

IPAC FINAL REPORT

7 September 2012

Section 1: The Formation of IPAC and the Development of its Central Mission

Higher Education in our country today faces a conundrum of very serious realities, the most challenging of which are related to the cultural forces actualizing major negative influences on our young teenagers and adults. The most dramatic influences have become very evident and include the following: the demise of traditional family values, gender and race discrimination, sexual assault and harassment, binge drinking, disrespect, and attacks on the value of honor. For the past several years, we have witnessed the implications of these problems on a number of the nation's higher education campuses.

The Citadel has not been immune to these problems as we enroll and host young people from all over the country.

It would be difficult to overstate the degree to which The Citadel community was rocked by the arrest of our graduate, Skip ReVille, in the fall of 2011. As chair of the Honor Committee and cadet recipient of the Algernon Sidney Sullivan award, ReVille had seemed to epitomize our core values. The profound disconnect between who ReVille really was and who he had seemed to be caused many on campus to question whether there might be other instances in which our institution's realities are at odds with our ideals and values.

As one of many ways of responding to this institutional concern, Lieutenant General Rosa announced the creation of an Institutional Program Assessment Committee (IPAC). "The work of the IPAC," President Rosa wrote in a message to the college's faculty and staff on 6 January 2012, "will demonstrate our resolve to continue living up to the standards stated in the mission, vision, and core values of The Citadel and the highest standards of practice within the higher education community."

A most significant task charged to IPAC was to conduct a comprehensive self-study that would identify significant risks to the institution inherent in our customary operations. The official charge was for IPAC to conduct its work in two phases:

- First, the IPAC will identify and prioritize the institutional programs that need to be assessed based on the potential risk presented by the programs. The IPAC will make recommendations to President Rosa for the appointment of assessment panels/teams as needed to focus on a priority program area (e.g., programs that bring minors onto campus) (January 2012.)

- Second, once that review is completed, the IPAC will recommend improvements in the management of and administrative policies and procedures (to include compliance requirements) for Citadel programs that may present potential risk to the college and its key constituents (e.g., students, faculty and staff, alumni). (April/May 2012) The second phase will result in recommended modifications to programs, policies, and procedures, which are needed to strengthen the institution, incorporate best practices in higher education, maintain a unique military culture, and minimize risk for the institution and our constituents.

President Rosa asked Dr. John Palms, one of our college's most distinguished graduates and a former president of the University of South Carolina, to chair IPAC. Dr. Russell Warren, who has been provost and acting president of James Madison University as well as president of Truman State University, agreed to serve with Dr. Palms, thereby providing more external expertise. Joining Drs. Palms and Warren on the IPAC were, from within The Citadel, Deans Bo Moore and Ron Welch, Patricia McArver of the School of Business, Coach Kevin Higgins, Janet Shealy, the Director of Cadet Advocacy, Response, and Education, Colonel Douglas Fehrmann of the Krause Center, Dr. Suzanne Bufano, the Director of the Counseling Center, and Justin Pearson of the Admissions Department. Professor Harry Carter, our former provost and an expert on the theory and practice of leadership in higher education, was named Vice-Chair of IPAC.

To begin the self-study, a meeting was held with The Citadel Experience Integration Team (CEIT). With a membership including, among others, Provost Sam Hines, the Commandant of Cadets, the College Chaplain, the Executive Director of the Krause Center for Leadership and Ethics, and the faculty advisor to the Honor Committee, the CEIT is very familiar with both the realities and highest ideals of the institution. In response to General Carter's questions about possible areas of risk, CEIT members identified more than a dozen.

This list of concerns was taken to a series of six focus groups convened in early January. The focus groups were made up of the following constituencies. From the corps of cadets, there were separate groups made up of the top nine ranking cadets and other upperclassmen, the human affairs officers (24), representative fourth-classmen (20—nominated by their CIT 101 instructors), and representative third-classmen (16—nominated by their LDRS 201 instructors). There were two focus groups of staff members—one of TAC officers (20) and one of NCAA coaches and athletic administrators (10).

Each focus group participant was given the list developed by the CEIT, and each item on the list was discussed from a definitional point of view. Then each participant was asked to pick a "top five." The participants were also encouraged to add to the list, if they felt that there were significant issues not present on the CEIT-developed list.

Following the meetings, Institutional Research analyzed the results of the “top five” listings by the different participants.

Given the specific nature of the different groups, there were inevitable discrepancies among the cadets. Fourth classmen, for instance, saw “fourth class training abuses” as a substantially higher risk than did their fellow cadets. There was, nonetheless, substantial agreement among them all regarding eight issues. Their top issue, by far, was

- “accountability and exceptions to policies/standards” (mentioned by 39 of the 82 cadet respondents).

This was followed by

- “discipline system” (34 respondents),
- “communications and transparency” (33) and
- “substance abuse with special emphasis on alcohol & K2” (33).

Slightly below this second group of issues was a third pair

- “sexual harassment/abuse & gender issues” (31) and
- “honor system” (30).

Slightly below that, the cadets as a whole listed a final pair of issues

- “institutional decision making” (28) and
- “fourth class training abuse” (27).

The coaches had four issues at the top of their list: “honor system” (10), “fourth class training abuses” (9), “discipline system” (7), and “sexual harassment/abuse & gender issues” (6).

