

## **Benchmarking Homeland Security Education in the EU and the US\***

***Paper Presented to the Fifth Annual Homeland Defense and Security Education Summit,  
11 March 2011, University of Maryland.***

Don Wallace, Craig McLean, William Parrish, Sarah Soppitt, and Daniel Silander

### **Abstract**

*Researchers from the University of Central Missouri, Virginia Commonwealth University, Northumbria University (United Kingdom) and Linnaeus University (Sweden) joined for a policy-oriented measures project funded by a grant from the EU-US Atlantis Program. This project has been examining Homeland Security academic provision within the US and EU. The study's goals focus on developing benchmarks and assessing core areas within the Homeland Security-related curricula. This paper will present preliminary findings that examine definitional and conceptual differences on Homeland Security provision both between the EU and US and within these two regions. Amidst frequent calls for closing the gap between security services and academia, these findings could have an impact on establishing specific benchmarks for "homeland security" specific academic programs. In the US context these academic programs reflect a post 9-11 government restructuring that has not occurred to the same extent in either the governmental or academic institutions within the EU.*

### **Author Names & Affiliations:**

- Don Wallace, University of Central Missouri
- Craig McLean, Northumbria University
- William Parrish, Virginia Commonwealth University
- Sarah Soppitt, Northumbria University
- Daniel Silander, Linnaeus University

---

\* The contents of this paper were developed under an EU-U.S. Atlantis grant (P116J090056) from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, (FIPSE), U.S. Department of Education and the European Union's Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (156478-UK-2009-USAPOM). The authors would therefore like to thank the EU/US Atlantis Program for the financial support, which made this research possible. However, the content of this paper does not necessarily represent the policy of the Department of Education or the European Union, and any endorsement by the Federal Government or EU should not be assumed.

Correspondence to the author: Don Wallace, Department of Criminal Justice, University of Central Missouri, Warrensburg, MO 64093 USA. Email: [wallace@ucmo.edu](mailto:wallace@ucmo.edu).

## **Benchmarking Homeland Security Education in the EU and the US**

During any examination or assessment of the subject, homeland security, it becomes quite evident that by the definition(s) alone Homeland Security is a very dynamic, complex, and broad subject area. In the United States, within the academic community there has been considerable debate since the passage of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 regarding issues on whether homeland security constitutes a profession, whether a framework of academic disciplines can be agreed upon within homeland security academic programs; whether the field of homeland security is too broad to be addressed within a single degree; or, what career opportunities exist for recipients of a nominally designated “homeland security” degree. The fact remains that following the events of 9-11 the professions and the academic areas that constitute homeland security within the US have been subjected to much reexamination. Yet, curiously in both government and academic institutions, this re-examination is not as apparent in Europe<sup>1</sup>.

This paper examines these issues along the following lines. First, an overview is presented of the development of prescriptions for curricular outcomes and competencies for Homeland Security in the US. A second part to this paper examines US doctoral level programs in homeland security using the prescriptions for curricula. This is followed in a third part by a proposal to synthesize the leading efforts at identifying the curriculum and competency goals for homeland security education. The fourth section of this paper specifically examines the curricular goal of the transnational and global application of homeland security strategies and operations that has been promoted by HSDECA. The context of homeland security education in academic institutions in Europe will be provided in this discussion. The fifth part of the paper will examine US post-baccalaureate programs in homeland security for their curricular offerings in transnational and global applications of homeland security strategies and operations. The last section of this paper offers some conclusions to the issues presented in this paper.

### **I. Establishing Standards for Homeland Security Education in the US**

Since the attacks of 9-11 a series of significant events and policy decisions were made within federal, state, and local governments, non-governmental organizations, and private industry. Of significant importance was the signing of the National Homeland Security Strategy by President Bush in 2002, as it was this document that provided the foundation for the Homeland Security Act subsequently passed by the US Congress in the fall of 2002. These two documents did much for the restructuring of the US government as well as identifying the necessity for both change and engagement by state and local governments and, equally importantly, private industry. This is clearly evident in the homeland security definition contained in the National Homeland Security Strategy of 2002, which provides a focus on human sources of threats to homeland security:

A concerted national effort to prevent terrorist attacks within the United States, reduce the vulnerability of the United States to terrorism, and minimize the damage and assist in the recovery from terrorist attacks.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> For further information on why this *might* be the case, see: C. McLean, D.H. Wallace, S. Soppitt, W.H. Parrish, D. Silander, and A. Irving (2011) *Developing a Transatlantic Understanding in Homeland Security Academic Education Provision: The Emergence of a new Academic Discipline?*, paper presented at the ISA Annual Convention, 2011.

<sup>2</sup> NSHS (2002) *National Strategy for Homeland Security*, Office of Homeland Security, P. 2. Available from: [http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/nat\\_strat\\_hls.pdf](http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/nat_strat_hls.pdf).

Perhaps the real and timely value of the National Strategy for Homeland Security and Homeland Security Act of 2002 was the delineation of clearly defined “critical mission areas”. Those mission areas have become significant in how federal and national governments have restructured themselves, how state and local governments have implemented new strategies to comply with appropriate mission areas, and how response by private industry has addressed those mission areas applicable to their industries. The six critical mission areas were identified as:

- Intelligence and Warning
- Border and Transportation Security
- Domestic Counterterrorism
- Protecting Critical Infrastructure and Key Assets
- Defending Against Catastrophic Threats
- Emergency Preparedness and Response<sup>3</sup>

These mission areas have and continue to be applied in the framework of many academic homeland security or homeland security related programs. Equally important to the academic implications within these mission areas are the career fields represented in each one.

The dramatic changes in policy and reorganization of government structures in homeland security in the US have also led to an important review within higher education with the goal of developing a means to enlarge the body of skills and knowledge for this area. Based on the reality of an expanding and enduring professional career field, it becomes quite apparent why there has been such growth at all levels of the academic community in the expansion of existing academic programs with a nexus to homeland security, and the creation of new programs with a multitude of titles that are related to one or more of the previously stated critical mission areas”.

As US government agencies, both at the federal and state levels, moved forward in implementing policy and strategies of homeland security, debates began within the academic community as to whether there was a need for academic degrees in homeland security and, if there were, what role would higher education play in addressing the academic issues associated with this new discipline.

At the same point of time, the Homeland Security and Defense Education Consortium (HSDECA) was being established. The mission statement of HSDECA provides:

The Homeland Security and Defense Education Consortium Association, HSDECA, is the association for homeland security and homeland defense educational program accreditation. HSDECA is the national organization of excellence for education in the science and art of homeland security and defense education. It also serves as a network of teaching and research institutions focused on promoting education, research, and collaboration related to and supporting this new academic discipline. The Association is committed to building and maintaining a community of higher education institutions supporting this mission and the overall homeland security and homeland defense enterprises through the sharing and advancement of knowledge.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> NSHS (2002) *National Strategy for Homeland Security*, Office of Homeland Security, Available from: [http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/nat\\_strat\\_hls.pdf](http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/nat_strat_hls.pdf).

<sup>4</sup> Mission Statement. Homeland Security and Defense Education Consortium Association. Available at: <https://www.hsdeca.org/>

As HSDECA became more established within the academic community, the US Department of Homeland Security and other partnering agencies, it began to focus on the accreditation and the role it could play in serving as a leading accreditation organization for homeland security and homeland defense education programs.

