

EXHIBIT 1

Redacted DoD Inspector General Report

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

January 13, 2021

SUBJECT: Captain Curt Cizek (the Complainant), United States Air Force, Chaplain, 20th Fighter Wing, Shaw Air Force Base, SC. Request for reconsideration, DCATS 20150107-029317-CASE-02.

1. References:

- a. 10 U.S.C. 1034, Protected Communications, Prohibition of Retaliatory Personnel Actions (Military Whistleblower Protection Act) as of November 3, 2020
- b. DoDD 7050.06, "Military Whistleblower Program," dated April 17, 2015
- c. Report of Investigation (ROI) for Allegations of Reprisal – Captain Curt J. Cizek, (ACTS FRNO 2014-22818/DCATS #20150107-029317)
- d. Guide to Investigating Military Whistleblower Reprisal and Restriction Complaints, dated April 18, 2017.
- e. CIGIE Quality Standards for Investigations, dated November 15, 2011.

2. **Scope:** The scope of this case review included a review of Ref (c), a sworn and record interview with the Complainant, and a review of documentary evidence that the Complainant termed "new and compelling."
3. **Standards:** According to Ref(d) Chapter 3 and Ref(e): "The Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (CIGIE) "Quality Standards for Investigations," dated November 2011, establishes the professional standards and principles for investigators of the Federal Offices of Inspectors General. CIGIE standards require that investigators conduct investigations in a timely, efficient, thorough, and objective manner" (p. 3-1).
4. **Background:** This case originated at Joint Base San Antonio – Lackland (JBSA-Lackland), Texas, in the November / December 2012 timeframe where the Complainant was assigned as a Chaplain, Basic Military Training (BMT) Squadron, 502nd Air Base Wing. In April 2013, while assigned to BMT, the Complainant reported what he reasonably believed was an ethics/integrity violation to multiple members of his chain of command involving the reading of trainee end-of-course surveys in violation of the Air Force "Little Blue Book," on core values dated January 1, 1997.

On May 31, 2013, the Complainant was removed from his BMT position, reassigned to the Installation Chaplain's office and on June 21, 2013, issued a letter of counseling (LOC) regarding his removal from BMT. From June 2013 to Jan 2014, the Complainant was deployed in support of on-going combat operations. While deployed in theater, the Complainant filed an IG complaint alleging that he was removed from his BMT position, received a LOC and received a weak OPR (Aug 2013), for reporting ethics/integrity violations to members of his chain of command. Later, the Air Force Education and Training Command IG determined that the Complainant's removal from his BMT position and LOC were not personnel actions and that his August 2013 OPR was issued before he made protected communications¹. However, ACTS FRNO 2014-22818 ROI did annotate that that the Complainant's "LOC is considered a UPA [unfavorable personnel action] because it was placed in the PIF [personnel information file] and the contents of a PIF are to be considered by raters when preparing performance evaluations IAW [in accordance with] AFI 36-2404, Officer and Enlisted Evaluation Systems." On March 26, 2014, the Complainant received a second LOC for "failure to properly utilize [the] chain of command" and later on June 18, 2014, he received his officer performance report for June 16, 2013, through May 27, 2014, and his promotion recommendation which the Complainant stated was unfavorable and in reprisal for his protected communications.

¹ ACTS case notes documented the following: "that due to ongoing issues in BMT reading the end of course surveys was appropriate. No violation was noted."

The Complainant was separated from the Air Force on after his assignment at Shaw AFB after not being selected for promotion. WRI conducted an oversight review of this ROI and approved its findings as not substantiated on August 2, 2016.

5. **BLUF:** (b) (5) [Redacted]

6. **Recommendation:** (b) (5) [Redacted]

7. **Report of Investigation Observations:**

Thoroughness:

a. **Investigative plan:** (b) (5) [Redacted]

b. **Report of Investigation (ROI):** (b) (5) [Redacted]

c. **Subject Interviews:** (b) (5) [Redacted]

Below are some examples extracted from the witness' testimony:

1. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) testimony:

IO: Did you ever talk to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) about Capt Cizek in those first few days of your assuming that role?

S: No. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

IO: Okay. Do you know what year that was or approximate month?

S: The end of 2013. Probably in August maybe.

IO: You said he was preparing to deploy at that point?

S: Yes.

IO: Did, all right, so you indicate (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) concerning that, at that point in time, is that correct?

S: Yes. I believe so.

2. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) Testimony:

IO: Okay. What was your relationship with Capt Curt Cizek?

S: When I arrived at Lackland (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) Chaplain Cizek was one of the CGOs on staff at Lackland. He was deployed at the time when I arrived.

IO: And that position (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) is that correct? And again who informed you of this?

S: This was (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

IO: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) So all of this that you referred to so far came to you from (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

S: Yes. It did.

IO: So (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) his request for extension was based solely on that need as opposed to anything that you had heard about Capt Cizek?

S: Oh, of course.

IO: So that was the first time that you had learned that he had filed an Inspector General complaint?

S: I believe it is sir.

IO: An IG complaint.

S: Yes.


8. Other observations: (b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

9. Point of contact for this memorandum for record is the undersigned at (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), or by e-mail at (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)@dodig.mil.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)



Whistleblower Reprisal Investigations