The TAC officers had as their top issue by far “Fourth class training abuses” (12); then they had a second group of three issues—“communications & transparency,” “discipline system,” and “honor system” (each with 8 mentions)—and a third group of three, each with seven mentions—“sexual harassment/abuse & gender issues,” “accountability and exceptions to policies and standards,” and “other cadet training abuse (Summerall Guards and other groups).”

There are obvious differences in priorities among the different focus groups. While most of the cadets other than the freshmen had “fourth class training abuses” as a low priority, the TACs had it as their highest. But agreements among the focus groups are notable. The cadets, coaches, and TACs all agreed that the cadet discipline system is a significant issue. The cadets and TACs shared a concern with “accountability and exceptions to policies & standards.” All of the groups noted problems with the honor system, although the TACs and especially the coaches saw this as a more significant concern than the cadets did.

On behalf of IPAC, Institutional Research also conducted an online survey of the college’s faculty and staff. Surveys were sent to 946 individuals and were completed by 315, a response rate of 33%. Like the focus group participants, the faculty/staff members were invited to list five areas of concern. They were given examples from

the CEIT list that the focus group participants had used but were told that “the items listed above are just examples” and that they “may or may not include any of them.”

The open-ended nature of the survey led to a wide number of issues receiving mention, but the responses did focus on a small handful of issues. Nearly half of the respondents identified “sexual harassment/abuse & gender issues” as a significant concern. About one-third of the respondents identified “fourth class training abuses.” The other issues that drew substantial mention were “substance abuse,” “honor system,” and “discipline system.”

An interesting discrepancy between the survey results and the findings of the focus groups is the relative weight given to the issue of “sexual harassment/abuse & gender issues.” The faculty & staff survey had this as by far the top area of risk to the institution, while the cadets as a whole, coaches, and TACs had it somewhere in the middle. (The cadet human affairs officers did have this issue as their top concern.)

In response to this data from the survey and the focus groups and after reflecting on their own sense of the risks to the institution, the IPAC as a whole identified two tiers of issues. The first tier was made up of five issues:

- sexual assault, harassment, gender and racial bias
- alcohol and substance abuse
- hazing and training abuse
- honor system
- discipline system.

In the second tier were four issues:

- disaster preparedness (including issues of campus security)
- student welfare & morale
- employee welfare & morale
- questions involving accreditation and certification.

On 24 January 2012 IPAC briefed President Rosa on the two tiers of issues. Following this briefing, President Rosa decided on six investigative panels, one each for the five first tier issues and a sixth for campus security and student and employee welfare and morale.

Volunteers for the six panels were solicited from the college’s faculty and staff. Provost Hines and Professor Carter worked to staff the panels with a strong cross-section of faculty members and staff members. They also recruited several prominent alumni to serve on panels.

One key principle followed in staffing the panels was to ensure that members would be knowledgeable and interested in their subject, but in no case at that time professionally responsible for it. So, for example, the Faculty Advisor to the Honor Court did not serve on the panel on the cadet honor system, nor did the Assistant

Commandant for Discipline serve on the panel on the cadet discipline system. In both cases these individuals provided information and perspective to the respective panels, but the panels retained their own objectivity and independence.

With the establishment of the six investigative panels, IPAC had thus fulfilled the first part of its charge.

Section 2: IPAC Top Ten Recommendations

On 7 March General Rosa and Dr. Palms held a meeting with IPAC and the six IPAC panels, beginning the second, main phase of the IPAC self-study.

The six IPAC panels met continuously throughout the months of March and April, identifying elements of risk within their areas and developing recommendations for improvements. It soon became apparent, however, that drafting well-informed reports was going to take longer than eight weeks. The deadline for the separate panel reports was therefore extended until the end of July.

But in order for President Rosa to brief the Board of Visitors and for the college's administration to begin work on some of the matters that IPAC would be bringing forward, the panels were asked to identify their most important recommendations. Working closely with the chair, the other members of IPAC, and the panel chairs, a briefing was prepared for President Rosa on 14 May of IPAC's top ten recommendations.

IPAC's top ten recommendations are as follows:

- Implement mandatory background checks and training programs for employees, students, and volunteers involved with youth programs.
- Modify, consolidate and promulgate policies and procedures regarding protection of youth
- Establish a full-time alcohol prevention program for the entire campus
- Improve weapons security on campus (M14s & personal weapons)
- Lock doors on all cadet rooms in the barracks
- Reinvent the OC Program and "Take back the Night"
- Implement the operational changes regarding the Honor system
- Implement the operational changes regarding the Summerall Guards
- Develop and implement a workable plan to address the hostile environment that exists with regard to women in the Corps of Cadets.
- Develop and implement a new plan to diversify the workforce and student body

To avoid redundancy in this report, we will discuss the top recommendations in the paragraphs devoted to the separate panels. Documentation of the issues can be found in the actual panel reports presented as appendices to this narrative.

At the May briefing, President Rosa asked for information on two other matters not covered in the IPAC top ten—fourth-class training and mentoring programs such as the host family program. The panel on training abuses had devoted most of its attention to questions about Summerall Guards, but fourth-class training has remained on its agenda. The panel recommendations on fourth-class training are discussed below. Regarding mentoring programs, Professor Carter decided to take the lead himself since the question didn't fit naturally into any one of the current panels. In a follow-up meeting in early July between the President, the vice-presidents, and the IPAC panel chairs, the following concerns associated with the mentor programs and sponsor program were identified:

- Establishment of program goals
- Selection and assignment of mentors, to include the issue of background checks
- Integration of the programs with The Citadel experience
- Evaluation of the programs

The decision was made that the Citadel Experience Integration Team should be responsible for addressing these issues.