The idea of accreditation can be useful and necessary within academia. The challenge for conducting accreditation for newly developed disciplines lies in the collective agreement regarding the core competencies that are required within a homeland security type program. HSDECA has developed a list of core competencies, which have been incorporated into its developing accreditation program. These core competencies are:

- Intelligence
- Critical Infrastructure and Key Resources
- Law and Policy
- Strategic Planning
- Emergency Management Terrorism
- Risk Analysis
- Strategic Communication

There are some close similarities to HSDECA's core competencies and the Critical Mission Areas previously addressed. This should not be surprising as a number of HSDECA members engaged in the accreditation process have had experience in the federal government in either the Department of Defense or Department of Homeland Security. Their expertise in understanding the application of strategic documents and national policy into an academic setting is very useful and might help to explain some of the logic behind the established core competencies.

In November of 2007, the US Assistant Secretary of Defense (ASD) for Homeland Defense issued a memorandum that addressed the need for a national security workforce to meet the needs of the nation following the 9-11 attacks and the new policies and procedures that had been implemented over the following six years. The memorandum addressed educational and professional development requirements that would provide knowledge and expertise in preparing the US to prevent and to respond to catastrophic events, either human-made or natural. Following a workshop that brought together a variety of professionals, the ASD for Homeland Defense included their findings for "competencies" in educational and professional development programs. The competencies were:

- Ethics
- Collaboration
- Communication
- Creative and Critical Thinking
- Cultural Awareness
- Strategic Leadership
- Management and Planning Skills
- Adaptability
- Crisis Management
- Critical Expertise
- Science/Technology Expertise
- Risk Management

These descriptive and prescriptive listings for curricular content in homeland security academic programs can be used to provide benchmarks. The next section examines US PhD programs in homeland security-related academic areas using these benchmarks.

## **II. Application of Standards to U.S. PhD Programs in Homeland Security and Related Disciplines**

The Homeland Security Curriculum survey conducted under the EU US Atlantis project proved to be extremely limited in response by academic institutions offering Doctoral level degrees/certificates in homeland security or related fields of this emerging discipline. However, it is important to recognize that the homeland security academic discipline within the US is becoming ever increasingly accepted across the academic communities and perhaps even more importantly is the accepted recognition by professionals in the field.

The majority of the PhD programs examined was located as a result of internet searches. In the final analysis a total of 15 PhD programs were identified for data collection. During the course of research it was determined one of these institutions did not offer a PhD or doctoral certificate and another institution's program may have been discontinued. At the time of this writing confirmation on this program's status has not been received.

Of the remaining 13 PhD programs examined, only 1 program listed Homeland Security in the degree title. The following degree titles were identified:

- PhD Philosophy Public Safety concentration
- PhD Management, Homeland Security concentration
- PhD Biodefense, Homeland Security or International Security concentrations
- PhD of Science in Crisis Emergency and Risk Management (Engineering Management)
- PhD Public Policy, Disaster Management concentration
- PhD Strategic Security Studies
- PhD Philosophy in Business Administration, Homeland Security Leadership and Policy Specialization
- PhD Emergency Management
- PhD Philosophy, Fire Administration or Emergency Management concentrations
- PhD Philosophy, Public Health Studies concentration
- PhD Certificate, Environmental Hazard Management (confirmation of program's continuation pending)
- PhD Public Administration and Management
- PhD Energy and Environmental Policy
- PhD Public Policy and Administration

The programs methods of delivery varied among the universities. 4 programs were offered completely on-line; 2 programs were offered in a combination of in residence and on-line format, with the remaining 7 programs offered in residence. It was also noted in the majority of program descriptions that some programs were directed more toward scholars while others stated they were directed toward practitioners and senior leadership of organizations. Some programs indicated they were for both scholars and practitioners. The majority of programs directed toward practitioners and senior leadership were most often offered on-line while programs directed toward scholars were most often in residence.

The examination of the PhD programs focused on program goals, objectives, course titles and course descriptions. The examination was conducted by searching for key words and phrases

associated with the composite list of core knowledge content and abilities previously identified in this paper and used in the examination of the graduate level programs. Table I. provides a break out of the data assessed.

Under the Core Knowledge and Content Areas, two specific areas stood out; Emergency Response and Preparedness followed by Intelligence and Warning. Under Emergency Response and Preparedness 10 out of the 13 programs made reference to these terms in program goals or objectives as well as 10 of the programs referenced these terms in their core course descriptions. It was also noted that 7 out of the 13 programs made reference to emergency response, preparedness or management in elective courses. Emphasis on the term “intelligence” was noted in 10 of the programs goals and objectives. However, only 4 programs listed “intelligence or warnings” in the core and elective courses. Although the use of the terms “counterterrorism or terrorism” were not reflected in most program goals and objectives, they were prominent in 6 program core course descriptions. Although the areas of “catastrophic threats” and “critical infrastructure” were not prominently mentioned in goals, objectives or core course descriptions, they were well represented in elective courses.

The Assistant Secretary of Defense’s “Abilities” or “Competencies” proved to be more subjective in determining their application within the programs. The most prominent “ability” or “competency” fell within the area of “Management and Planning Skills.” This was not viewed with any surprise as the majority of the programs addressed emergency “management” in a variety of both core and elective courses.

Although there are overlaps in the Critical Mission Area under the Core Knowledge and Content Areas and the Core Competencies of the Homeland Security and Defense Education Association (HSDECA), there are some areas of note. The application of risk and vulnerability assessments has been a critical element within the Department of Homeland Security’s resource allocation procedures. Only 2 of the programs made reference to risk in their program goals and/or objectives while 8 programs referenced “risk” in their core course descriptions. The other area worthy of note in the HSDECA core competencies is “Emergency Management.” Here 7 programs made reference to the term in their goals and objectives and 10 programs addressed emergency management in their core courses.

**Table I. Curricular Offerings in US PhD Programs in Homeland Security and Related Disciplines**

<b>Core Knowledge/Content Areas (Six Critical Mission Areas of Homeland Security)</b>	<b>Number of Universities Listing under Goals and Objectives</b>	<b>Number of Universities Listing as Core Courses</b>	<b>Number of Universities Listing as Electives</b>
Intelligence and Warning	10	4	4
Border and Transportation Security	0	0	4
Domestic Counterterrorism	2	6	3
Protecting Critical Infrastructure/Key Assets	1	6	6
Defending Against Catastrophic Threats	0	3	7
Emergency Response and Preparedness	10	10	8
<b>Abilities (Asst Sec Defense stated abilities within homeland defense)</b>			

Ethics	0	5	1
Collaboration	1	1	4
Communication	2	4	5
Creative, Critical Thinking, Adaptability	1	0	0
Cultural Awareness	0	0	4
Strategic Leadership/Leadership	4	6	4
Management/Planning Skills	13	12	7
Crisis Management	3	4	2
Scientific/Technological Expertise	2	3	4
Risk Management	2	5	3

#### **HSDECA Core Competencies**

Intelligence	10	4	4
Law and Policy	4	6	3
Emergency Management	7	10	4
Risk Analysis	2	8	3
Critical Infrastructure and Key Resources	1	3	1
Strategic Planning	2	6	5
Terrorism	3	8	2
Strategic Communications	0	3	1

In the examination of the program content of the 13 doctoral programs it is evident that the “field” of homeland security is indeed broad and encompasses multiple disciplines.

### **III. Program Outcomes and Synthesis of Standards**

The above discussion has so far focused on core curricular areas for homeland security academic programs. This section examines the learning or program outcomes that have been identified and are anticipated of graduates of degree programs in homeland security.

