

From: Dianne Reed
Sent: 4/23/2015 4:12:59 PM
To: Rosa, John; sbernar@citadel.edu
Cc: wsteele@citadel.edu; dgoff@citadel.edu;
allisondeanlove@citadel.edu; pricef@citadel.edu; jsams@citadel.edu;
thooper@citadel.edu; pmccoy@citadel.edu; rnuttall@citadel.edu;
lpinson@citadel.edu; glapoint@citadel.edu; myerss@citadel.edu; mharrin1
@citadel.edu; Haley, Nikki; blivingston@gregoryelectric.com; Spearman, Molly
Subject: Re: Jonathan Reed - The Citadel - Sierra Company

Dear General Rosa and Lt. Col Robert
S
berna:

I am writing you both in regards to the recommendation of dismissal that Cadet Jonathan Reed has received due to a charge of hazing that was marked as "Proven" to which I am to understand came from a thorough investigation by the administration and followed up with a Class I hearing which was held on 3 March 2015. Lt.Col Serberna, you spoke with Jonathan's father via phone regarding this matter so it will prove frivolous to rehash the points the two of you discussed.

First, I would like to request all of Jonathan's records which should include detailed information from the investigation showing clear, concise and very specific details of the actions Jonathan performed that constitutes the definition of "hazing" as outlined in the Blue Book. I will assume from the stand point of the administration they will target the word "tyrannical" on the bullseye. If this be the case, I will ask that the charges against Jonathan show how he acted as a "horrible and oppressive" leader by having knobs do push-ups. Did the hazing charges originate from his knobs or did they originate after the knobs were called in to a meeting with Capt. Paluso?

The Citadel administration has failed to clearly communicate to the cadets by giving them a chance to uphold the core values of the school; this is proven with 85 cases of alleged hazing.

General Rosa on January 6, 2012 announced the creation of an Institutional Program Assessment Committee (IPAC). Reading a plethora of reports I understand the reason of its creation. My question is, were the recommendations brought forth by the selected individuals on these committee's taken to heart? If they were I do not believe our cadets and this administration would find themselves in the situation we have at hand.

Back on July 12, 2012 there was an IPAC report done on Discipline. In this report it stated many concerns with one conclusion in particular "*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"

Not stopping there it also stated "very few 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 practice ("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."

I again ask, how were these assessments handled? It is very apparent there had/has been concerns within the administration regarding multiple issues to include discipline but what information were the cadets given so they were afforded the opportunity to make the necessary improvements. Were the published regulations condensed in a manner where the rules were clear? Was there continued training from TAC and other officials on leadership and discipline? Were these cadets given the opportunity to prove themselves worthy of the rank they obtained? There have been mistakes made, but let me assure you it was not just by the cadets but by the administration as well.

What have we all learned from this? The Citadel is looking for a change and unfortunately up to this point have failed in doing so. Don't use these cadets as an example use them as a conduit to help create a more positive school environment.

Respectfully,

Dianne Reed