Subsequent to the May briefing and the July follow-up meeting, the Provost developed an action plan for the top ten IPAC recommendations. A coordination plan, linking members of IPAC to the relevant vice-presidents regarding each of the top ten recommendations was also developed.

Section 3: IPAC Panels

Each panel submitted its report in late July 2012. These complete reports are presented here as appendices 2 through 7. For the reader's convenience, we provide here summaries of each report. Appendix 1 contains the recommendations from each panel.

- IPAC Panel on the Cadet Discipline System

Chaired by Dean Bo Moore of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, the IPAC Panel on the Cadet Discipline System examined the current policies and practices of the cadet discipline system. The January focus groups had so prominently featured concerns about “accountability and exceptions to policies/standards” that *consistency* and the *targeting of cadets* were among the items this panel was asked to consider. They were also asked to look at the role of the TACs and OCs and the conceptual base of the entire discipline system.

In fulfilling their charge, this committee reviewed the college's official publications such as the Blue Book, White Book, Red Book, and the Honor Manual. They also consulted internal documents such as the recent Social Climate Surveys and Commandant's briefings to the Board of Visitors. They conducted extensive interviews of cadets, TACs, OCs, and other members of the Commandant's department, including the Assistant Commandant for Discipline and the Commandant of Cadets himself. Finally, three panelists made unannounced nighttime observation visits to the barracks.

Panelists (four of whom had once been cadets) were surprised at how exceedingly cumbersome and antiquated the operations of the discipline system are.

- With more than 350 pages of regulations, our policies are far more elaborate than those of other military institutions such as VMI, Norwich, and West Point. Testimony to the Panel indicates that "very few (if any) people try to read, much less understand and follow, the intimidating volume of written rules."
- Our process of adjudicating punishments involves cadet commanders, TAC officers at both the company and battalion level, and administrators in Jenkins Hall. As a result, it frequently takes about two weeks for a punishment actually to be assigned. Part of the delay is that much of this is done in handwriting, with paper copies being handed from person to person along the way to a final disposition.
- Although computerized, the Class Absence System nonetheless generates an enormous amount of paperwork, as cadets compose ERWs to avoid punishment and various college officials respond to them. The estimate is that roughly 40% of the administrative activity in the discipline system has to do with class absences.
- Because so much of the discipline system still takes place in a "pencil and paper" environment, the Panel was unable to answer with confidence the question in its charge regarding consistency. The Panel report points out that "there is no centralized, electronic data base that lends itself to making systematic comparisons and evaluations."

The Panel also expressed significant concern about the conceptual model of the discipline system, which seems to stress "intimidation and punishment" and which seems very much at odds both with psychological research on developing self-discipline and with the best practices of the United States Armed Forces. Panelists also heard of significant variations in disciplinary emphasis and practice between companies, and about the lack of systematic training and evaluation of TACs.

But the Panel's greatest concern has to do with the Night OC system, which, the report indicates, "is in need of major change and perhaps ought to be eliminated

altogether and replaced by something different.” Testimony to the Panel indicated that the OCs “exercise little authority and are not well respected by cadets.” The unannounced nighttime visits by three panelists to the barracks strongly corroborated this testimony. (Reports on these observation visits are included as attachments to the Panel report.)

Recommendations and Conclusion Given its importance, the summary and conclusion of the panel report is also presented here:

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 recordkeeping 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.

The Panel on the Discipline System has made eight recommendations, which are listed in the report, which is Appendix 2. The IPAC top recommendation regarding the Night OCs comes from this panel, as well.

The problems with the discipline system that the Panel was able to document are so significant that the IPAC as a whole has added the following to its list of top recommendations: “The College must undertake a major reform of the cadet discipline system, to include the approach and philosophy used for discipline.”

- IPAC Panel on the Cadet Honor System

The IPAC Panel on the Cadet Honor System worked to develop new Standard Operating Procedure documents for the honor system—one on the duties of the Faculty Advisor, one on the selection of members of the Honor Committee, and one on the structure and function of Honor Boards of Review.

In being tasked to develop these documents, this Panel had a considerably more focused charge than the other panels. There are two reasons for this:

- First of all, the honor system already functions as a way of keeping risk away from the college. As the college's general counsel confirmed to the Panel, colleges have a great deal of discretion in disciplining students. Courts will not interfere unless colleges act arbitrarily and without regard to students' rights. So in developing the SOPs, the Panel was not identifying a risk but was, instead, enhancing the operations of a fundamental cornerstone of the college's operations.
- Second, as mentioned above, the January focus groups all identified the cadet honor system as a cause of concern. These results highlighted what President Rosa and others had felt for some time—the honor system needed attention. On a few occasions, trial findings of "in violation" had been overturned by Honor Boards of Review or by the President himself because of procedural problems where the Honor Court had not followed its published standards. The President was also concerned about whether accused cadets were receiving fair and objective advice. The IPAC Panel was a way to act on these concerns in developing new SOPs that would enhance equity and transparency in the operations of the honor system.

Chaired by Colonel Douglas Fehrmann, the IPAC Panel on the Honor System began its work by looking over files and reports pertaining to the current and past operations of the court. Colonel Fehrmann reported to the panel on a telephone interview that had taken place with representatives of the honor system at VMI. Panelists also looked over the honor manual from the United States Air Force Academy. They also conducted interviews with The Citadel's general counsel, with the current and previous advisors to the court, Professors Kyle Sinisi and Michael Barrett, and with Coach Kevin Higgins.