#### **A. Program Outcomes**

In addition to the core competencies, HSEDCA has identified program outcomes, which define the professional field of homeland security. For graduate-level degree programs HSEDCA has identified the following outcomes that graduates of degree programs must demonstrate. These outcomes are listed below:

- An ability to apply homeland security or defense concepts in a capstone experience: thesis, graduate research project or comprehensive exam
- The ability to apply techniques, skills or tools common to either the social or physical science disciplines necessary for conducting research or systematic investigations
- An understanding of professional ethics and how they apply in the field of homeland security or defense
- An ability to apply knowledge of mathematics and science

- An ability to work collaboratively
- A recognition of transnational and global application of homeland security or defense issues, strategies and operations
- An ability to design, conduct, and analyze exercises applicable to the disciplines of homeland security or defense
- An ability to identify, describe and critically evaluate applicable homeland security or defense technologies
- Knowledge of contemporary, or emergent threats, challenges or issues

Kansas State University (KSU) and the US Army Command and General Staff College (Army-CGSC) used these HSDECA core content areas and competencies and the ASD competencies in the development of their homeland security degree program. Representatives of KSU and Army-CGSC sought perspectives from various groups of homeland security stakeholders on the ingredients of a viable homeland security graduate program that could serve the host of needs of homeland security professionals. The information collected was aligned with the HSDECA content areas and ASD competencies to define 15 core common areas that would be included in the eventual master's degree program in Homeland Security. This effort resulted in a detailed compendium of curricular goals and competencies. These 15 core common areas developed by this process included their analogues with the HSDECA content areas and ASD core competencies.<sup>5</sup>

---

These first three core common areas were seen to align with HSDECA content area of Current and Emerging Threats and the ASD core competencies of Critical expertise, Cultural Awareness, and Risk Management.

- 1) Historical aspects of domestic incidents
- 2) Human factors and psychology of domestic incidents, sociology, needs of people (resiliency)
- 3) Understand and identify characteristics of domestic threats (manmade and natural; accidental and purposeful) and hazards (chemical, biological, natural, terrorism, domestic threats, etc.)

Core common areas 4) through 7) correlated with the HSDECA content area of Context and Organization and the ASD core competencies of Critical Expertise, Communication, and Crisis Management

- 4) Policy, roles, and responsibilities at National, Tribal, State and Local organizational levels (including preparation, preparedness/ protection, response, and recovery).
- 5) Policy, roles, and responsibilities of non-profits, volunteers, and private sectors (within crisis continuum preparation, preparedness/ protection, response, and recovery.).
- 6) Common language, understand and learn acronyms, TEN code common terms, Homeland Security terminology.
- 7) Role of military in domestic incidents.

The following two common areas align with the HSDECA content area of Policies, Strategies, Legal Issues and the ASD core competencies of Critical Expertise and Ethics.

- 8) Core focus on state and local level structures
- 9) Legal aspects of domestic incidents

---

<sup>5</sup> Cheryl J. Polson, John M. Persyn, and O. Shawn Cupp (2010). Partnership in Progress: A Model for Development of a Homeland Security Graduate Degree Program. Homeland Security Affairs, 6, 1-25.



The core common areas, 10) through 13), correlate with the Processes and Management HSDECA content area and the ASD core competencies of Collaboration, Critical expertise, Science and Technology Expertise, and Management and Planning Skills.

- 10) Common national plan and emergency systems (National Response Framework (NRF) and National Incident Management System (NIMS))
- 11) Border and transportation security
- 12) Infrastructure protection, critical infrastructure and impact on homeland functions
- 13) Understand and identify assets for use in domestic incidents

Core Common areas 14) and 15) represent the Practical Application HSDECA content area and the Strategic Leadership, Adaptability, Creative and Critical Thinking ASD core competencies.

- 14) Leadership in crisis situations from the local, state, tribal, and federal levels (communication with the public)
- 15) Exercises, training, practicum as part of course (Table Top Exercise, training scenario, vignette-based practical exercise)

## **B. Some Resolution in Synthesis of Curriculum and Competency Goals For Homeland Security Education**

These core common areas produced in the development of the KSU and Army-CGSC homeland security master's level program provide a means of viewing the commonalities of the HSDECA and ASD proffers for curricular development in homeland security programs. Further, because of the derivative nature of their content definition, these Core Common Areas allow for a benchmarking of curriculum offerings in programs that permit a determination of whether a program's curriculum is serving the spectrum of content and competency concerns of HSDECA and ASD.<sup>6</sup>

Thus, sharing with the scheme provided by the development of the KSU and Army-CGSC homeland security master's level program, this portion of the paper provides a composite listing of defined curricular content areas drawn upon a somewhat larger set of sources. This composite list draws upon the four lists of content (the 2002 National Strategy for Homeland Security, the 2007 ASD competencies, and both the HSDECA content areas and content concerns) discussed above and their elaboration by their authors. These lists of content for curricular areas appear to concern either knowledge-based content or abilities-based content. The 15 core content areas identified in the KSU Army-CGSC exercise will be used to provide further content to the results of the compilation of these four lists.

The curricular benchmarks developed by the results of this effort to draw a composite list of knowledge-based content and abilities-based content area will allow for a detailed content analysis that better reveals whether a master's level homeland security program and its constituent modules/courses meet the demands of these various prescriptive lists for the education and development of homeland security professionals.

The following list develops a composite of these sources of prescriptive suggestions for a master's degree program of homeland security education and contains 18 content areas and separates Core Knowledge Content Areas from Abilities Content Areas. The explanatory justifications provided by the National Security Strategy, HSDECA, and the KSU-CGSC process are provided to indicate the scope of these curricular content areas. The ASD suggestions are included, however, these suggestions were apparently made without elaborative justifications.

---

<sup>6</sup> Polson *et al.*, *supra* note 5.

The KSU-CGSC evaluation provides a means for better distinguishing between knowledge and abilities based content.

**TABLE II. COMPOSITE LIST OF CONTENT AREAS AND ABILITIES  
FROM ASD, HSDECA, AND NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY**

