minorities.
Recommendation

Educate alumni about the importance of developing a campus culture that must be modified from the time when they attended. This is needed not only to address the changing demographics of students, but also to address the changing nature of the college student population.

The reports submitted by this IPAC panel address primarily the climate at The Citadel with respect to gender. Many of the same problems/concerns may arise in relation to the climate with respect to race, Corps Squad and other areas of diversity broadly defined (people with disabilities, international students, and people in the GLBT community). These issues are troubling and deserving of evaluation, but this panel could not take on those areas in addition to those addressed in our reports. Fortunately, we believe that many of our recommendations in regard to increasing acceptance of women and expanding the diversity of our workforce and student body will improve these other areas as well.

Respectfully submitted

Julie A. Lipovsky
John Colombo
Stephenie Hewett
Doug Warner
Dennis Willey
Lisa Zuraw

(with consultation from Russell Warren)
IPAC Report
Appendix 7

IPAC Panel – Morale & Welfare

The members of this panel are as follows:

Leah Schonfeld
Pat Lee
Kerry Taylor
Ward Logan
Hank Fuller
Arthur “Reddy” Hopkins
James Grigg, Chair

The number of topics to cover, the timing of the study, and the existing work load of panel members constrained the panel in attempting to study some areas in as much depth as was needed. But the Panel has attempted to provide a level of response that would at least indicate directions for future research.

Below are significant areas of study/concern from the panel.

1. Weapons on campus

Recent events in Colorado and Wisconsin have put the spotlight on gun safety and security issues. The Citadel’s military culture and the presence of college-issued weapons make it imperative that we articulate and follow robust policies regarding weapons on campus. Two special areas of focus are our policies regarding college issued M-14’s and personal weapons.

a. Cadet M-14s

Cadets march with Department of the Army Cadet Command issued M-14s that are signed for by the Professor of Military Science. Under the terms of a 2008 agreement between the College and the Department of the Army, weapons removed from the Jenkins Hall arms room must be secured using a two-lock security system. The cadet room door and rifle rack must remain locked. Many companies regularly violate this policy because of lack of enforcement of the requirement to lock cadet room doors.

A resourceful cadet could easily convert the M-14s into automatic weapons for less than $100. A quick web search (see below) identified the firing pin, selector switch, magazine and ammunition required to convert our M-14s into automatic weapons.
Recommendations for Cadet M14s

All cadet issued weapons should be demilled. This would enhance the safety of the campus community, obviate the need to enforce the two-lock rule, and reduce the security issues with the Jenkins Hall arms room. Or, as another alternative, The Citadel should consider replacing the M-14s with the Army-issued replica weapons now produced at Ft. Jackson. These replicas have the feel of real weapons and are used by opposing forces in training, but they are not functional.

b. Other fire arms on campus
Per college regulations (section IV item 4)

SECTION IV
Student Administration

1. Activities. The President is responsible for all cadet and non-cadet student activities. The Commandant is responsible to the President for all cadet activities. The Provost/Designee of the Provost is responsible to the President for student activities for non-cadet students.

2. Agent. No cadet or non-cadet student shall engage in buying or selling or act as an agent of the College for furnishing any service, article, or entertainment without the approval of the Commandant of Cadets or Provost, as appropriate.

3. Alcoholic Beverages. Except as specifically authorized by the President, cadets and non-cadet students will not drink alcoholic beverages on the campus (as defined in Section 1, paragraph 13 above) or bring to or have in their possession such beverages on the campus. Elsewhere, cadets and non-cadet students will not drink, possess, or traffic in alcoholic beverages in violation of law or in such a manner or under such conditions as to reflect discredit upon the College or student body.

4. Arms, Ammunition, or Explosives. Cadets and non-cadet students shall not have in their possession on campus firearms, ammunition, or explosives of any kind, except as specifically authorized by the Commandant of Cadets.

Cadet regulations (Blue Book, Chapter 3 section 28) provide additional details. However weapons have been found in cadet rooms and in cadet vehicles on campus; they may also be in the Central Supply warehouse cadet storage area. The Panel recommends updated education of the cadets on the current policy, enhanced inspection of cadet rooms for weapons, random inspection of cadet cars and the warehouse cadet storage area to ensure that cadets are following current policies.
Points a. and e. above seem to be in conflict since as the Commandant’s Supply is in Jenkins Hall.