To facilitate the drafting of the SOPs, one of the panelists used the honor manual to create a flow chart tracing a hypothetical case from accusation through its ultimate disposition. Panelists then examined every step with a view to enhance equity and transparency.

The proposed SOPs are an integral part of the panel report, which is Appendix 3, and should be read in their entirety. What follows is a brief description of the principal changes to be found in the SOPs.

The SOP for Faculty Advisor A most important feature of the new SOP on the duties of the faculty advisor is the proposed creation of a three-person staff—the Faculty Advisor to the Honor Court (FAHC), and two Advisors for Investigations, one for the prosecution (the AIP) and one for the defense (the AID).

At The Citadel, the tradition has been for a single faculty member to serve as advisor to the Honor Court. The work is exceptionally time intensive. Its corps is smaller and the number of violations per year is proportionately smaller still, but VMI has three people advising its honor court. Although he does not agree with the changes suggested by the IPAC panel, the former faculty advisor, Professor Sinisi, did indicate that he could have used some help in fulfilling his duties.

The position of Faculty Advisor has traditionally been without term limits and without any formal supervision. In the new SOP, the FAHC will serve a maximum of five years and will be evaluated annually by the Director of the Krause Center for Leadership and Ethics. The Krause Center Director will be the president's senior advisor on the honor system.

One of the most significant criticisms of the honor system has been that, when a case is being developed, the Faculty Advisor gives advice to both the Vice Chair for Investigations and his or her investigative teams and to the accused cadet. This can be seen as a conflict of interest. Working as closely as they do together over the course of a year, the Faculty Advisor and VCI inevitably form a working relationship that critics believe could prove prejudicial to accused cadets. The proposed creation of the two new advisor positions is intended both to separate the FAHC from investigations and to create the opportunity for an accused cadet and those helping with his or her defense to receive objective advice during the entire process. In the new SOP, the AIP and AID will work separately with the prosecution and defense. The FAHC will supervise the process.

Currently cases are approved for investigation by the Executive Assistant to the President and for trial by the cadet Vice Chair for Investigations. In the new SOP, it is proposed that the Deputy Director of the Krause Center assume the role of the EAP. (This is part of the move shifting the honor system to the Krause Center for Leadership and Ethics, the most appropriate venue for it.) The FAHC will, after consulting with the Honor Court president and the AIP and AID, approve all cases for trial.

The SOP for the Honor Committee One of the most significant concerns recently raised about the honor system is that sometimes cadets have served on courts despite being ineligible to do so. The IPAC panelists strongly believe that members of the honor court must be above reproach. The new SOP mandates that cadets who

serve on the honor committee must be proficient in terms of academics, discipline, and fitness. Regarding discipline, the requirement is that “cadets who have committed a Class I offense during the current or previous year are ineligible for nomination/election [to the Honor Committee]. 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.” Regarding academics, members of the Honor Committee must have attained the classification of “1A” in fall and “1B” in spring; they must also have at least a 2.3 GPA. Prior to each trial, the FAHC has the duty of confirming that each member sitting on the panel currently meets all requirements for service on the Honor Committee.

The SOP for Honor Boards of Review The only significant changes proposed here are that the Deputy Director of the Krause Center will take over the role of the Executive Assistant to the President in establishing HBORs, that academic department heads may now serve as chairs of HBORs, and that the Advisor for Investigations/Defense (AID) will be available as an advisor to the appellant.

Recommendations and Conclusion The adoption of the operational changes in the cadet honor system described in the new SOPs is an IPAC top recommendation. The Panel on the Cadet Honor System has made additional recommendations regarding record keeping and honor education. The Panel also recommends a comprehensive review of the college’s honor system, covering, among other matters, the problem of overlap between the college’s cadet discipline and honor systems.

- IPAC Panel on Hazing and Training Abuses

Chaired by Associate Provost Mark Bebensee, the IPAC Panel on Hazing and Training Abuses spent a significant amount of time in March and April focused not on freshmen, but on upperclassmen. They did this because rumors were widespread on campus about bizarre practices involved in the training and selection process of the 2011 and 2012 Summerall Guards. In looking into the matter, panelists discovered that the Commandant’s department was conducting its own inquiry. The Commandant of Cadets met with the panel and shared what he had learned.

Upon hearing the Commandant’s testimony, panelists developed recommendations of how to respond to the training abuses associated with the Guards. These recommendations are as follows:

1. Until further notice, all off-campus performances/trips for the 2013 Summerall Guard should be hereby suspended; on-campus performances at Parents’ Day and Homecoming should proceed as usual, provided that adequate progress is being made in the areas outlined in point #2 below.

- The resumption of off-campus performances should 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 Physical fitness, Drill proficiency, Conduct proficiency, Military proficiency, and 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.

The Panel made these recommendations to President Rosa at the 14 May IPAC briefing.

Subsequent to the briefing, Professor Bebensee represented IPAC in a Working Group that the Commandant had called together to develop a “Summerall Guards Transformation Plan.” The outcome of this Transformation Plan has, as of this writing (17 August 2012), not yet been announced.

After considering the Summerall Guards problem, the Panel turned its attention to fourth-class training abuses and did so “by looking at the three major studies of that system which the institution had conducted since 1968.” Panelists noted that the three studies—the Whitmire Report (1968), the Mood Report (1980), and the Lane Report (1991)—share many of the same findings. The Panel report, available here as Appendix 4, contains a detailed summary of each of these major reports.