**Core Knowledge Content Areas:**

- 1) Intelligence & Strategic communications**
  - a) (HSDECA Core Area Outcomes) Intelligence: A systematic process of collection, analysis, and dissemination of information in support of national, state, and/or local policy or strategy
  - b) (National Security Strategy, 2002) We must have an intelligence and warning system that can detect terrorist activity before it manifests itself in an attack so that proper preemptive, preventive, and protective action can be taken.
  - c) (HSDECA Core Area Outcomes) Strategic Communications: An effects-based approach of synchronized themes and messages designed to enable the implementation of the national elements of power; to include but limited to the diplomatic, intelligence, military, economic, financial, information and law enforcement, toward the accomplishment of national and homeland security objectives.
- 2) Border and Transportation Security**
  - a. (National Strategy for Homeland Security, 2002) We must therefore promote the efficient and reliable flow of people, goods, and services across borders, while preventing terrorists from using transportation conveyances or systems to deliver implements of destruction.
  - b. (Workshop Core Common Area—processes and management content) Critical Expertise=Border and transportation security
- 3) Terrorism & Domestic Counterterrorism**
  - a. (HSDECA Core Area Outcomes) The threat of violence, individual acts of violence, or a campaign of violence designed to primarily instill fear. Terrorism is violence for effect: not only and sometimes not at all for the effect on the actual victims of the terrorists' cause. Fear is the intended effect, not the by-product of terrorism.
  - b. (National Strategy for Homeland Security, 2002) We will pursue not only the individuals directly involved in terrorist activity but also their sources of support: the people and organizations that knowingly fund the terrorists and those that provide them with logistical assistance.
  - c. (Workshop Core Common Area –Current and Emerging Threats content) Risk Management = Understand and identify characteristics of domestic threats (manmade and natural; accidental and purposeful) and hazards (chemical, biological, natural, terrorism, domestic threats, etc.)
- 4) Critical Infrastructure and Key Assets**
  - a. (HSDECA Core Area Outcomes) Systems, resources and assets, whether physical or virtual, so vital to the US that the incapacity or destruction of such systems, resources or assets would have a debilitating impact on national security, economic security, public health or safety, or any combination of these.
  - b. (National Strategy for Homeland Security, 2002) Our society and modern way of life are dependent on networks of infrastructure—both physical networks such as our energy and transportation systems and virtual networks such as the Internet.
  - c. (Workshop Core Common Area—processes and management content) Science and Technology Expertise=Infrastructure protection, critical infrastructure and impact on homeland functions.
- 5) Defending Against Catastrophic Threats/Strategic Planning**
  - a. (National Strategy for Homeland Security, 2002) chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear terrorist attack in the United States could cause large numbers of casualties, mass psychological disruption, contamination and significant economic damage, and could overwhelm local medical capabilities. Currently, chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear detection capabilities are modest and response capabilities are dispersed throughout the country at every level of government.
- 6) Emergency Management =Response and Preparedness & Crisis Management**
  - a. (HSDECA Core Area Outcomes) Emergency management includes the process of preparation for and the carrying out of all emergency functions necessary to protect, prepare for, respond to, and recover from emergencies and disasters caused by all hazards, whether natural, technological, or human caused. Emergency management is a comprehensive and continuous improvement oriented process designed to save lives, avoid injury or illness, and minimize damage to the environment and economic losses to property.
  - b. (National Strategy for Homeland Security, 2002) An effective response to a major terrorist incident—as well as a natural disaster—depends on being prepared. Therefore, we need a comprehensive national system to bring together and coordinate all necessary response assets quickly and effectively. We must plan, equip, train, and exercise many different response units to mobilize without warning for any

- emergency. Many pieces of this national emergency response system are already in place. America's first line of defense in the aftermath of any terrorist attack is its first responder community
- c. (Workshop Core Common Area—Context & Organization content) Crisis Management = Role of military in domestic incidents
  - d. (ASD, 2007) Crisis Management
- 7) Law & Policy & Ethics**
- a. (HSDECA Core Area Outcomes) Law and Policy: Legal and policy formulation that provide the basic direction of homeland security means and objectives and establish a context for homeland security with the broader purview of national security.
  - b. (Workshop Core Common Area—Policies, Strategies, Legal Issues content) Ethics = Legal aspects of domestic incidents.
  - c. (Workshop Core Common Area—Policies, Strategies, Legal Issues content) Critical Expertise=Core focus on state and local level structures.
  - d. (HSDECA abilities) An understanding of professional ethics and how they apply in the field of homeland security or defense
  - e. (ASD, 2007) Ethics
- 8) Risk Analysis & Risk Management**
- a. (HSDECA Core Area Outcomes) A systematic method of indentifying the assets (CI/KA) of a system, the threats (strategic, political, economic, technological or cultural) to those assets and the vulnerability of the system to those threats in such a way as to be able to quantify threats and their consequences to a system for the purpose of developing appropriate countermeasures.
  - b. (Workshop Core Common Area –Current and Emerging Threats content) Risk Management = Understand and identify characteristics of domestic threats (manmade and natural; accidental and purposeful) and hazards (chemical, biological, natural, terrorism, domestic threats, etc.)
  - c. (ASD, 2007) Risk Management
- 9) Strategic Planning & Management and Planning Skills**
- a. (HSDECA Core Area Outcomes) The process of defining an organization's strategy (a long term plan of action designed to achieve a particular goal or objective) or direction and making decisions on allocating its resources to pursue this strategy, including its capital, its technology and its human resources.
  - b. (Workshop Core Common Area—processes and management content) Management and Planning Skills = Understand and identify assets for use in domestic incidents
  - c. (ASD, 2007) Management and Planning Skills
- 10) Critical Expertise**
- a. (Workshop Core Common Area –Current and Emerging Threats content) Critical Expertise = Historical aspects of domestic incidents
  - b. (Workshop Core Common Area –Context and Organization content) Critical Expertise = Policy, roles, and responsibilities at National, Tribal, State and Local organizational levels (including preparation, preparedness/ protection, response, and recovery)
  - c. (Workshop Core Common Area –Context and Organization content) Critical Expertise = Policy, roles, and responsibilities of non-profits, volunteers, and private sectors (within crisis continuum preparation, preparedness/ protection, response, and recovery)
  - d. (ASD, 2007) Critical Expertise
- 11) Cultural Awareness**
- a. (Workshop Core Common Area –Current and Emerging Threats content) Cultural Awareness = Human factors and psychology of domestic incidents, sociology, needs of people (resiliency)
  - b. (ASD, 2007) Cultural Awareness

**Abilities:**

- 12) Transnational & Global Application of Homeland Security**
- a. (HSDECA abilities) A recognition of transnational and global application of homeland security or defense issues, strategies and operations
- 13) Collaboration**
- a. (HSDECA abilities) An ability to work collaboratively
  - b. (Workshop Core Common Area—processes and management content) Collaboration = Common national plan and emergency systems (National Response Framework (NRF) and National Incident Management System (NIMS))
  - c. (ASD, 2007) Collaboration
- 14) Communication**
- a. (Workshop Core Common Area – Context and Organization content) Communication = Common language, understand and learn acronyms, TEN code common terms, Homeland Security terminology
  - b. (ASD, 2007) Communication
- 15) Creative & Critical Thinking & Adaptability**

- a. (Workshop Core Common Area – Practical Application content) Creative and Critical Thinking & Adaptability = Exercises, training, practicum as part of course (Table Top Exercise, training scenario, vignette-based practical exercise)
- b. (HSDECA abilities) An ability to design, conduct, and analyze exercises applicable to the disciplines of homeland security or defense
- c. (ASD, 2007) Creative & Critical Thinking and Adaptability
- 16) Strategic Leadership**
  - a. (Workshop Core Common Area – Practical Application content) Strategic Leadership = Leadership in crisis situations from the local, state, tribal, and federal levels (communication with the public)
  - b. (ASD, 2007) Strategic Leadership
- 17) Science/Technology Expertise**
  - a. (HSDECA abilities) The ability to apply techniques, skills or tools common to either the social or physical science disciplines necessary for conducting research or systematic investigations
  - b. (HSDECA abilities) An ability to apply knowledge of mathematics and science
  - c. (HSDECA abilities) An ability to identify, describe and critically evaluate applicable homeland security or defense technologies
  - d. (ASD, 2007) Science/Technology Expertise
- 18) Capstone Experience**
  - a. (HSDECA abilities) An ability to apply homeland security or defense concepts in a capstone experience: thesis, graduate research project or comprehensive exam

This on-going Atlantis Project is examining homeland security academic programs both in the EU and US and will further develop and apply this composite list of curricular benchmarks. Many areas of overlap can be identified when one compares mission areas, core competencies, program outcomes, and even the role of higher education in homeland security mentioned previously. Although overlap may be desirable as it prevents gaps in curricular offerings, and the overlaps may reveal an indication that, minimally, the principles of homeland security, the key components of the definition contained in the National Strategy for Homeland Security – “*a concerted effort... to prevent terrorist attacks ... reduce vulnerabilities... minimize damage and assist in recovery*” are being addressed in homeland security core curriculums. Yet, this overlap can hinder analysis of academic offerings. For these analytical purposes this composite listing of curricular benchmarks attempts to diminish the impact of this apparent overlap in mission areas, learning objectives and curricular offerings.