Veteran, CGC and other non-cadet students need to be educated on the above college policies regarding firearms on campus.

There seems to be no college policy regarding faculty, staff and visitors who may have weapons on campus (if there is a policy it was not readily found while searching the college policies nor was it on Public Safeties web page). However some members of this population do have firearms on campus, and some may have concealed weapons permits for those weapons. This includes faculty and staff who live on campus as well as some who may live off campus. The college needs to study all laws associated with this issue. Then the college must develop a policy to address this issue and ensure appropriate promulgation and education regarding the policy.

c. Parade Ground and black powder salute cannon

In the past there have been significant concerns raised in audits conducted by the US Army and The Citadel concerning the on campus storage, handling, and use of the 75mm blanks for the parade cannons. Over time the procedures set up for the handling of these munitions have changed; therefore, the college must determine if the current procedures meet the applicable laws and standards.

Concerns have been raised in past audits about the storage, accountability, and handling of the black powder used for the salute cannon and re-enactments. The salute canon, limbers, and hauling trailers are stored on campus at various locations. There seems to be limited adult oversight of the process for handling the black powder; there are rumors of black powder being kept in the barracks and/or cadet vehicles. Additionally, bags of powder may have been given to cadets as a thank you for their participation in reenactment events. A detailed study of the handling and use of the black powder and salute cannons needs to be made. This study must address the proper procedure for storage, handling, and accounting for the black powder.

2. Faculty and Staff Morale – Chronicle Social Climate survey

The 2011 Chronicle of Higher Education survey of faculty & Staff shows a significant drop in scores for all but 2 of the 15 sections. The 30%, response rate for the ’12 survey mirrors the response rate for the ’08 survey and is above the 20% threshold for acceptable survey results. The non-responders for the ’12 survey are in the lower pay band categories. Although the ’12 data released as of this writing is only for The Citadel and so does not allow a comparison with how other peer institutions did over the same period, it still reflects a significant drop in “satisfaction” of the faculty & staff. In 2008 the recession had just begun, budget cuts were impacting departments, and staffing cuts including RIFs were taking place. In 2012 budget situations had stabilized. However, The ReVille case had taken place in late 2011. Regardless of these qualifiers, the message is clear. There has been a
serious decline in the confidence that the faculty and staff place in the administration of the college.

Some examples of this:
- A Town Hall meeting where the VPFB position was noted to go away to fund the new EVP position; however within six months of the town hall there was a job advertisement for a new associate VP for Business.
- A Town Hall meeting right after the reductions in force (RIFs) it was noted that this would just be the first round and the institution would see similar actions in other areas. To date no other RIFs have occurred.
- Town Hall meetings have often included a slide for the budget reductions from the State, but little or no mention has been made of carrying over a multimillion dollar surplus from the previous fiscal year.

Other areas that show a lack of concern or poor communication are:

- Noting department/employees are one deep and stretched thin but then failing to respond when their work load is increased.
- After Gayle McCaffrey disappeared on Sunday, the college administration knew of the issue on Monday. But it was not until Tuesday afternoon that an email went out notifying the campus, and it was not until after an emotional staff council meeting on Wednesday that a message came out from Gen Rosa.

**Recommendations for Faculty and Staff Morale – social climate survey**

- Use focus groups of faculty and staff to explore the issues that surfaced in the survey and ensure the confidentiality of comments.
- Improve the accuracy and completeness of communications between administration and faculty & staff.
- Improve employee recognition.
- Senior staff needs to genuinely seek advice & input from their deans and directors.
- Above all the administration must set the example in upholding our core values and guard against saying one thing and doing another.

3. **Faculty Concerns**

Faculty raised their concerns during a regular meeting of the Faculty Council, as well as through one-on-one interviews and through various surveys. Additional comments came to the committee unsolicited.
• Members of the faculty council expressed a lack of confidence in the current honor system. Some reported that faculty members sometimes feel as if they have been put on trial themselves. Others wonder if the honor court can accurately determine whether cheating or plagiarism has occurred given that the determination is often best made based on the student’s work to date and his or her classroom performance. Still others worry that the system is not applied consistently and that it is used as a mechanism to weed out undesirable cadets, women and minorities.

