

From: Dianne's Work
Sent: 5/6/2015 3:46:44 PM
To: Mark C. Brandenburg
Cc: John W. Rosa; Eugene Paluso; COL Eugene L. Gene Pinson; COL Peter M. McCoy; COL Myron C. Harrington; COL Tee Hooper; COL Dylan W. Goff; COL Allison Dean Love; COL Robert H. Nuttall; Haley, Nikki
Subject: Re: College Response to Request for For Reconsideration From Cadet Jonathan Reed

Mr. Brandenburg,

I have read over your email and the training material provided. First I would like to let you know Jonathan did in fact complete the paperwork a few weeks ago allowing myself and his father to receive his records.

I can see but not understand how the administration is driving the point of hazing as I will explain below. I do want to commend the BOV for issuing a statement regarding their stance on hazing.

Here is where I as well as a lot of cadets and parents are confused. I think the outline that I am about to provide you will help you see our side a bit and any information you can provide to this would be greatly appreciated.

1) Where in all the material that you have provided states physical training is hazing? I'm not looking for what an individual may perceive a word to be because that can differ depending on who is reading. We are looking for a specific sentence that states "physical training is grounds for hazing". If your fallback is the word "tyrannical" where do the cadets find information showing that physical training is considered tyrannical and grounds for hazing? This is a very grey area which is open for interpretation.

2) The Administration continues to force their opinion that physical training is considered hazing despite the fact that the freshman have repeated they did not consider it hazing. While the school pushes the premise that the physical training was unlawful to the extent that the upperclassmen were intentionally or recklessly engaging in acts which had a foreseeable potential for causing physical harm; the freshmen requested the physical training to improve themselves physically and mentally. They had a choice not to participate without judgement.

3) If the administration considers physical training hazing and as an example there are 4 cadets from a company who are charged with hazing. One cadet Pt'd 2 freshmen, another Pt'd 4 freshmen, another Pt'd 7 freshmen, and the last one Pt'd 12 freshmen. Are all the cadets charged with hazing and punished accordingly per the citadels regulations? From what is repeated by the administration and specifically Col. Sberna - hazing is hazing? There are no different degrees of hazing but from what we are to understand the

administration is using a sliding scale to determine punishment. But once again - hazing is hazing.

Let me take this one step further. Let's say there is a cadet who put a hot substance in a freshman's eyes or mouth and on top of that hits a cadet. Is this considered hazing? Would this cadet be punished by dismissal or expulsion or would they receive a battalion transfer with tours? As a parent reading the definition of hazing I can see where this would be grounds for charges. There is no gray area on this behavior -it's clearly in black and white. Even with this type of behavior are cadets afforded the opportunity of remaining at the school because on a floating scale it only happened once? If it happened say 5 or more times would it be grounds for dismissal? Once again my thought reading the law on hazing - hazing is hazing.

4) Is "branding" considered hazing per the guidelines?

5) Are the cadre allowed to use push-ups as punishment?

6) Why were the cadets not allowed to have legal representation at their hearings?

Thank you,
Dianne Reed

On May 6, 2015, at 9:07 AM, Mark C. Brandenburg <brandenburm1@citadel.edu> wrote:

Ms. Reed

I inadvertently omitted the Resolution of the Board of Visitors from 1912. I have attached it to this email. My apologies.

Mark

Mark C. Brandenburg

General Counsel

The Citadel, The Military College of South Carolina

171 Moultrie Street

Charleston, SC 29409

(843) 953-5252 (office)

(843) 953-5509 (facsimile)

mark.brandenburg@citadel.edu <<mailto:mark.brandenburg@citadel.edu>>

The information transmitted in this message is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender, destroy any printed copies, and delete the material from any computer

IF YOU ARE THE INTENDED RECIPIENT OF THIS E-MAIL AND IT CONTAINS THE CAPTION "PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL" YOU MAY NOT FORWARD THIS MESSAGE TO ANY OTHER PARTY WHATSOEVER WITHOUT THE PRIOR CONSENT OF THE OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL.