Recommendations and Conclusion The adoption of recommended operational changes for the Summerall Guards is an IPAC top recommendation. The Panel also has made a series of recommendations regarding the fourth class system based both upon the common findings of the three major studies and upon the lengthy experience of the panelists in working with fourth-classmen. Among these recommendations is one to consider the “scrambling” of company assignments, another to consider shortening the duration of knob training, and another to consider the rotation of rank during the school year. All of the recommendations are listed in the Panel’s full report in Appendix 4 and in the list of recommendations in Appendix 1.

- IPAC Panel on Alcohol and Substance Abuse

Chaired by Dr. Jane Warner, Director of the Academic Support Center, this panel studied official policies and survey data as well as applicable federal and state laws and alcohol and drug policies from other institutions.

The Citadel has a zero tolerance policy for illegal drugs. The zero tolerance policy is enforced through the random testing of the cadet corps for illegal drugs. During the 2011-12 academic year, the Commandant's department reported 13 expulsions, one dismissal, and one suspension for drug-related offenses.

Data from the Fall 2011 CORE Institute Alcohol and Drug Survey indicate that Citadel cadets report significantly lower rates of marijuana usage than their peers—11.2% for cadets vs. 31.2% for members of their peer group. The Citadel's random drug testing is working to keep this number low; 45.8% of respondents within the corps who had "used illegal drugs in the past reported that The Citadel's random drug testing deterred them from using" them currently.

Survey results indicate that alcohol abuse is substantially more prevalent among cadets than is drug abuse. The Citadel has administered the CORE survey nine times—twice to freshmen only and seven times to the corps as a whole. Cadets have consistently reported higher incidence of annual alcohol usage than have their national reference group peers, although the gap between the cadets and their peers has narrowed in the last two administrations of the survey. In the Fall 2011 administration of the survey, 51% of the cadet respondents reported binge drinking in the previous two weeks and 60% reported underage consumption in the past thirty days.*

The Panel found that The Citadel "is making a significant effort" in combating alcohol abuse. The Commandant's department punishes violations of college policies and regulations. The predominant alcohol-related offense is possession of alcohol on campus; among other alcohol-related offenses that have been punished in the past three years are "hazing," "major violation of the fourth-class system," "gross poor judgment," and "bringing discredit to The Citadel." The Citadel Counseling Center reported that in the 2010-11 academic year 104 cadets sought counseling regarding alcohol-related issues; 89 of these were mandatory referrals based on an alcohol-related violation of school rules.

* It is worth noting here that the IPAC Discipline Panel heard some troubling testimony about the impact of binge drinking on the cadets. In interviews with night OC's, one of the panelists was told that alcohol abuse was the single most pressing discipline issue. One OC told the panelist that his basic rule was that, if a cadet came to the barracks gate drunk but could walk and say his or her name, he would let the cadet enter; if not, he would make the cadet go to the infirmary.

TAC officers play an important part of the college's education and enforcement program regarding alcohol and illegal drugs. Not only do the TACs enforce the college's rules, but they also educate the students by presenting The Citadel's policies and rules to the cadets of all four classes in the "Rules of the Road" components of the Leader Education Program. The TACs are also well placed to encourage cadets "to seek counseling or self-help programs both on and off campus before disciplinary actions are required." One must note, however, that the TACs are not usually present on campus when cadets come into the barracks after a night of drinking.

Recommendations and Conclusion The severity of the problem of alcohol abuse on campus has led the Panel to recommend that The Citadel establish an office to provide a comprehensive alcohol and substance abuse program for The Citadel and that "staff for this office be hired from outside The Citadel." This is an IPAC top recommendation. The full Panel report is available as Appendix 5.

- IPAC Panel on Sexual Assault and Harassment and Gender and Racial Bias

Chaired by Professor Julie Lipovsky of the Psychology Department, this panel studied official policies and survey data. They also conducted interviews and considered best practices.

Youth-Related Programs The Panel found that, although The Citadel has taken many steps to prevent the sexual abuse of minors, there is no coherent approach to the problem. The Panel report, available here as Appendix 6, indicates that many people on campus ... 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.

To remedy this lack of oversight, the Panel recommends two steps:

- first, the institution should hire someone to "coordinate training, background screenings, policy development and compliance related to child protection"
- second, the institution should engage "an outside consultant with expertise in child sexual assault ... 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 strongly believes that an external, rather than internal, review is necessary.

To enhance the safety of minors who come on campus, the Panel also believes that employees, campus residents, students and volunteers should receive Darkness to

Light *Stewards of Children* training. These individuals should also be required to have SLED background checks.

Currently any organization or group that wants to use Citadel facilities for a program involving youth is required to complete the “Activities Involving Children Approval Form”—commonly called the “Camp Packet.” A completed form circulates from office to office on campus acquiring signatures. Each person whose signature is required examines the form from his or her own departmental perspective, but it is unclear if one person ever looks at the completed form from an over-all Citadel perspective. As the report indicates, “if everyone has partial responsibility, no one has full responsibility.”

To correct the lack of oversight with the “camp packets,” the Panel recommends that one person should have final approval of each packet and that the packet itself should require information from the applicant organization that would enhance child protection.

Sexual Assault When examined from a best practices perspective, The Citadel is doing an excellent job in addressing the problem of sexual assault. The Panel report indicates that “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.”