• Members of the faculty council also raised criticisms of the Summerall Guards. Applying for the Guard undermines students’ academic work by demanding up too much of their time and leaving them exhausted. The training period seems to be much longer than some alumni remember. The issue of excluding women from the Summerall Guards as well as from top leadership positions (Regimental Commander) has been raised as a concern.

• The monumental ring that was placed in a high profile area of the Parade Ground did not include any discussion with faculty. The process lacked transparency and the campus communications around the ring placement were poor.

• There were many concerns expressed regarding the apparent abandonment of salary surveys, which included compression issues. There is a desire for more information as to why this approach was abandoned in favor of a merit pay system.

• The results of a survey conducted last summer regarding the issue of military uniforms for faculty has not been fully addressed in a public manner. The vote by Faculty Council on the issue seems to have resulted in negative feelings from some alumni toward faculty. A faculty member reported that the apparent contempt expressed toward faculty suggested some deep issues that were never appropriately addressed. See the link: http://www.scribd.com/doc/63669017/Citadel-The-Faculty-Uniform-Issue-Has-Been-Resolved

• Several faculty members suggested that our greatest legal and financial vulnerability lies in the makeup of the Board of Visitors (currently limited to alumni). One suggestion was to structure our BOV in line with other South Carolina public colleges or even VMI.

• Adjuncts, visitors, and part-time faculty represent one of our most valuable untapped assets. Many of them are as experienced as our full-time faculty. Some are well-published and enjoy the respect of colleagues within their fields. Their contributions to the campus intellectual and social life often extend far beyond the classroom, though that work is seldom acknowledged or compensated. The Citadel should consider ways to recognize the fullness of their contributions and to provide all classes of faculty with opportunities for professional advancement.
These might include enhancing their compensation to keep pace with peer institutions, offering healthcare benefits (especially for full-time visitors), and providing access to research and travel money. Parking is a major issue for adjuncts, who are unable to purchase parking passes but are discouraged from parking in visitor spaces. Any changes regarding non-tenure track faculty should be implemented with an eye toward more fully integrating them into the campus community, while boosting the retention of teachers who demonstrate excellence and a deep institutional commitment.

- The Citadel’s policies on maternity leave for faculty and staff needs clarity. It seems that application of the policies vary within Human Resources.
- Faculty members expressed an interest in more aggressively working against Cadet tobacco abuse by restricting spit cups, dipping, and chewing, especially in class.

4. Cadet Climate Surveys

There are two significant surveys that have been regularly administered to the Corps of Cadets. The Social Climate survey dates back to 2002 and has been administered annually. Some additional questions have been added over time. Survey questions focus on gender, race, training, and toleration.

The Citadel Senior Experience survey dates back to 2003 and is also administered annually. This survey includes questions on academics, other services provided by the college, and on the students’ future plans after graduation.

An important finding is that most of the survey data have remained consistent over the time period of the survey. Despite changes in college administration including the Commandant, despite the expansion of the role of TACs, and despite Values & Respect/LED training programs, the results have remained constant.

For instance, on the Social Climate survey:

- Acceptance of female cadets by the male cadets has stabilized at an alarmingly low level.
- Reports of sexual harassment have plateaued over the last six years, even though the cadets acknowledge improved training & enforcement over the same period.
- Successful integration of races has been consistent in the 70-80% agreement range for twelve years.

On the Citadel Senior Experience survey

- On the question “what items WERE IMPORTANT to the development of my character and personal discipline:” all the items surveyed have remained
constant over the 10 years. However, the “4th class system” has declined over the same time period.

- On the question “If you could make your college choice over, would you still choose to enroll at The Citadel?,” the “yes” response for the last three years is in the mid-sixty percent range.

These data tend to suggest that our initiatives to change the culture of the SCCC have not been as effective as desired. The quotation used by IPAC in previous communications is relevant here, “culture eats strategy for breakfast.” We must develop new methods for changing the culture of the SCCC. We must continue to assess effectiveness of these approaches.

