

Report to
Faculty, Administration, Trustees, Students
of the United States Naval Academy

Prepared following analysis of the institution's
Periodic Review Report

First Reviewer
Dr. Gregory von Lehmen
Provost
University of Maryland University College

Second Reviewer
Dr. Neil B. Weissman
Provost and Dean of the College
Dickenson College

30 July 2011
Evaluation of the Periodic Review Report of
The United States Naval Academy

I. Introduction

The US Naval Academy was established by an act of Congress and today has 4,400 midshipmen. Its mission is "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".

The Periodic Review Report provides a discussion of the institution's progress since the Naval Academy's decennial team visit in 2006 and its progress letter of 2007. The PRR indicates that it is the product of faculty and staff volunteers, representing both the active-duty and civilian sides of the institution. Extensive documentation was provided with the Report, providing deep coverage in some areas.

The Report is candid and reflects an institution that continues to measure itself against the Standards of Excellence while working to meet new requirements stemming from the Department of Defense and the Department of the Navy. The PRR makes clear that the Academy struggles with the instability of the federal budget process and resource shortfalls that impact staffing and facility needs. Nonetheless, the Report reflects a vital organization that is actively engaged with its challenges, that has significantly strengthened its core capacity for assessment and institutional effectiveness and that is making progress in addressing some infrastructure, staffing, compensation and other needs.

II. Responses to Recommendations from the Previous Decennial Evaluation

This section first considers the recommendations by the 2006 visiting team and then provides an overview of the actions taken by the institution in reference to its self-recommendations.

MSCHE Recommendation for Standard 3: Institutional Resources

"Frame the funding problems under the MSCHE guidelines for outcomes assessment and other requirements to clearly outline the issues to DON so that short and long-term accreditation requirements and issues are clear. "

As indicated in the discussion of Chapter Four below, the Academy has worked with the Department of the Navy to re-baseline its budget to meet the needs of the USNA's core mission. *The reviewers acknowledge the efforts that the Academy has made to represent its need for additional resources and recommend that the Academy continue to do so, especially in areas such as facilities and staffing where deficiencies may raise issues of accreditation.*

MSCHE Recommendation for Standard 7: Institutional Assessment.

"Establish a comprehensive, integrated institution-wide written assessment plan as both a framework and goal for the Strategic Assessment Plan to meet the criteria of MSCHE Standard 7

(and 14) and report progress in developing and implementing the plan no later than 01 April 2007.”

The institution provides extensive attachments to its PRR demonstrating that it responded in a detailed and appropriate manner to the 01 April 2007 reporting requirement (Enclosure 2.01). The Academy has continued to implement and even to improve its assessment plan as it discovered the need for further articulation of the conceptual framework on which the plan was built (Enclosures 2.02 – 2.06).

The reviewers agree that the Naval Academy has made the recommendation under Standards 7 and 14 an institutional priority and that the response meets the recommendation as stated. The reviewers provide additional comments in section five below.

MSCHE Recommendation for Standard 10: Faculty

"It is recommended that the Academy study the current situation for the library and other support staff, particularly technicians in the engineering and science laboratories, and develop a long-range plan for adequate staffing into the future, including replacements resulting from retirements and resignations."

The 2006 Team Report indicates that the foregoing "factors combined have the potential to make the current situation much more serious in the future" (p 16). The PRR indicates that "[i]n 2007, a thorough, zero-based assessment of the requirement for technical staff in support of engineering and science laboratories was conducted, providing a documented foundation for future requests for augmentation of technical staff support" (p6). It also indicates that the "Director of the Nimitz Library has also conducted a zero-based study of staffing levels" and that regarding support staff in general, "discussions are currently underway, in collaboration with the Academy's Director of Human Resources, to develop a more robust administrative structure" (p6).

With respect to actions taken, the PRR indicates that there was a small increase in the engineering and science technical support staff but that "budgetary circumstances have led to further erosion" (p6). The Academy is attempting to address the need for these staff within the context of the Navy's long-term budgetary planning process in relation to the broader STEM initiatives of the institution. The Report states that a small increase in library staffing has ultimately been sustained and that "efforts are underway to fill other key positions" (p6). It appears from the narrative that other staffing increases for support staff have not been "possible to accomplish.. due to budget constraints" (p6).

The reviewers acknowledge the persistent efforts represented in the PRR to address needs under Standard 10 and recommend that that the Academy continue to make strong efforts to achieve approved and funded plans to meet the identified needs.