This composite listing of content areas and abilities of homeland security curricula illustrate shared definitions and constructions. Further analysis of this listing may lead to further consolidation as overlapping or redundant subject matter is identified. Some indication of relative importance of these 18 content areas and abilities can be derived the number of sources supporting their inclusion on this listing. Of greatest importance to a HS curriculum may be those content areas and abilities that have three or four sources that identify them.

From this listing these would be:

#### Core Knowledge Content Areas

- 1) Intelligence & Strategic communications
- 2) Terrorism & Domestic Counterterrorism
- 3) Critical Infrastructure and Key Assets
- 4) Emergency Management =Response and Preparedness & Crisis Management
- 5) Law & Policy & Ethics
- 6) Risk Analysis & Risk Management
- 7) Strategic Planning & Management and Planning Skills
- 8) Critical Expertise

#### Abilities

- 9) Collaboration

- 10) Creative & Critical Thinking & Adaptability
- 11) Science/Technology Expertise

This composite listing of curricular benchmarks for homeland security education with its delineations of the manifestations of areas of core knowledge and abilities content will allow for improved analysis of academic programs also offered by European universities. In Europe where programs are predominantly *not* nominally “Homeland Security,” they may yet have many of the characteristics of US programs, which are denominated with the title of Homeland Security. These more developed benchmark criteria offered here should provide these authors a greater sense of the degree of similarity of a European academic program that plausibly resembles these desired characteristics in US homeland security programs.

Because a focus of the research of this Atlantis Project is on the interface of homeland security educations programs in the US and in Europe, the balance of this paper examines one of these benchmark criteria for homeland security education programs curricula. This criterion is among the least proffered in this composite list – the HSDECA program outcome of a recognition of transnational and global application of homeland security or defense issues, strategies and operations.

#### **IV. A Curricular goal of Transnational and Global Application of HS —A European Context**

In further evaluation of this composite list as its curricular benchmarks are used to evaluate the content of homeland security academic programs, one benchmark of particular concern is found in the abilities area that addresses the transnational and global application of homeland security. The HSDECA designation is somewhat ambiguous since it has not recognized this area as one of core knowledge content, where HSDECA has identified program outcomes for its accreditation program, which define the professional field of homeland security. Skills and abilities may be developed in any number of modules/courses that are not necessarily coupled to a specific content area. However, a knowledge content area would seem to improve the assessment of specific curricular offerings as to whether there is a genuine opportunity offered the student to develop a “recognition of transnational and global application of homeland scrutiny or defense issues, strategies and operations”

##### **A. The EU Context**

The goal of this Project is to increase the ability of academia to facilitate the growth of knowledge about homeland security issues important to both the US and the EU. Experts believe that greater US-European cooperation in the field of homeland security is necessary in order to guarantee better security on both sides of the Atlantic. Yet, the homeland security structures on both sides of the Atlantic differ in significant respects. The terrorist attacks on the US in 2001 and the subsequent attacks on European countries such as the UK and Spain prompted both sides of the Atlantic to reinvigorate their respective efforts to ensure homeland security and combat terrorism, however, with differing approaches. The US embarked on a wholesale reorganization of its domestic security and border protection institutions. By contrast European countries largely preferred to work within their existing institutional architectures to combat terrorism and respond to other security challenges and disasters, both natural and man-

made.<sup>7</sup>, although the UK did create an Office for Security and Counter Terrorism within its Home Office<sup>8</sup> as a response to the 7/7 bombings. Further, perceptions may differ on the scope of the danger of terrorism and on appropriate counter-measures. For the homeland security student, practitioner, and policymaker, therefore, it is necessary to develop a transatlantic understanding of the cooperative arrangements that have been institutionalized, whilst simultaneously being aware of significant structural differences.

## **B. A Role for Academia**

Any joint efforts in developing the capacity of homeland security expertise for counterterrorism efforts will necessarily call upon academic programs to assist in the understanding and analyzing the nature of the problem, the measures needed to manage it, and the establishment of such measures in a legitimate international framework.

The U.S. Secretary of Homeland Security, Janet Napolitano gave a “state of homeland security” address on January 27, 2011 at George Washington University. Her speech she made specific reference to the homeland security discipline and its importance.

Because of this Institute, and other efforts emerging at colleges and universities across the country, homeland security is taking its place among longer-standing fields – like international affairs and criminal justice – as an area where major global challenges are being studied and addressed. For the students and young professionals here with us today, or watching online, you are the next wave of homeland security thinkers, professionals, and managers. You can – and undoubtedly will – have a significant influence on this emerging field.<sup>9</sup>

There is a recognition of the need to develop homeland security expertise through academic programs. An examination of homeland security academic education is an appropriate means for ultimately enhancing the functions of the homeland security apparatus. Academia has traditionally served as a forum for public debate and decision. It should provide the role of critical examination of homeland security issues with its research capabilities. Homeland security practitioners and policymakers require the knowledge and abilities to confront homeland security threats that are of a characteristically multinational nature, and require a multinational effort to confront them successfully. Considering the contributions extending along the continuum of academia up through the doctoral level, a nation’s universities constitute a formidable resource in both basic and applied research areas.

“On both sides of the Atlantic,” according to Larrabee and Julian Lindley-French for their Rand Corporation Project report, (2008, p. 34)<sup>10</sup> there is also a pressing need to close the gap between the “intelligence and security services and academia” to get more ideas and external analysis into the process of challenging terrorist organizations.

---

<sup>7</sup> Archick, Kristin, Ek, Carl, Gallis, Paul, Miko, Francis & Woehre, Steven (July 24, 2006). European Approaches to Homeland Security and Counterterrorism. Congressional Research Service The Library of Congress, Order Code RL33573, [www.fas.org/sfp/crs/homsec/RL33573.pdf](http://www.fas.org/sfp/crs/homsec/RL33573.pdf) (accessed February 9, 2009).

<sup>8</sup> See <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/about-us/organisation/home-office-structure/> (accessed February 13, 2009).

<sup>9</sup> Address by Janet Napolitano (Jan. 27, 2011). State of America’s Homeland Security Address, George Washington University. Available at: [http://www.dhs.gov/ynews/speeches/sp\\_1296152572413.shtm](http://www.dhs.gov/ynews/speeches/sp_1296152572413.shtm).

<sup>10</sup> Larrabee, Stephen, and Lindley-French, Julian (2008, December 5). Revitalizing the Transatlantic Security Partnership--An Agenda for Action. A Venusberg Group and Rand Corporation Project. Available at: [http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/reprints/2009/RAND\\_RP1382.pdf](http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/reprints/2009/RAND_RP1382.pdf)

### C. The Need for Understanding Transnational Applications of Homeland Security Strategies

In the examination of appropriate homeland security curricular offerings as part of a general definitional attempt at homeland security education, Michael Chertoff, former Secretary of the US Department of Homeland Security, offered seven integral core curriculum elements. One of these dealt with developing a greater understanding of international processes related to HS. A curricular element of international relations and processes would include border security and immigration, as well as relations and constraints specific to the European Union and its constituent nations.<sup>11</sup>

At the *Workshop on National Needs (WON2)*, cosponsored by HSDECA and Texas A&M University in 2007, representatives from ten prominent universities sought to identify “What Employers Want from Graduate Education in Homeland Security.” In their assessment, the discipline-specific content area of international considerations was emphasized.<sup>12</sup> Yet, of the areas of Discipline-Specific Knowledge, Skills and Abilities, mentioned less often at the workshop, than other topics of cooperation and communication between US entities and foreign agencies, international relations – languages, basics of world religions, social and political realities abroad, specific regional or country knowledge, and domestic and international factors and their interaction to lead to sound policy.