Statistics on sexual assault show roughly seven reports over a twelve-month reporting period. This number has increased slightly over the past six years, but the best professional judgment is that such a slight increase is more likely to reflect an improvement in reporting rather than an actual increase in events.

Although there seems to have been progress in the reporting of sexual assaults, significant challenges remain. Panelists heard testimony that “cadets of both sexes in some companies have reported they have been discouraged from reporting incidents of sexual assault” because “what happens in the company should stay in the company.” Panelists also heard of a significant amount of resistance to the college’s efforts to provide education on sexual assault. Evidently “cadets do not all take the education sessions seriously,” thereby creating a hostile environment. As the report notes, “policies can only go so far when the environment fosters secrecy and the culture among cadets minimizes the problem.”

Sexual Harassment As is the case with sexual assault, The Citadel seems to be following best practices in developing programs and policies responding to sexual harassment.

Emma Bennett-Williams, the college’s Chief Diversity Officer, is responsible for sexual harassment education and response regarding employees. Ms. Bennett-

Williams reports that there have been only a few complaints concerning employees in the past several years.

In contrast to the situation with employees, the situation with female cadets seems significantly more serious. Despite efforts to address the problem that are based on best practices, several knowledgeable sources on campus told the Panel that it seemed to them that most, if not all, women cadets experienced some form of harassment. While some of the harassment is the typical sexual harassment found at other institutions, some of it is what would be more accurately termed “gender based” and is tied to a lingering resistance to having women in the Corps of Cadets. That is, women in the corps are being harassed because they are women. The 2011 Social Climate survey of cadets indicated that 45% of male cadets believe that women do not belong in the corps.[†]

To go along with this hostility towards women in the corps is a corresponding sense among many male cadets (nearly 43%) that women cannot be effective leaders. A particularly disturbing element of the survey data is that, while most male freshmen cadets hold positive views regarding the leadership of women, “the percentage of cadets who do so decreases over the next three years. Thus, upper-level cadets are, in effect, teaching younger cadets to disrespect women.” There is also the sense that “embarrassing and disrespectful behavior” observed from some alumni towards women cadets has contributed to the development of negative attitudes in cadets.

The Panel is concerned that the college has not provided enough positive examples of the leadership abilities of women to counter this negative impression. For example, only one of the fourteen Greater Issues speakers in the past five years has been a woman. There are currently only two female tactical officers, the senior leadership within all of the ROTC detachments is male, and there are not even pictures of women on any of the ROTC department websites. Within the corps, women tend to be overrepresented in some leadership areas, such as Human Affairs, but nearly absent in others, “particularly those at the company and battalion levels, as well as within the Honor Court.” There are few female administrators, few female faculty members (particularly in the rank of full professor), and few senior staff members.

Adding to concerns about the lack of women in leadership positions on campus is the relative lack of visible programs that address women’s leadership or highlight successful women. There is focus on this issue within academic and LDRS coursework, the military programs, specialized groups (e.g., Women Actively Seeking Achievement), and through occasional speakers in a variety of

[†] Nighttime observations of the battalions conducted by members of the IPAC Panel on Discipline uncovered [an obvious instance of this hostility](#). Under the label “Wall of Shame” on a door in one of the battalions was a cartoon showing a silhouette of a pony-tailed head wearing a cadet shako with the universal sign of a slash across it. See the picture on p. 24 of this text.

contexts. However, this focus is not readily apparent beyond these venues, nor is it integrated across the campus.

Diversity of Employees and Students The Panel report notes that “The Citadel historically has been made up of a homogeneous faculty, staff, and student body” and that the institution’s efforts to change that status quo have not succeeded.

Regarding workforce diversity, in the required 2012 South Carolina Human Affairs Committee Report to the General Assembly the institution states that “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.” No other state agency has such a prolonged history of failure in regard to affirmative action goals.

Despite this history of failure, The Citadel has continued to use “the same recruitment approaches to attract minority and women faculty and staff that have always been used.” The Panel believes that a new approach is essential, an approach developed with outside consultation and that is “specific to the characteristics and needs of The Citadel.”

The difficulties associated recruiting a more diverse workforce are present also in recruiting a more diverse cadet corps. Over the past five years the percentage of women cadets has remained stable at between 5.8 and 6.5 while the percentage of African American cadets has risen slightly from 6.8 to 8.4.

The Panel report maintains that “The Citadel continues to operate with unsuccessful policies and procedures despite little change in the percentage of women and African Americans enrolled each fall. “ For instance, alumni volunteers conduct some recruitment activities for the cadet corps. But of the eighty or so volunteers, it is estimated that only eight are African American and only three are women.

It has been argued that until we have a cadet corps with a population of about 15% women, we will “continue to struggle with issues of sexual harassment.” Given the dangers of the status quo to our institutional mission, it is imperative that we change what we are doing. The institution might, for instance, expand into new academic majors as a way of attracting more women students. But the Panel believes that, in order to make the essential changes, the institution needs a new plan, one developed with outside consultation and specific to our distinct institutional needs.

Gender and Racial Bias Given the complexity of the issues already described, the Panel was not able to explore other problem areas in any kind of depth. Panelists believe, however, that “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).” In recent months, the college has sponsored training of faculty and staff members by the National Coalition Building Institute (NCBI). Further NCBI training of personnel throughout the college would help improve the institutional climate regarding diversity.