MSCHE Recommendation for Standard 11: Educational Offerings.

"The library, which was constructed in 1973, is in need of extensive renovation. A facility plan to upgrade the facility must be undertaken soon or the USNA risks undermining its strong educational offerings. "

The Report includes the Academy's "Revised Facilities Master Plan - Revised December 2010" (Enclosure 2.07). The document indicates that the RFP for the Nimitz library was to be completed in FY 2011, the design work in FY 2012 and completion of the renovation through FY 2017. The Report indicates that the "plan remains on track" (p7).

The reviewers commend the progress, referenced elsewhere in this document, that the Navy has made to address the physical infrastructure of the Academy and recommend that the plan for the library be kept on track despite the fact that "as projects progress, funding lines change, and the needs of the Navy and Marine Corps change, this [Facilities Master] plan will change over time" (Enclosure 2.07).

Recommendations Made by the Institution.

The PRR identifies 103 numbered self-recommendations. These span all 14 Standards of Excellence. *The reviewers are satisfied that the Academy has appropriately and adequately addressed in some manner most of its self-recommendations.*

The institution has not been able to address a number of the self-recommendations due to tight budgets (e.g. 10-120, 10-21 [Provide more release time for faculty assuming more committee assignments] and 10-10 [Funding of Naval Academy Research grants. Two self-recommendations are identified without explanation as items that simply will not be acted on (Self-Recommendations 12-7 [Consider whether to prescribe a minimum academic performance level in the core curriculum] and 12-17 [Consider formal instruction in software]). *The reviewers suggest that the institution as a matter of record close out these items with an explanation.*

The reviewers find much to commend in the responses to the self-recommendations. These include the attention given to governance (4-3, 4-4, 10-11 and 14-3); the commitment to two additional professional positions for the Academy Effectiveness Board (AEB) (7-1) as well as other efforts in relation to Standard 14 (14-1 - 14-5); the research and analysis undertaken with respect to student success (8-6, 8-13, 8-16, 8-17); the progress in diversifying the student body (8-7, 8-8, 8-9, 8-10, 8-11, 8-12), faculty and staff (6-1); and the progress in addressing faculty salaries (10-18, 10-19).

Two responses are especially underscored for commendation given the predominant budgetary challenge to the institution. These are the review of the right mix of majors and minors (11-2, 11-3) and consideration of the role of technology in the education process (12-15). To the extent to which the USNA has the freedom to make changes, the questions of concerning what a 'right-sized' academic inventory might look like in light of budget constraints are good questions.

Elsewhere in the Report, it is indicated that there are ever new content demands on the Academy's existing curricula which the institution has attempted to manage by incorporation within the existing curricular structure. It may be time for the Academy with its faculty to undertake a review of its curricula from the ground up, starting with program outcomes and working backwards through programs and courses to include needed learning outcomes and other content as part of the original program design instead of meeting needs by accretion.

Consequently, the reviewers suggest that the institution continue comprehensive examination of its curricula against its mission and strategic plan with the Faculty Senate and the departments.

Second, given the pressures on facilities, the reviewers also suggest that the Academy consider, again with the faculty and its governance structure, whether the selective use of online course delivery, in hybrid or completely online formats, could be a solution to relieve some pressure on facilities.

III. Major Challenges and Opportunities

The PRR organizes its discussion of challenges and opportunities under the 14 MSCHE Standards of Excellence. Within each standard, the challenges and opportunities are framed with respect to the institution's strategic plan. This review has organized its discussion in fidelity to interconnections that exist within the PRR narrative itself.

Standard 1 (Mission and Goals), Standard 2 (Planning and Institutional Renewal)
Standard 7 (Institutional Assessment) and Standard 14 (Assessment of Student Learning)

The USNA has a new strategic plan (Strategic Plan 2020) that was the result of a three-year process that allowed input from all stakeholders. The Report notes that "the document makes possible long-term continuity in an institution characterized by regular military turnover in key leadership positions" while acknowledging that the challenge is actually "ensuring its continued use when making organizational decisions and changes" (p23). To support continuity of execution at some level the USNA has established the Academy Effectiveness Board (AEB). Described in more detail below, the AEB is a permanent structure "charged with institutional assessment" and "evaluates effectiveness across all three major aspects (moral, mental, physical) of the USNA mission and monitors the implementation of the strategic plan" (p23).