### D. The EU Academic Context

For there to be communication between academic institutions in the US and Europe, a perspective of homeland security based in international relations might be essential. In a conference paper<sup>13</sup> to be presented at the 2011 ISA conference these researchers reported that 146 EU-based programs delivered in English concerned themselves with Homeland Security-related issues. These were identified by using terms that describe the definition of the mission areas of homeland security as identified by the National Strategy for Homeland Security of 2002, the curricular benchmarking efforts of HSDECA and the ASD 2007 memorandum on competencies in educational and professional development programs. Of these 146 programs, 61.6% listed *international relations* under their program goals and objectives. This was followed in descending order by *security* (45.9%), *global issues/globalization* (39%), *terrorism* (29.4%), *war* (28.1%), and *political science* (19.9%). For the core courses/modules for these EU-based programs there is a focus on *international relations* (41.1%), *security* (35.6%), *global issues/globalization* (21.2%), and *law* (16.4%). Thus, to comprehend the academic developments in homeland security issues in EU-based institutions, a grounding in studies of international relations and globalization for US academics will be needed to engage in a dialogue with their European counterparts.

The US academic approach to homeland security in its efforts to synthesize a unique discipline devoted to homeland security reflects its government's approach with its complete reorganization of security and institutions. Similarly for most EU-based universities, their approach of working within existing academic disciplines reflects the overall European approach governmental approach to homeland security efforts since 9-11, which has seen the existing

---

<sup>11</sup> Address by Michael Chertoff at Fourth Annual Homeland Defense and Security Education Summit. 2010.

<sup>12</sup> HSDCA and Texas A. & M. (2007). After Action Report, *Workshop on National Needs: What Employers Want from Graduate Education in Homeland Security* <http://homelandsecurity.tamu.edu/won2-1/won2-reports/WON2%20Final%20After%20Action%20Report%2003.pdf>

<sup>13</sup> McLean *et al.*, *supra* note1.

institutional architectures to combat terrorism and respond to other security challenges remain basically unchanged.

## **V. Curricular Offerings Of Transnational and Global Applications of Homeland Security In US Programs**

As suggested by the HSDECA program outcome of a “recognition of transnational and global application of homeland scrutiny or defense issues, strategies and operations” an approach to homeland security education that includes a component regarding international and comparative issues should have substantial potential for the homeland security profession. This component could span conceptual divides that may be observed within a nation’s security apparatus, such as the divisions between domestic and international security and intelligence operations.

### **A. Master’s and PhD Level Homeland Security Programs**

The master’s level programs examined were identified through websites that have listed those institutions providing higher education in homeland security. These were the CHDS University and Agency Partnership Initiative,<sup>14</sup> ASIS International Academic Programs Council,<sup>15</sup> and FEMA Emergency Management Institute, Colleges, Universities and Institutions Offering Emergency Management Courses.<sup>16</sup> For this part of the analysis, those programs providing a master’s level degree in homeland security or a concentration in homeland security for a master’s level degree were considered to be nominally homeland security degrees. Thus, degrees that carried the label “homeland security,” “security studies,” “terrorism studies,” or “intelligence” in their title, were included. Two post-baccalaureate certificate programs were included for this analysis. From this, a pool of 48 programs from 46 different institutions was identified. The websites of these programs provided the data for this part of the study. In our examination of content in these programs on homeland security, a search was conducted for key terms in the publicly available information for curricular offerings, mission statements, and program descriptions, which indicated a content regarding international and comparative issues that would promote a transatlantic understanding of the cooperative arrangements in homeland security.

Thus, search terms were used that were intended to uncover curricular content or program goals that would place some emphasis on developing an understanding of international political, social, intelligence, or cultural environments for homeland security. Though many curricular offerings listed a module in terrorism or international terrorism it was assumed that this would likely provide an examination of international groups involved in terrorist activities without the needed content to allow a student to become familiar with the international and transnational governmental networks that are employed to counter these activities. Thus, though these course offerings on terrorism were identified by search terms of “international” or “global” they were not further examined.

From this search 27 academic programs in homeland security being offered at the master’s level at 25 institutions were identified as containing at some level some international or comparative content. This number is in addition to the 7 programs of the 13 institutions offering

---

<sup>14</sup> Available at: <https://www.chds.us/?partners/institutions>.

<sup>15</sup> Available at <http://www.asisonline.org/education/universityPrograms/traditionalprograms.pdf>

<sup>16</sup> Available at: <http://training.fema.gov/EMIWeb/edu/collegelist/>.



PhD level programs that similarly contain such content. Thus, for the purposes of this paper an attempt was made to examine how several of these programs articulate this educational means to serve this need of homeland security students and experts to have an ability to operate within a globalized context. This portion of the study will examine how various programs articulate and implement these goals. Due to the tentative nature of this first conference paper dealing with this specific data on university programs and curricula in homeland security, the authors believed it best to preserve the anonymity of these universities. The names of these institutions are substituted with alphabetical letters. Table III provides a summary of the findings discussed in this section.

**Table III. Goals/Objectives & Curricular Offerings in Transnational & Global Application of Homeland Security**

	Program Goals-Learning Objectives				None specified	Curricular Offerings Content Areas	Int'l Impact of Threat	Int'l Approach to Threat	
	Instill recognition of Int'l Scope of Threat	Int'l Impact of Threat	Int'l Approach to Threat Gen'l Approach	Specific to HS				Int'l Approach to Threat Gen'l Approach	Specific to HS
University A	X								
University B	X					X		X	X
University C	X					X			
University D	X						X	X	
University E	X	X				X			
University F	X					X			
University G	X					X			
University H				X					
University I				X		X	X	X	
University J				X		X	X	X	X
University K-MA-SS				X					
University K-MA-IS				X				X	
University L					0				X
University M					0				X
University N					0			X	
University O			X					x	X
University P						X	X		
University Q						X		X	
University R					0			X	X
University S					0				X
University T-MPA				X		X			
University T-PhD-HS				X				X	
University T-PhD-IS				X				X	X
University U			X					X	
University V				X				X	
University W					0				X
University X					0				X
University Y-MA-HS						X		X	
University Y-MA-IS						X		X	X
University Z-PhD							X		
University AA-PhD					0				X
University BB-PhD							X		X
University CC-PhD					0				X
University DD-PhD					0			X	X

Various statements of goals and learning objectives are first examined. This is done with the understanding that a later discussion of curricular offerings is needed to see how these goals and objectives are conceptualized at the institution. A subsequent analysis on course offerings will examine how or whether these goals are implemented. For example, in the program in Master Of Science in security studies at University A, where a stated goal is to “develop the ability to analyze the global complexities and implications of National Security policy, procedures, and operations” is implemented with courses such as “Counterintelligence” and “Contemporary Counterterrorism.”” Here there is a certain ambiguity as to the intended context of the term “global”. However, in its curricular offerings there does not appear to be any modules focused on international or comparative concerns.