Some of the results from these two surveys are also being studies by other IPAC subpanels – Gender, Honor, Discipline, and Alcohol Abuse. Those panel results and recommendations are presented in their respective reports.

5. Dissemination of Survey Data

The college surveys students, faculty, staff and other constituent groups on a regular basis. However, there is a concern that the data collected are not effectively used for improvement at the college or departmental levels. The data collected need to be more effectively used for improvement as a component of our institutional assessment program.

6. CGC Student Integration

Panel members met with four members of the CGC student government to obtain their feedback on overall morale and welfare. These results have already been shared directly with the Provost and Dean of CGC. In summary the student government representatives believe that the CGC student is the “bastard stepchild of the Corps of Cadets.”

We understand that CGC students have different views regarding their affiliation with the college. Some want a traditional college experience and the others just want to take their classes and leave the campus as soon as they can. However, expanding the CGC enrollment is a strategic initiative (Blueprint item 4.1). Therefore, the college must address CGC student concerns in order to reach the enrollment goals in our strategic plan.

Finally we must remember that the competition for these students is increasing. So our recruiting and customer services must increase if we are going to grow in this area.

The following are some highlights from the conversation with CGC student government representatives.
There are few places to study after hours. Bond Hall labs are locked down after hours. It suggests a lack of trust in the graduate students.

Graduate students are seldom notified of campus events and other important issues. As graduate students they have been kept in the dark during the Skip ReVille crisis, while alumni and even Cadets were given some updates on the situation. Meanwhile, as Citadel students they were queried by curious family and friends. School communication with graduate students is generally very poor.

Undergraduates have mandatory leadership assemblies and other opportunities in which major issues are addressed, but there is nothing similar for graduates. They are kept in the dark. Larger assemblies might help forge a coherent sense of identity as Citadel students.

It is especially difficult to sense the Citadel identity at the Lowcountry Graduate Center, where our “brand” is barely in evidence.

The logic of course scheduling/location is not always clear. Different programs run on different clocks. Library hours run on a schedule that corresponds to cadet needs, but with little regard for other patrons. It was closed by 3pm on the Saturday of finals.

The Career Center offers very little support for graduate students and is mostly geared to the undergraduate population. This is a real lost opportunity as students in the graduate program are highly marketable.

Both MBA and education students have trouble accessing the courses they need to graduate, thus prolonging their time as students. Declining enrollments will only make course selection / requirement issues a more acute problem.

We are missing opportunities to have graduate and undergraduate students interact. This could take place on many levels. Graduates are inexplicably unable to obtain access to alumni networks online until after graduation. Graduate students need access to those networks prior to graduation. Cadet seniors, however, have at least limited access.

A December Graduation ceremony might provide necessary ritual to help build Citadel identity. As it is, December graduates seldom return for the May ceremony having moved out of town for a job or returned home having been in Charleston just for the Graduate program.

Little is done to introduce graduates to the history and culture of the Citadel. Graduates have no idea what the Avenue of Remembrance is, or the knob experience, the Star of the West, etc. They need something to orient them.

A mandatory orientation might be in order during which important administrative services are represented--financial aid, recreation, student life, etc.

Having a physical space for graduate students needs to be a top priority for The Citadel. There ought to be a lounge for students, somewhere to rest before class, study, socialize, etc. This place would be a locus for information and would help immeasurably to meet basic needs and help forge identity. Also, there needs to be some place to buy food in the evening. This would be a good
place for a suggestion box where grads could offer their ideas for ways to improve the grad experience.

- Intramural sports for graduate students should be explored. Grad students also need to be encouraged to attend sporting events.
- Lastly, there is a need to explore offering day classes for graduate students as well as offering access to required undergraduate courses. Expansion of the course offerings would make graduate education feasible for many more students and would allow our existing students to graduate more quickly.

7. Disaster Preparedness & Crisis Management

A. Major Disasters
As a state agency, The Citadel enjoys the benefit of being able to work directly within South Carolina’s statewide Emergency Management Program. The State’s program is coordinated by the South Carolina Emergency Management Division (SCEMD), a division of the Adjutant General’s Office.

