United States Naval Academy Periodic Review Report

June 2011

Chapter One

Executive Summary

Chapter One
Executive Summary

Presidents routinely visit us. World leaders travel to our campus for Peace Conferences. Cabinet members deliver lectures here. We grow accustomed to dignitaries in our midst and important duties on our calendars. We know ourselves to be a top-tier academic institution, engaged in work of the most important kind; vital work that trains future leaders to protect our democracy.

But for all of that, we remain an undergraduate institution, providing a college education to over 4400 young men and women: The Brigade of Midshipmen. While we may crane our necks to glimpse a visiting President, we will not gaze too long; rather we will look at ourselves to see how we should improve. We continually monitor our improvement. Consistent with our status as a national, publicly-funded institution, contained and accountable within the Department of the Navy (DON) and the Department of Defense (DOD), the higher level goals and objectives linked to the Academy's mission are developed, reviewed, assessed, and refined in a broad context of both internal and external constituencies. Congress imposes statutory objectives upon the Academy. Both DOD and DON provide us with specific written guidance.

In developing this Periodic Review Report (PRR) we arranged the work in five major areas and recruited faculty and staff volunteers. We had ample civilian and military representation. Our military-civilian mix has been the unique strength of USNA since its inception in 1845. When the Civil War threatened to rip the nation and our school apart, we held together. When World War II inexorably demanded more officers than our routine matriculations could yield, we doubled our efforts and created two graduating classes in 1944. In 2003, when Tropical Storm Isabel flooded our buildings, we taught on a barge, rather than succumb to the temporary loss of classroom space.

The Naval Academy has a unique clarity of purpose, expressed in our mission: "To develop midshipmen morally, mentally and physically and to imbue them with the highest ideals of duty, honor and loyalty in order to graduate leaders who are dedicated to a career of naval service and have potential for future development in mind and character to assume the highest responsibilities of command, citizenship and government." In developing the Periodic Review Report, we always kept this mission clearly in mind.

And so, when the 2005 Middle States Report identified some challenges, we set to work. Chapter Two summarizes our efforts to implement the 2005 MSCHE visiting team recommendations and our own Self-Study recommendations. In particular, we discuss the charter, structure, and agenda of the Academic Effectiveness Board (AEB) created in response to the 2006 MSCHE Visiting Team Recommendation Requiring Follow-Up Action regarding Standard 7. We detail the development of the Attributes of Graduates, along with our plans to assess those attributes. Further, this chapter presents, in detail, our responses to the Self-Study recommendations. Here, as elsewhere in the report, the issue of inadequate staffing emerges. While the size of the Brigade of Midshipmen has steadily increased, the number of faculty and staff has not kept pace. Many of the issues related to budget constraints that are identified in Chapter Two are reiterated in subsequent chapters.

In Chapter Three, the Middle States' standards provide the context for considering our Challenges and Opportunities. As noted above, many of these are related to the timing and the amount of USNA funding. Chapter Four, Enrollment and Finance Trends and Projections, addresses USNA Finances in depth, identifying and detailing the multiple sources of USNA funding and the issues related to them. This chapter discusses required financial information included in the Chapter Four Appendix.

Chapter Five, Institutional and Academic Assessment, describes the development of a coordinated and consistent structure for conducting academic assessment linked to institutional effectiveness. Chapter Six, Linked Institutional Planning and Budgeting Process, outlines USNA's continued progress in aligning strategic planning, resource allocation and institutional renewal. USNA operates in a unique planning and budgeting environment. Integration of planning and budget must occur not only within the institution but also within the larger context of the Department of the Navy and the

Department of Defense. The current environment is particularly challenging as the DON grapples with funding, ongoing combat operations, recapitalizing the force and meeting ever increasing personnel costs. USNA's ability to plan, budget and assess must be considered in light of this complex environment and competition for federal sources.

The USNA 2010-2011 Middle States Institutional Profile is at the end of the PRR. The supporting documents listed as Enclosures in several of the PRR chapters are contained in a separate Appendix, as is the 2010-2011 USNA catalog.

This PRR presents a snapshot of who we are, a picture taken at a specific moment. Like any snapshot, it freezes what is in essence a far more dynamic reality. For example, as we submit this report a new field of study has emerged at USNA, cyber security. In response to the technological threat to our nation's security, we are adjusting our curriculum to prepare our students for the increasingly dangerous arena of cyberspace just as we once adjusted our curriculum to reflect the move from steam power to nuclear power ships. The needs of the nation have always influenced our work here. From its beginning in 1845, USNA military and civilian professors have offered midshipmen a rigorous and vibrant academic experience and a curriculum capable of adjusting to the needs of the nation. This PRR is but another step in the process of continuous improvement.