Recommendations and Conclusion Here at the conclusion of the panel phase of the IPAC process, it is safe to say that the matters dealt with in this Panel report have clearly been revealed as the most pressing of all those facing The Citadel. A measure of this is that four of IPAC’s top recommendations have to do with this area:

- Implement mandatory background checks and training programs for employees, students, and volunteers involved with youth programs
- Modify, consolidate and promulgate policies and procedures regarding protection of youth
- Develop and implement a new plan to diversify the workforce and student body
- Develop and implement a workable plan to address the hostile environment that exists with regard to women in the Corps of Cadets.

The Panel has made numerous other recommendations and provided suggested resources to address the above issues. These are given in the report itself, which is Appendix 6, and are listed in Appendix 1.

- IPAC Panel on Campus Security and Student and Employee Welfare and Morale

Chaired by James Grigg, the Director of Physical Plant Operations and Resident Engineer, this panel investigated a wide range of issues having to do with campus security and welfare by conducting interviews and consulting published documents and surveys, particularly the 2012 Faculty/Staff Social Climate Survey and The Citadel Senior Experience and Social Climate surveys of cadets. Panelists also met with Faculty Council and with members of the Graduate Students Council.

Weapons Security The threat of a school shooting came up repeatedly in interviews conducted during the IPAC process. Public Safety does conduct regular training on what to do in response to a shooting, and they have coordinated plans of action with the Charleston Police Department. But there is widespread concern about the lack of weapons security on campus, both in regard to the M-14s issued to cadets and to personal weapons.

The M-14s are federal property and have been issued to The Citadel by the United States Army Cadet Command of Fort Monroe, Virginia. The 2008 Memorandum of Agreement between The Citadel and Cadet Command notes that the rifles “are not de-militarized” and that “although firing pins and selector switches have been removed...a resourceful cadet could purchase a firing pin and selector switch from a

local gunsmith or gun show and restore the weapon to full mission capable status.” Citadel Public Safety officers, the College Armorer, and others knowledgeable about the M-14 do confirm that a rifle could easily be made operational quickly and for less than \$100.

The Citadel stores the M-14s in the same way as they do at the United States Military Academy. When the cadets are on furlough, the M-14s are locked in a secure armory. When school is in session, the rifles are issued to the cadets who are responsible for keeping them secure. When not in use, each rifle is supposed to be behind two locks—the lock on the rifle rack in the cadet barracks room and the lock on the barracks room door itself.

Despite regulations to the contrary, Citadel traditions strongly discourage cadets from locking their room doors. It is therefore not uncommon for some, if not most, of the rifles to be relatively unsecured for long stretches of each day.

From all that the Panel learned, it seems quite easy to make an M-14 functional but very difficult for the college to keep it adequately secure. This set of circumstances is, therefore, a significant risk to The Citadel.

Nor are the M-14s the only cause of concern regarding weapons security. College regulations allow cadets to bring their privately owned firearms onto campus, so long as they check them with Public Safety and store them in the college armory. Firearms have, however, been found in cadet rooms and vehicles, and there is a suspicion that some may be in the Central Supply warehouse cadet storage area. Moreover, there seems to be no college policy regarding whether faculty, staff, or visitors may bring weapons onto campus.

Disaster Preparedness As a state agency, The Citadel takes part in the South Carolina Emergency Operations Plan, “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 Citadel also has an Emergency Response Plan, a Crisis Management Plan, and plans for hurricanes and influenza pandemics. Citadel personnel train for emergencies according to a schedule put in place in an Annual Exercise Program for Safety, Security, and Public Safety.

Although we have sound plans for dealing with emergencies, there is a sense that these plans are not as well known as they should be.

Faculty and Staff Morale The 2012 Faculty/Staff Social Climate Survey was administered in March and April of 2012, the same months that the IPAC Panels were doing the bulk of their work and a time of great upset on campus following the revelations about Skip ReVille. The 2009 survey was administered at a time that the institution was dealing with significant state budget reductions.

The 2012 results differ substantially from the results of an administration of this survey in 2009. The difference is most obvious in the responses from the faculty because the faculty response rate of slightly more than 38% is more than double the staff response rate (18%).

For the faculty, 54 of 55 items on the survey have lower results in 2012 than in 2009. Among the most significant declines are those items having to do with the institution's senior leadership. For example, the item "this institution is well run" fell from an agreement rate of 65% to 41%. Similar declines occurred in the following areas; (1) providing a clear directions for the future, (2) knowledge, skills and experience necessary for institutional success, (3) showing a genuine interest in the well-being of employees, (4) communicating openly about important matters, (5) modeling institutional values, and (6) believing senior leadership.

These survey results suggest that there has been a significant decline in the trust and confidence that faculty place in the senior administration of the institution. This is a critical issue because, as Stephen Covey explains in his 2006 book entitled *The Speed of Trust*, trust is the "life-blood" of an organization.

One significant disappointment of the 2012 survey is that it indicates that changes that had been prompted by the 2009 survey have not really borne fruit. The institution had seen room for improvement based on the 2009 results. That survey had been administered on the heels of the economic collapse of 2008, when Citadel employees were dealing with budget cuts and, in some staff areas, even facing the prospect of reductions-in-force. To increase communications regarding these issues, the college's senior administration began a series of "town hall meetings," where employees were given the opportunity to raise concerns.

