

From: Theresa Crepes
Sent: 9/21/2015 11:11:18 AM
To: Robert Maeyama
Cc: blivingston@gregoryelectric.com; John Sams;
Dylan@jamesmithpa.com; John W. Rosa; Gregory A. Lapointe - External Email;
Haley, Nikki; Spearman, Molly; compliance@citadel.edu; Mark C. Brandenburg;
Joe.Wilson@mail.house.gov
Subject: RE: Confusion and inconsistency between College Regulations and
Blue Book Regulations with respect to Discipline

Dear Robert,

Thank you for your very well stated response to Mr. Brandenburg. Like you, we are well aware that the current Citadel Administration did not fully investigate our son's situations. He has yet to be given a copy of the evidence package that was supposed to be submitted with his case. That package contained many letters from the students that he mentored over the summer stating that he did not do what he was accused of doing. Our sons were simply pawns in this new administration's game. The Citadel will soon graduate at least three years of upperclassmen who feel the administration betrayed them and they will feel no obligation to give back to the Citadel like some of the former Alumni have done. How truly sad it is to know that your Alma Mater, your "faithful mother", betrayed you in such a way. Moral among the upperclassmen is at a low point but if asked directly they would say exactly what the current administration wants them to say. The upperclassmen live in fear that the slightest error will cost them dearly like it has already cost so many of their fellow classmates.

We understood from the beginning that our son didn't stand a chance of being heard because he certainly could not speak for himself as evidenced by many events but primarily by Lt Col Sberna's admitted verbal attack. He feels his ERW was not even read. He denied the charge which was substantiated by many other students but no one followed up with the students. The administration was so bent on being right that they failed to properly investigate and now they refuse to admit they made a mistake. This is an insignificant matter for them but they failed to consider the larger impact their callousness would have on our sons' lives and how that callousness would perpetuate itself among the student body.

Thank you for speaking up for our son as well as yours.

Dean & Theresa Crepes

724 Vale Crest Drive

Leesville, SC 29070-7044

From: Robert Maeyama [mailto:bobmaeyama@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, September 21, 2015 6:52 AM

To: Mark C. Brandenburg

Cc: Major General Robert E. Livingston, Jr. (blivingston@gregoryelectric.com); John Sams; Dylan Goff (Dylan@jamesmithpa.com); John W. Rosa; Gregory A. Lapointe - External Email; nikkihaley@gov.sc.gov; mspearman@ed.sc.gov; compliance@citadel.edu

Subject: Re: Confusion and inconsistency between College Regulations and Blue Book Regulations with respect to Discipline

thank you mr.brandenburg for your reply. and specifically, thank you General Sams for your assistance and referral of this matter to the Strategy, Vision and Governance Committee during their normal course of review.

my 3 Sept Memo, Mr. Brandenburg, has nothing to do with the punishment of my son. the misapplication of the confusing cadet disciplinary system outlined in the Blue Book Regulations and the lack of an adequate hearing and appellate process for a cadet as well as the Citadel community, has made it's way through the administration, and, our son is currently serving his tours and has lost his rank and responsibilities within the corps of cadets. you and the administration have made it clear that we, as parents, will not be heard in this matter.

by the tone and content of your response, and, specifically, your continued reference to punishment administered to my son, i must conclude that you, as representative of The Citadel administration, have not reviewed our memo of 3 september to the Board of Visitors in detail, and, your email is non-responsive to my request.

by the referral to the SVG committee by gen sams, i am satisfied that a review by

the BOV will be conducted with regard to the Blue Book Regulations and it's consistency and compliance with the College Regulations.

i again will state our case that the issue is not with the College Regulations. i am in agreement with the BOV and you that the the general guidelines and responsibilities for disciplinary matters outlined within the College Regulations is logical and consistent with the core values of The Citadel. this is the regulation that requires compliance by all other rules and regulations promulgated and applied, including the Blue Book Regulations with regard to the corps of cadets during the academic year..

the issue is with the Chapter 6 of Blue Book Regulations regarding the administration of discipline within the Corps of Cadets. as you aware, the BOV is responsible for the College Regulations, and, the President, through the Provost and the Commandant of Cadets is responsible to publish the specific rules and regulations regarding the disciplinary system that applies to all cadets and students. of course, i would have preferred to have resolved this issue within the administration. however, we were not allowed a hearing on this matter and our request for hearing have been denied by the Assistant Commandant of Discipline, the Commandant of the Corps of Cadets, and, the President of the Citadel.

again, per the request for hearing and memo of 3 september 2015, my request deals with the inconsistency with respect to the cadet disciplinary system published in the Blue Book Regulations, and, that of the College Regulations.

simply put, the College Regulations Section V is clear regarding offenses to be included within the Citadel Disciplinary System for cadets and students:

1. Off-Campus Offenses, cadets who commit off campus acts that may be punished as if committed on campus.
2. Cadet Offenses, divided into three categories: Class I offenses, Class II offenses and Class III offenses, and
3. Offenses of Non-Cadet Students During the Academic Year and All students, including cadets, attending The Citadel Maymester/Summer School or Employed by The Citadel, that apply to students ***other than cadets during the academic year*** and to all students including cadets during Maymester/Summer School. These provisions also apply to students

employed by The Citadel.

Blue Book Regulations Chapter 6 regarding the cadet disciplinary system and offenses/punishments appears to attempt to combine all offenses into a single offense section:

1. CADET BEHAVIOR AND OFFENSES DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR, WHILE ON STUDY ABROAD, FURLOUGH, OR ATTENDING THE CITADEL SUMMER SCHOOL OR EMPLOYED BY THE CITADEL DURING SUMMER FURLOUGH.

the Blue Book Regulations combines all College Regulations Section V offenses and prescribes only Class I Offenses (this was amended by the Commandant in the middle of our appeal process). the reference to Class II and Class II offenses has been removed according to the Blue Book Regulations Change Sheet for Blue Book for 2015-2016 School Year (1 July 2015) and further confuses the consistency between the College Regulations and the Blue Book Regulations.

in addition, the Blue Book combines cadet offenses during the academic year and those of cadets other than during the academic year, cadets during Maymester/Summer School, or, employed by the Citadel. these have different offenses prescribed in the College Regulations, and, with respect to cadets employed by The Citadel, an employment contract that includes a specific disciplinary system while employed. The Blue Book prescribes all three College Regulations offenses under the cadet offenses during the academic year, which is inconsistent with the College Regulations that prescribe separate offenses depending on the status of the cadet or student.

regarding your response that "Specifically, the Board of Visitors does not have jurisdiction to hear appeals in cases such as this one." again, the 3 September memo deals specifically with the confusion between the College Regulations and Blue Book Regulations, not any specific punishment administered, to which i assume you refer. additionally, the College Regulations charges the SVG committee with responsibilities to "ensure the Institution's...Core Values", and, to "provide guidance and liaison for...governance between the Board of Visitors and the administration on behalf of the College. "

administration of discipline goes to the core values of the institution. confusion and inconsistency in it's administration of discipline reflects directly upon the core values of the Citadel.