From: Mark C. Brandenburg

Sent: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 5:00 PM

To: 'Dianne's Work'

Cc: 'm.steele82@me.com <<mailto:m.steele82@me.com>>'; John W. Rosa; Eugene Paluso

Subject: RE: College Response to Request for For Reconsideration From Cadet Jonathan Reed

Ms. Reed

I apologize that I have not responded to your emails earlier.

As you request, I am attaching an excerpt from your son's disciplinary file. This document is the acknowledgment of hazing which he signed in August of 2012. I am not providing the remainder of his file at this time. Although he executed a FERPA release in August of 2012, he did not identify the person or persons to whom records can be released. If he will execute a revised release, specifically identifying you as a recipient, I will be happy to provide you with additional documents from that file. In anticipation of such a release, though, I advise you that the cadets' disciplinary files do not include "all the training" cadets receive. Thus, I recommend you review the training documents which are available on The Citadel's website, under the Operations and Training section of the Commandant's webpage.
<<http://www.citadel.edu/root/operations-and-training/commandant-training>>

Further, I am attaching a copy of the POIs for the Fourth Class, Cadre, and Leadership Training Program. These documents prescribed the schedules of training for these respective groups last fall. In other words, these documents show the depth and diversity of the training The Citadel provides to each of these groups of cadets, each year. I recognize that your son was not a freshman last fall, but nonetheless, this schedule is very similar to the schedule he would have followed in 2012-2013. On the other hand, as a member of the training cadre last year, your son did attend the training reflected in the Cadre Orientation and LTP documents.

In a subsequent email, you have requested "the hazing policy in regards to the standpoint of the administration." In particular, you indicate you are "interested in seeing the training and policy the administration receives." I refer you, first, to the *College Regulations*, and in particular, Section IV, Paragraph 11.a, which provides the school's definition of hazing. The *College Regulations* is The Citadel's governing document, approved and promulgated by the Board of Visitors. It is available on the school's website at: <<http://www.citadel.edu/root/images/BOV/Policies/01-bov/college-regulations.pdf>> (As an aside, I note that the school's definition of hazing is

nearly identical to the definition adopted by the Board of Visitors in 1912, as seen in the attached resolution from the Board of Visitors. That definition has remained consistent for over 100 years.)

I further refer you to the Blue Book, available on the Commandant's website at this link: <<http://www.citadel.edu/root/images/Commandant/blue-book.pdf>> The Blue Book contains the day to day regulations for the Corps of Cadets.

The Assistant Commandant reviews the Blue Book in depth with the Company and Battalion TAC officers during training each summer. Cadets are required to know the contents of the Blue Book and the *College Regulations*, and "ignorance of the rules is not an acceptable excuse for taking actions contrary to the regulation." (Paragraph 1.2.1.5). The definition of hazing contained in the *College Regulations* is reiterated in Paragraph 1.4.3. I also refer you to Section 3.10.1, which provides, in relevant part:

Push-ups may be assigned **ONLY** by the individual Fourth Class Cadet's Chain of Command (the Company Commander, Platoon Leader, First Sergeant, Platoon Sergeant, Squad Leader **who will perform** the push-ups with the Fourth Class Cadet. **The maximum time for the completion of 20 push-ups is no longer than 1 minute. This is extended to 30 pushups in the Spring Semester when authorized by the Regimental Commander. ... A space of 30 minutes must be observed between push-up sets. Push-ups may not be assigned during designated study periods (MSP, ASP, ESP) or periods of General Leave. Push-ups will not be done in cadet rooms.**

(Bold in original; underlining added).

Last, I refer you to the Citadel Training Model materials, on which the TAC officers also received training, extensively, last summer, in preparation for this academic year.

<<http://www.my.citadel.edu/root/images/Commandant/Bowman/Leadership-Development-Training/citadel-training-manual-4apr2014.pdf>>

I am including a copy of the resolution passed by the Board of Visitors at its meeting on April 25, 2015, which unanimously supported the recent efforts of