The Report underscores that it is committed to external standards to ensure the currency and quality of its academic programs. The USNA participates in LEAP and maintains special accreditation for selected programs through EAC, ABET and ACS. Its program of assessment is also responsive to these other agencies.

The opportunities identified in the Report include the following:

Expanding the scope and rigor of assessment. The Report states that the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) and the AEB have been very effective in certain areas of assessment, such as using outcomes from STEM programs to improve the Naval Academy's Preparatory School (NAPS). The SLT and the AEB have the opportunity to "make the institution even more effective by applying this plan of action more widely" (p26). The PRR notes that the SLT could provide more guidance on "what institutional-level analyses are needed" (p26) and that the AEB should continue "to develop the appropriate assessment tools to analyze how well the USNA's undergraduates are progressing" toward learning outcomes that the Academy has identified as critical (p26). The Report indicates that the academic departments have completed the process of curricular alignment, created formal timelines for assessment and identified assessment tools. But it states that the institution could benefit from more detailed guidance from the AEB, given

the variation in the assessment tools and in the quality of data (p30). Finally, with respect to student learning, the Report points to the need to formally integrate information and library literacy into the institution's assessment of student learning. The reviewers note that this is an essential learning outcome identified by Standard 11, and in fact the PRR recognizes that "information literacy is critical to several of the USNA's graduate attributes" (p30).

Continued implementation of metrics more widely across the institution to enhance institutional effectiveness and student success. The USNA is committed to recruiting a more diverse student population and therefore has the opportunity to conduct ongoing analysis that will identify what factors correlate with these students' success. Similarly, data on the use of tutoring and other student services would assist the Naval Academy in assessing the impact of these services and how they might be improved. Tracking information literacy mentioned above would also assist the library in focusing its initiatives and resources. The Report suggests that an analysis of Department of the Navy policies and how they impact choice of majors by students could help the Naval Academy better focus its resources to achieve Navy goals.

The reviewers suggest that the Academy incorporate information literacy into its assessment plan at the nearest opportunity as it continues to deploy its learning outcomes assessment plan.

The reviewers commend the Naval Academy for its active program of research in student success and suggest that it accelerate the process of building out its institutional effectiveness system by adding metrics that target tutoring and other student services described in this and other parts of the Report.

Standard 3 (Institutional Resources), Standard 4 (Leadership and Governance), Standard 5 (Administration)

The PRR highlights the challenges of funding, staffing and facilities that it discusses in more depth in Chapter Four and that are summarized below. The reviewers note the efforts made by the Naval Academy to establish indirect cost recovery for reimbursable grants to support faculty grants administration and the success in expanding wireless access across campus to enable students to use laptops and reduce the need for computer lab facilities.

A challenge in leadership and administration focused by the PRR involves communication: reducing the stovepiping of information, effectively communicating changes that stem from the relatively frequent rotation of senior leaders and fully realizing the practical business processes of sharing assessment information. The PRR indicates that there are positive developments in these areas with senior leaders, the AEB and faculty governance all making efforts to coordinate in improved ways and to share information. The Report offers evidence to substantiate the efforts in learning outcomes assessment.

Standard 8 (Student Admissions and Retention) and Standard 9 (Student Support Services)

The Report presents evidence that USNA has taken steps to widen its recruitment to ensure the diversity and geographic distribution of its student population. This has involved a variety of national, regional and local tactics including a summer seminar program for rising high school

seniors and a STEM camp. For the 2015 admissions cycle, the Naval Academy reported a record high 19,000 applications for 1,220 admitted freshman.

To support its students, the USNA identifies a variety of support services, such as the Writing Center, the Chemistry Resource Room, the Theodore J. Banc Mathematics Lab, the Class of 1963 Center for Academic Excellence and others. The PRR provides evidence of a commitment to improve these services. In 2010, the Academy commissioned an external team to review the Class of 1963 Center for Academic Excellence, the recommendations were received, a new center director was appointed, and the Report states that additional funds are currently being sought to support the center.

Two opportunities are identified by the Report:

Creation of a structure to coordinate student services and to implement a uniform system of data collection and metrics. The PRR mentions that these services are staff intensive and suggests that there is some duplication of effort. Consequently, it describes the need for a mechanism to supervise these services at the institutional level, to institute a common reporting system and to improve "follow through" with underrepresented students.