The State of South Carolina has adopted and implemented The South Carolina Emergency Operations Plan (SCEOP), an all-hazard plan developed for use by state government departments and agencies to ensure a coordinated and effective response to natural, technological, or man-made disasters that may occur in South Carolina. The SCEOP is predicated upon the principle that emergency operations will be executed at the level of government most appropriate to provide effective response. State assistance is provided upon request when requirements exceed the capability of local government. Federal assistance is provided upon approval of a request by the Governor to the appropriate federal agency or to the President.

In the event of a serious emergency or disaster, The Citadel will coordinate (via direct liaison) all requests for emergency response resources and support through the Charleston County Emergency Operations Center (CCEOC). The Citadel’s Director of Environmental Health and Safety has been formally designated as the college’s official liaison to the CCEOC.

The SCEOP is available online at: [http://www.scemd.org/index.php/department/plans/emergency-operations-plan](http://www.scemd.org/index.php/department/plans/emergency-operations-plan)

B. On-Campus Emergencies
The Citadel has developed and implemented an Emergency Response Plan (ERP) to guide and control on-campus emergency response and recovery operations. The ERP establishes the policies, procedures, and organizational hierarchy to be implemented in response to campus emergencies, and it addresses critical emergency response components to include: incident classification; command authority and reporting structure; personnel roles and responsibilities; emergency operations center activation and operations; and, emergency notification and communications.
The ERP also includes The Citadel’s Crisis Management Plan (CMP), which addresses how the college’s Executive Staff will coordinate an internal administrative response to a serious campus emergency.

Additionally, The Citadel has individual plans that specifically address campus response to a tropical cyclone (hurricane) or influenza pandemic event. These plans have been developed as separate documents due to the complex scope of a response to these types of incidents.

The Citadel’s Director of Environmental Health and Safety is currently assigned as the primary campus emergency management coordinator and is responsible for maintaining the college’s emergency planning documents.


The Citadel’s Hurricane Response Plan and Pandemic Response Plan are available online at: [http://www.bulldogalert.info/root/](http://www.bulldogalert.info/root/)

C. Serious Incidents

Serious Incidents are unexpected occurrences directly or indirectly involving The Citadel, which require a response or action from the college administration; or, which have the potential to generate positive or negative publicity regarding the college. Serious incidents include, but are not limited to, such events as a death, serious injury, fire, accident, criminal activity, acts of heroism, severe weather or other natural disasters affecting the campus.

The Citadel has implemented a Serious Incidents Policy which outlines campus response to these types of incidents.

The Citadel’s Serious Incident Policy is available online at: [http://www.citadel.edu/root/images/BOV/Policies/02-president/ser_incid_memo_39.pdf](http://www.citadel.edu/root/images/BOV/Policies/02-president/ser_incid_memo_39.pdf)

D. Training and Exercises

The Citadel has adopted and implemented an Annual Exercise Program for Safety, Security, and Public Safety. The policy establishes an annual schedule for conducting campus emergency preparedness training and exercises.

The Citadel’s Director of Environmental Health and Safety also coordinates the college’s participation in periodic drills and exercises organized and conducted by the County or State.
The Citadel’s Annual Exercise Program for Safety, Security, and Public Safety is online at: [http://www.citadel.edu/root/images/BOV/Policies/02-president/2-16_annual_exercise_program.02-10-10.pdf](http://www.citadel.edu/root/images/BOV/Policies/02-president/2-16_annual_exercise_program.02-10-10.pdf)

**Recommendations on Disaster Preparedness & Crisis Management**

- Provide one central space where all the plans are located. Currently there are plans at Bulldog alert, Public Safety’s web page on and the College Policies & Procedures pages.
- Ensure that all groups who have a part in the plans are versed and understand their roles. During the review of the plans for Physical Plant, for instance, some requirements of these plans were not known by PPLT personnel.
- Conduct regular tests of the critical, high profile plans at more than the senior staff level so that others who have significant roles can participate. A majority of the plans are currently exercised at Senior Staff or one-office (Public Safety) level. Tests of the plans need to involve all levels that have significant responsibility for actions.
- Ensure “cross-training” of key individuals so that if one person is not present the plan can still be executed effectively.
- Public Safety needs to have more involvement in day to day campus disaster preparedness and emergency management activities.