The Panel has made several suggestions in its report regarding ways to improve the town hall meetings and further communications between faculty, staff, and the senior administration. In order to gain a better understanding of these survey data, IPAC recommends that follow-up studies be conducted using independent, non-administrative facilitators as focus groups leaders. This is particularly needed due to the very different environments which existed when these surveys were conducted. Finally, it should be noted that simply increasing communications will not fully address this issue.

Given the seriousness of the issue, IPAC as a whole has added the following to its list of top recommendations: "To strengthen the trust between students, faculty, and staff that is essential for The Citadel to achieve its mission, the College's administration must enhance communications and the decision making processes within the institution. Above all, The Citadel must ensure that its actions are consistent with its communications."

Student Morale Panelists looked at results from the Cadet Social Climate surveys and the Citadel Senior Experience surveys. The Social Climate survey

measures attitudes on gender and race, among other issues; the Senior Experience survey contains questions on the college's programs and on the students' career plans.

What was particularly striking about the survey data is the relative lack of change in responses from year to year. Despite all that has changed in the last ten years with expanded leadership development programs and Values and Respect training, the Social Climate surveys suggest that attitudes within the corps have remained more or less constant. The consistently expressed views suggest that "the culture and traditions of the Corps overwhelm the changes to maintain the status quo."

As a way of exploring attitudes held by CGC students, a panel member met with some members of the CGC student government. These individuals made a number of interesting suggestions about how to improve the CGC student experience. For instance, they pointed out that many graduate students think that required courses in their programs are not offered often enough so that they end up having to delay the completion of their degrees. They also stressed the need for a physical space for graduate students, a place where they could relax between classes, buy food in the evening, and basically just get to know each other in an informal setting.

Recommendations and Conclusion Two of the IPAC top recommendations come from this Panel—"Improve weapons security on campus (M14s & personal weapons)" and "Lock doors on all cadet rooms in the barracks." The Panel has also made a series of other recommendations in its full report, available here as Appendix 7. Regarding disaster preparedness, the Panel recommends centralizing access to all relevant disaster plans and improving training on them. To improve morale, the Panel also recommends some steps that would enhance communication on campus.

Section 4: Conclusion

In response to the charge from President Rosa, IPAC is here presenting its report highlighting significant challenges facing the college. The members of IPAC and its six panels point out these challenges frankly and in an earnest spirit of improving the college's performance of its central mission of educating principled leaders.

Based on the results of the study, the case of Skip ReVille is but one of too many instances in which the institution's realities are at odds with its ideals and values. The report further concludes that the continuation of the status quo in these areas of the college's operations poses serious risks to The Citadel. The committee's response has been to recommend a series of bold corrective actions to be instituted immediately. Action on these recommendations should not be delayed.

In addition however, actions of the sort called for in this report must be accompanied by a change of culture within the institution that will maximize the

possibility that these actions will gain traction and produce long-term results. Implementation and success will require exceptional leadership from the highest levels of the institution.

While there are a number of important recommendations from the panels (see Appendix 1), it is the consensus of IPAC that the following fourteen recommendations must receive first priority and immediate action by the institution. These fourteen critical recommendations are presented here in the context of The Citadel's core values of Honor, Duty, and Respect:

HONOR

To enhance equity and transparency in the cadet honor system, the College must adopt the new Standard Operating Procedures documents on the duties of the Faculty Advisor, on the selection of members of the Honor Committee, and on the structure and function of Honor Boards of Review.

To strengthen the trust between students, faculty, and staff that is essential for The Citadel to achieve its mission, the College's administration must enhance communications and the decision-making processes within the institution. Above all, The Citadel must ensure that its actions are consistent with its communications.

DUTY

The OC program currently in place is not providing necessary security in the barracks at night. This program must be reexamined and reinvented.

By all reports, cadets are not following regulations about locking their room doors. This is a clear instance of the saying that, without vigilant supervision, "culture eats strategy for breakfast," and it must change.

The College must improve weapons security on campus, in regard both to the federally-owned M-14s and to privately-owned weapons.

The College must address the problems that have arisen regarding the training and selection of the Summerall Guards by adopting a strict and comprehensive operational plan for the Guards.

With documents like the Whitmire Report, the Mood Report, and the Lane Report in mind, the College must take a new, comprehensive look at the fourth-class system, one that considers our knob traditions in light of our core values of HONOR, DUTY, and RESPECT.

Given the seriousness of the problems of binge drinking and underage drinking in the corps, The Citadel must establish a fully staffed office to provide a more robust alcohol and substance abuse program for the college.

The College must modify, consolidate, and promulgate policies and procedures regarding the protection of youth.

The College must implement mandatory background checks and training programs for employees, students, and volunteers involved with youth programs.

The Citadel Experience Integration Team must devise an operational plan governing all sponsorship and mentoring programs on campus.

The College must undertake a major reform of the cadet discipline system, to include the approach and philosophy used for discipline.

RESPECT

The College must develop and implement a new plan to diversify the workforce and student body.

The College must develop and implement a new plan that combats negative attitudes toward women and builds upon the work of those cadet companies and other entities within The Citadel that have successfully assimilated women.

This institutional assessment affords The Citadel a critical opportunity to enhance the culture and character of the institution consistent with its core values of Honor, Duty, and Respect. During the course of this assessment, it has become clear that many members of The Citadel community are eager to participate in actions called for in this report. Such an initiative has the potential of building community within the institution as well as strengthening the institution and its reputation as an institution of higher education dedicated to achieving excellence in the education of principled leaders.



Illustration referenced in footnote on p. 16. [Return to text.](#)