The need for expanded services. The Report links this opportunity to the increasing diversity of the entering classes. The opportunity includes both faculty training as well as targeted student services.

Standard 6 (Integrity), Standard 10 (Faculty), Standard 11 (Educational Offerings), Standard 13 (Related Educational Activities)

Challenges with respect to faculty are reviewed in more detail below. There is evidence that the USNA has tried to address full-time faculty compensation issues by defining the issue for the Navy, particularly for full professors, and by obtaining an increase from the Navy in the number of full-time military faculty, phased over time, to rebalance the faculty and to reduce reliance on adjuncts (Enclosure 2.09).

The PRR notes that the USNA has responded to Navy and Marine Corps directives (as captured in its own strategic plan) by making its Languages, Regional Expertise and Culture (LREC) program more robust and by supporting this growth through additional faculty. To expand student exposure to foreign cultures the USNA has established and funded an International Programs Office to facilitate experiences with foreign navies. It has devised an experimental elective course which it has offered and now will convert to permanent status. Through its Center for Middle East and Islamic Studies, the Academy provides lectures. Student participation in international travel and language/cultural immersion experiences has been supported through "a significant augmentation of funds" (p29). Beyond the emphasis on LREC, the USNA is preparing to address the cybersecurity education needs of the Navy with additional curricula and requesting additional facilities. The challenge that the USNA has lies in prioritizing the list of growing enhancements to its educational mission, so that they can be reasonably achieved within an already demanding curriculum.

As part of its core mission, the Academy promotes the moral development of its students. According to the PRR a new honor code was adopted by the Naval Academy. The Report indicates that to more effectively promote the character development of students "across the spectrum of their lives" a reorganization has divided responsibility for character training and leadership, respectively.

The Naval Academy's athletic programs are integral to the mission of the institution and are conducted for that purpose. Consequently, players are recruited first and foremost to be future officers with academic achievement given the same priority as for any other student. The PRR indicates that a very high percentage (85%) of USNA players are commissioned. The Report describes a number of challenges concerning organization, recruitment of coaches at salaries the Naval Academy can offer and some facility needs. Overall, the Report regards these programs as one of the USNA's "notable strengths". As discussed below, there is evidence that the facility needs are already being addressed.

IV. Enrollment and Finance Trends and Projections

The Academy is funded principally by the federal government in appropriations that come through the Department of Defense and the Department of the Navy. The students at the Naval Academy do not pay tuition. The upper limit of the enrollment at the Naval Academy is established by Congress while the number of admissions from year to year within this ceiling is determined by the Chief of Naval Personnel. The Academy seeks funding that is consistent with these enrollments. From 1999 to 2010, its student population grew by 14%. This growth has slowed in recent years to about 3% over the period 2006 – 2010 (Enclosure 4.04). In addition to appropriated funds, the USNA relies on variety of other funding sources, including private sources.

The Superintendent of the Naval Academy does not have direct control over all of the human and financial resources related to operation and maintenance. The number of active-duty instructors and other staff at the Naval Academy is determined by the personnel chiefs within the Navy and the Marine Corps. Control over the funds used for "support, sustainment, restoration, and modernization" of the physical infrastructure lies with the Commander, Naval Installations Command (CNIC).

The PRR emphasizes three large points about the Academy's finances over the last five years.

The attention to infrastructure has been substantial. This includes the construction of a new field house and the renovation of dining and crew facilities, respectively. The risk of deferred maintenance on the physical plant in general has been significantly reduced. For the two oldest academic buildings on campus, a multi-year plan for their restoration is in place. A newly identified need is a building to provide faculty offices, classrooms and equipment to support a recently added academic program in cybersecurity.

The operating budget continues to be challenged. There is funding uncertainty that results from the federal budget process. Even in the best of circumstances, it is difficult for the Naval Academy to predict what its appropriation will be. Additionally, it frequently finds itself

operating under continuing resolutions. Because these are based on the previous fiscal year, they create a funding scenario that is out of sync with operating costs which have risen about 3.5% annually and have cumulatively contributed to a budgetary shortfall.