## **1. Program Goals and Learning Outcomes**

Ten of these programs contained no reference to goal or learning objectives that shared these concerns in the publically available information on their websites, Those did articulate such goals and outcomes ranged from a mere aspiration for students to learn about the international dimension of the threat to homeland security, to the international impact of the threat beyond the US, and to either a generalized concern for comparative approaches and cooperative arrangements to a more specific concern for these approaches and arrangements focused on how to approach these threats.

There can be seen a recognition of the international dimension of the threat to the homeland security of the US, without a clear articulation of the need for understanding of international cooperative efforts to combat this new threat. This is seen in the program goal statement at University B in its Certificate Program in Homeland Security:

The ability to prevent acts of international terrorism, and to cope with them if they occur, will be at the forefront of many nations' national security agendas for years to come. Given both the enormity and novelty of the task (at least for the United States), the development of new educational programs has become a vital part of national efforts to protect homeland security.

### **a. To Learn about the International Scope of the Threat**

This recognition of an international level of threat is seen in the goals established by University C:

This curriculum focuses upon international and domestic security and preparedness issues related to “all hazards” including terrorist threats, such as the 9/11 attack, and natural disasters, such as Hurricane Katrina.

This recognition also seems to be the source of the statement of goals for University D Master of Arts in Management program in homeland security:

This graduate program has as its purpose the development of advanced knowledge and skills needed to provide leadership in public safety and national security in an increasingly global environment.

## **b. Moving from the International Scope to the Impact of the Threat**

Beyond an international dimension of the threat, some institutions profess a goal to have students understand an international as distinguished from a domestic impact from these threats. Students in the Master of Professional Studies program in homeland security at University E will similarly be given the opportunity to see the global dimension of the impact of human-sourced threats. Here students will come to recognize “how natural and man-made catastrophes affect society and the domestic and global economy”.

From this recognition of an international dimension for the source of threat to, and impact, on HS, both University F and University G see that homeland security is not strictly a domestic entity furnishing both domestic and international threats. Here the identical goal statements offer:

Students may select courses based on their professional, personal, or research interests, to include ... international homeland security.

This notion of “international HS” is not defined in the statements of goals at these institutions.

## **c. Towards the Goal of Learning about International Approaches to the Threat**

University H offers in broad language that students in its programs will not be limited to domestic perspectives. Among “[t]he goals of the program [is to] support success of the students in the educational process, contribute to preparation of world citizens through global education.” In its goals for the concentration in homeland security in the Master of Science program in Administration of Justice at University I, there is a similar sense of mission for broadening the perspectives of students:

This program is designed to respond to the interests, knowledge requirements and needs of professionals in the field of law enforcement and justice at the local, regional, state and international levels.

There is clearer articulation in the mission statements for two of the institutions analyzed here of a recognition of a student’s need to understand comparative approaches to homeland security at University J in its Master of Science Homeland Security program. Here the program “emphasizes international and comparative approaches to the concept of homeland security.” Beyond this recognition, the program implements this emphasis by requiring short or long-term study abroad for all students in the homeland security program.

In a program, that by its title suggests a comparative emphasis to homeland security studies, there is a clearer articulation of a goal of international cooperation among homeland security experts. At University K, the international security studies program offers that graduates will be prepared to:

- Evaluate the role of force in international politics by combining an understanding of theory and historical examples with an appreciation for the contemporary strategic environment.
- Understand the challenges of strategy and statecraft within the emerging spectrum of new and complex security issues as they relate to the origins, conduct and resolution of conflict.

Thus, the available program goals and learning objectives identified for these programs at 12 of the 34 programs range at instilling within students a broad theme of comprehending the international dimension of homeland security threats, to a more focused goal of understanding multilateral efforts at homeland security.

## **2. Implementation of Goals--Curricular Offerings**

In the programs where the goal is limited to fostering a recognition of an international dimension to threats to HS, one might anticipate that this goal would be satisfied by curricular offerings limited to international terrorism. Such is the case with the programs at University F, University G, University C and University E. University H adds a curricular offering on Historical Perspectives of Terrorism to its other elective focusing on current Terrorism issues.

Yet, for other programs there seems to be a disconnect in several institutions between the articulation of this limited goal and the breadth of curricular offerings which cover comparative issues. For example, at University B, there are curricular offerings in its required core, which include International Political Economy and Comparative Politics: States and Societies In The 21<sup>st</sup> Century. Further there is the required module on Healthcare, Homeland Security and Global Terrorism, where the description for the content suggests that answers will be sought for the question of "How do preparedness and security efforts in the US compare to those of other nations, and what can we learn from attacks here and abroad?" The required module on International Terrorism is not limited to furthering an understanding of the phenomenon, but in efforts at countering it, with an examination of the history of the US in international efforts to combat terror, focusing on post 9/11 debates over grand strategy and tactics, among which would be the "debate on multilateralism vs. unilateralism".

### **a. Curricular Offerings on Generalized International Approaches to Threat**

This breadth of application of seemingly limited goals is seen in the curricular offerings at University D where elective offerings in Comparative Governments and International Human Rights are made. Yet, there appears to be made no effort at making this foundational module specifically relevant to homeland security education.

The broader goals articulated at University I are furthered by a breadth of curricular offerings. Here there are required electives of Social and Ethical Issues: A Global Perspective, International Human Rights, Comparative Justice Systems, in addition to the offering in Terrorism and Transnational Crime.

### **b. Curricular Offerings -- International Approaches Specific to Homeland Security**

The goal at University J with the broader emphasis on international and comparative approaches to the concept of homeland security is clearly furthered by the breadth of its curricular offerings. In its required core, students must take a seminar in homeland security where there is an examination of domestic, national security, and foreign policies as they relate to prevention, deterrence, preemption, defense against, and response to terrorist attacks and other man-made and natural critical incidents and emergencies on local, regional, national, and international levels. The seminar in Emergency Preparedness examines the interrelationship of public, private, and non-profit sectors on local, regional, national, and international levels. A third required seminar, on Seminar in Law, Society, and Homeland Security, examines the role and function of law related to homeland security on domestic and international levels, in addition to the historical development of ideas and rules of homeland security-related law and their relation

to domestic and international legal, social, and political structures. The international and comparative quality of these examinations is furthered in elective seminars on Intelligence and Homeland Security (Theories and historical evolution of intelligence. Intelligence in domestic and international contexts), on Terrorism and Counterterrorism (Theories and practice of terrorism and counterterrorism on domestic and international levels), on Transnational Crime and Homeland Security (Role and function of transnational criminal networks to security-related issues), and on Homeland Security Law: International (International laws, conventions, and treaties addressing homeland security efforts manifested in different countries and roles and functions of international institutions and non-governmental organizations in creating, enforcing, and adjudicating international legal remedies to ensure security and human rights).

### **3. Curricular Offerings Where Statement Of Goals Was Unavailable:**

Several programs did not provide on their public websites an indication of program goals or learning outcomes. However, the curricular offerings suggest the learning objectives of these programs; many of which seem welcome to furthering their students' understanding of international and comparative issues in HS.

As part of its required core, the master's degree program in homeland security at the University L provides a module on Comparative Government for Homeland Security. In this course students will learn how to "assess homeland security strategies employed by liberal democracies around the world; to distill and extrapolate policy implications from these examples; and to apply these lessons to the organizational and functional challenges faced by homeland security leaders in the United States."