The Report indicates that the pressure on the operating budget is a function of several variables. One is the increase in the number of students from year to year. Another is a decline in the number of active-duty faculty resulting from decisions made in other parts of the Navy and Marine Corps. The USNA aims for a 50/50 split between active-duty and civilian instructors. The salaries of active-duty instructors are paid by the Navy or Marine Corps unit from which they come and not by the Academy. Currently, more than 60% of the instructional staff are civilian, which weighs more heavily on the labor component of the budget that the Academy does control and has resulted in greater reliance on adjunct faculty. This pressure has been magnified in two ways: by the USNA's emphasis on STEM-related disciplines, including new ones like cybersecurity, for which faculty salaries are highly competitive and by Congressionally mandated merit and COLA which have not been not been fully met as an obligation through appropriations. Other operating expenses have increased each year, such as the cost of library serial subscriptions.

In response to the challenge of escalating costs, the Navy and the Academy have taken concrete steps toward corrective action. Most fundamentally, the "Navy leadership" has undertaken a fundamental review of the Naval Academy's budget. The aim of this effort has been to "rebaseline" the operating budget to better reflect what the Naval Academy realistically needs to meet its core mission. While not yet approved, the rebaselined plan would result in a significant increase in USNA's operating budget starting in FY 2012. Second, the Academy's leadership has moved in the direction of greater transparency with all of its faculty and staff. It is doing this both by sharing validated financial information and by trying to involve these stakeholders in facing the trade-offs that are part of budgetary decision-making under constrained resources. Third, it has been working with the larger Navy and Marine Corps and anticipates a rebalancing of its instructional staff to 50/50 officers and civilians. Fourth, given the complexity of its funding sources, the USNA has tightened aspects of its financial management, implementing guidance provided by the Inspector General and through related audits. With respect to future budgets, the Report is nonetheless cautious noting that

The current environment is particularly challenging as the Department of the Navy grapples with funding ongoing combat operations, recapitalizing the force, and meeting ever increasing personnel costs while at the same time dealing with ongoing Defense Department cuts. The Navy's ability to plan, budget, and assess must always be considered in light of this complex environment and competition for federal resources (p45).

V. Assessment Processes and Plans: Standards 7 and 14

The reference for the Academy's assessment processes is its *Strategic Plan 2020: Leaders to Serve the Nation*, which was published last year and endorsed by the new Superintendent (Enclosure 2.03). The Plan identifies the seven key attributes of a USNA graduate and four

priority goals (exemplary people, integrated programs, vibrant enterprise, and value added outreach) which are articulated into a number of imperatives and initiatives. This plan follows four others, starting with the first strategic plan in 1992.

Chapter Five and its related enclosures (administrative memoranda, report templates, etc) create a full picture that captures the organizational structure and business processes associated with the implementation of the plan. At the Academy "it is the responsibility of the Academy Effectiveness Board (AEB)...to monitor and improve the Naval Academy's overall effectiveness and report to the Superintendent" (Enclosure 2.04). The AEB is a permanent subcommittee of the USNA's Senior Leadership Team and is co-chaired by senior leaders of the Academy.

With respect to Standard 14 and learning outcomes assessment, the Report's Enclosure 5.04 provides evidence that the seven key attributes of a Naval Academy graduate have been mapped across each of the Academy's four academic divisions. Courses within each division have been identified that implicitly or explicitly support those attributes. The faculty within the divisions are responsible for devising appropriate measures. The Naval Academy has created the Faculty Senate Assessment Committee (FASC) to be an active reviewer of the outcomes assessment work and to be the partner of the AEB in evolving the Academy's outcome assessment program.

The Report indicates that a number of different approaches are used by the divisions for assessment of learning, including common exams, use of rubrics, and rubrics. To assess content knowledge, some departments encourage their students to take examinations created by special accrediting bodies or the ETS. The institution has also administered both the NSSE and the FSSE in 2005 and 2008 and the NSSE again in spring 2011. Going forward, the Academy will conduct both surveys on a three-year cycle. Enclosure 5.03 offers a summary of the 2005/2008 administrations. The PRR indicates that the results were compared with those at the other two military academies. Most importantly, Enclosure 5.05 provides nine examples of closing the loop where assessment data were used to make curricular changes, even if the data in five of those cases are from student surveys and are not outcomes data strictly speaking. To build an appropriate baseline for the assessment of complete academic programs, the AEB is collecting performance data from Navy and Marine Corps units to which Academy graduates are assigned.

Standard 7 expects that the institution will have "documented, organized and sustained assessment processes to evaluate and improve the total range of programs and services; achievement of institutional mission, goals and plans". In its response to the Team Recommendation under Standard 7, the PRR points to evidence that the Academy is attentive to institutional effectiveness more broadly understood. The institution has created a conceptually integrated view of the student life cycle (Enclosure 2.05) that both links the strategic plan's imperatives and defining initiatives to phases of the life cycle and helps direct data gathering and assessment that the Academy should be doing.

The Report offers evidence that a broader program of institutional effectiveness is operational if still unfolding under the aegis of the AEB. For example, it is a strategic imperative of the 2020 Plan that the USNA "recruit, admit and graduate" a more diverse student population. In response, the Academy has conducted baseline research to improve its preparatory program for candidates who are promising but not yet ready for admission. Guided by its findings, the Academy has

reshaped its preparatory program with evidence that it results in higher persistence. Similarly, the Academy is conducting research on achievement gap and student success issues (Enclosure 2.06). Looking ahead, the Report indicates that over the next several years the institution's goals are to refine its achievement gap research and its performance data on graduates and to monitor other aspects of the 2020 Plan. In Chapter Three, the Report points to opportunities to expand its monitoring and assessment activity. Likewise, in Chapter Six, the PRR notes that the Academy "is currently developing a set of metrics to measure performance objectives laid out in the strategic imperatives and defined by the attributes of graduates". (p48)

The reviewers commend the USNA for the evident progress that it has made in creating a learning outcomes assessment program that produces documented curricular change. Clearly, the Academy has built functioning structures and routines, involving faculty, to drive its learning outcomes assessment program forward. This is not to say that there is not more work to be done. The Report notes that progress is uneven across some departments, that not as many faculty are involved as would be desired and that metrics and data must be improved. But the Academy is conscious of these areas of opportunity which should not diminish the pride that it can take in its accomplishments to date.

The reviewers recommend that the USNA accelerate its development of a comprehensive institutional effectiveness program with a view to producing a dashboard of key indicators across all major goals and initiatives of the institution, including those identified as opportunities in Chapter Three.

VI. Evidence of Linked Institutional Planning and Budgeting Processes: Standard 2

The PRR acknowledges that “[t]he key to the Academy’s ability to form an effective link among plans, budget and assessments rests with the development and execution of a comprehensive strategic plan” (p45). Within the Academy, the Deputy for Finance is directly responsible for working with the cost centers at the Academy to align the budgeting and allocation of resources with the plan. Final budgets are reviewed by the Senior Leadership Team and approved by the Superintendent.

The Report provides a case study showing how resources have already followed the 2020 Plan. The Plan incorporates the goal of developing “adaptable individuals who understand and appreciate global and cross-cultural dynamics”. The PRR describes how DoD directed funds to the Academy for this goal. This included a one-time provision of \$10 million for facilities and \$3.22 million annually for the program's operational needs. The Academy used the funds to establish a new International Programs Office to facilitate study abroad experiences for Academy students, to strengthen the Academy’s language, regional expertise and cultural awareness programs and to establish majors in Chinese and Arabic with appropriate support in the way of facilities and faculty.

In reviewing versions of the Academy's strategic plans since the team visit and comparing them to the PRR narrative, it appears that the Academy's activity has aligned with the plans in other ways.

VII. Conclusion

Since the 2006 Team Visit, the USNA has made impressive strides in addressing Standards 7 and 14. The Report gives evidence not only of structures and business processes but also of closing the loop actions to improve persistence, learning outcomes and the alignment of Academy education with Navy and Marine Corps needs, for example. A key accomplishment is the creation of the Academy Effectiveness Board to provide the Academy with a durable center of gravity for its assessment and institutional effectiveness activities. The Academy continues to make efforts to meet the staff support needs for the library and engineering and science labs under Standard 10 and provides evidence that the Navy is moving to address the library facility itself (Standard 11), as it has with other facilities of the Academy. The USNA has devoted attention to its many self-recommendations, addressing most of them in some measure. It has taken steps to address faculty needs, including salaries below the rank of full professor, to share information more widely across the institution and to involve faculty governance in decision-making. It appears from a review of the current and strategic plans of the past five years that Academy resources follow strategic goals. Certainly, fiscal constraints remain a challenge (Standard 3). However, while funding continues to be uncertain, at least the Academy has involved the Navy in producing a rebaselined budget proposal to make clear what resources it needs to effectively meet the expectations of the Navy, MSCHE and its other stakeholders. In general, the PRR paints the picture of an institution that is focused on its mission and strategic plan and that is both tenacious and thoughtful in its approach to its challenges.