While this program is not open to the general public, other institutions throughout the US have incorporated the academic program of University L. Thus, the program at University M offers an identical module in its curriculum. University N offers a Master of Professional Studies degree with a homeland security concentration and also has a partnership with the University L, but unlike University M, it does not share this module with its partner. Instead curricular offerings include Global Enterprise Risk Management (here the course "emphasizes risk at the strategic and enterprise level in a global context reflecting the emergence of globalization and the risks encountered in international business and monetary transactions, commerce and transportation") and two offerings on humanitarian assistance.

A required course on Law and the International Community is part of a homeland security track for the Master of Science in Legal Studies at University O. Similarly, University P requires a course on Legal and Ethical Issues in homeland security (where students examine the "legalities and ethics relevant to organizing for counterterrorism, investigating terrorism and other national security threats, consequence management, and trying international terrorists in an effort to fight terrorists and international criminals"). A further required course at University P is on counter-terrorism, which provides some comparative aspects ("This course will analyze the history and role of terrorism in world politics over the last two centuries").

Students at University Q have a choice among required electives to learn how to identify key international and national policies and their impact upon community health and national security ("Disaster Response and Community Health") in addition to a course that has international perspectives on terrorism. An elective for the homeland security track in the MA in Criminal Justice at University R covers Western Democracy and homeland security ("Case studies from several European and Latin American nations will be provided and explored for lessons learned").

In the Master of Science program in Homeland Security Management at University S at least one elective curricular offering provides some comparative exposure. In Global Terrorism and Geopolitical Configurations, students in this module are critically analyzing the dynamic and evolving geopolitical context of terrorism will see “changes in political, diplomatic, military, and/or economic alliances and policies in the United States and other nations often alter, modify, and affect the objectives of extremist groups and the terrorist acts they carry out.”

It is not clear from the description of the core elective module at University T’s Master of Public Administration program in homeland security whether there is a comparative examination in Issues in International Security. Here the student will “examine issues of topical interest in general area of international security. Possible topics include nuclear strategy, disarmament, American defense policy, and international terrorism.” Similarly in the doctoral level program on emergency management at University Z an elective is available on the “The Politics of Disaster,” which “situates disaster phases in the political context at the local, national, and international levels.”

Students in the Master of Public Administration homeland security program with University U may get exposure to various aspects of comparative and international issues should they elect International Nongovernmental Organizations Specialization Courses. One of these courses involves Understanding Different Cultures and Increasing Global Consciousness, where students have an opportunity to explore and understand the cultural values and styles of communication, reasoning, and leadership unique to their home culture.

University V in its Homeland Security Graduate Certificate provides for a course in Global Issues in Health Care Delivery During Disaster, which involves an examination of topics relevant to health care delivery and international humanitarian assistance in disaster, mass casualty events, and large population emergencies. Similarly with the doctoral level program in public health at University AA where an elective course that examines bioterrorism considers how National and Global governance should manage the challenges it raises, with a special focus on international cooperation in dealing with bioterrorism.

Another specialized comparative course is that of Global Chemical Regulations and Compliance Management offered as an elective in the MS in homeland security at University W where focus is given to the new regulations in North America, Europe, Asia, and the United Nations as well as a review of the government agencies enforcing these regulations. University X in its homeland security specialization for its MBA program offers a specialized course on Maritime Terrorism, where there is an exploration of the primary national and international strategies that shape the response to maritime terrorism.

For other doctoral level programs in emergency management there are elective modules offered at University CC and University DD that provide a specific focus on homeland security in their approaches to an international approaches to the threats. At University BB in its doctoral level emergency management program there are core required modules that examine the international impact of the threat (Contemporary Public Safety Leadership) in addition to the international scope of the approach to homeland security threats (Global Issues of Disaster Management).

## **B. Segregating International Security from Homeland Security**

Two of the master’s level programs that were considered nominally homeland security

programs provided students a choice of concentrations in homeland security or international security. Included this part of the discussion is an examination of a biological defense PhD program with homeland security or international security concentrations from University T. These programs raise further questions about the placement of the curricular goal of transnational and global applications of homeland security. At University T for either concentration, a course in International Relations is a required course. Here the course description indicates: "Focuses on changing structure of international politics, post-Cold War security issues, effect of globalized economy and information technology revolution, enhanced role of global corporations and nongovernmental organizations, and rise of nonsecurity issues in emerging international agenda". However, many of the offerings in the curriculum that entail issues involving transnational and global applications of homeland security are exclusively the realm of the international security concentration and are not a part of the homeland security concentration. Thus, modules are included in the international security concentration which are entitled, "Negotiating in the International Arena", "Ethics and International Security", "Nonproliferation and Arms Control," "Seminar in Global Systems", and "Biodefense Strategy and Policy" (which "Examines the interaction of biodefense and biosecurity with homeland, national, and international security"). These are not included in the homeland security concentration, for which other than the shared required international relations module makes no inclusion of the HSDECA objective of transnational and global applications.

This segregation of international security from homeland security is reflected in the M.A. program at University Y in Security Studies. Here, as with the PhD in biological defense program at University T there is a choice of concentrations between Homeland Security and International Security. The Homeland Security program includes curricular offerings in "Globalization & Security" (which includes a "number of specific case studies of how particular countries have had their lens on security, or their security challenges, affected by globalization"), "Weapons Proliferation and Security" (which provides an examination of "full range of national and international policy instruments by all diplomatic, economic, legal and military means necessary"), and "Transnational Crime Control" (where the module examines current transnational crime behavior and explain national law enforcement agencies and international police organizations response to control transnational crime"). However, the International Security concentration, apart from Transnational Crime Control, includes these curricular offerings and offers more that would contribute to transnational and global applications of HS. These additional offerings include: International Security (where the course examines "security problems--past, present, and emerging--on a region-by-region basis, looking at Europe, Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America"); Technology of Nonproliferation and Arms Control, Transnational Security Issues in South/Southeast Asia; Ethics & International Relations; Introduction to Humanitarian Crises; International Migration & Security; and, International Negotiation.

At the University K students at the International Security Studies (ISS) Concentration are required to complete three of the following curricular offerings: Force and Statecraft, (where students will explore different models of the international system and basic tenets of strategic thought), Origins of Conflict and War (where students consider the dominant role of non-state actors engaging in conflict over identity and ideology, and must explore whether this indicates a change in war's origins), and National Security Decision Making (where the course relates analytical tools to decision-making styles of organizations and individuals in different environments, especially competitive settings such as combat, international relations and business).

The segregation of international security from homeland security at these three institutions does

not result in the complete divestiture of transnational and global applications of HS. However, it does result in a diminishment of importance of these issues in the homeland security concentrations in these degree programs.

## **VI. Conclusions**

As part of its goal to benchmarking homeland security education in the US and in Europe, this grant supported research has focused on the curricular offerings in transnational and global homeland security efforts. This educational goal is identified only by HSDECA among the various curricular and program prescriptions considered here.

Of the sample of nominally homeland security post-baccalaureate homeland security programs, approximately half refer to aspects of transnational and global homeland security efforts in their statements on goals and learning objectives or in their curricular offerings. Those that do provide mention only rarely do so in the context of furnishing a broader understanding of multilateral or comparative efforts or structures at homeland security issues. The curricular offerings provide a view of a greater use of this educational goal. Here several institutions have required or elective modules, which indicate a goal to alert the student to transnational and global homeland security efforts that reach beyond providing an understanding of the international scope of the threat to an international approach to the threat to homeland security.

The focus on master's level programs that are nominally homeland security was to examine those programs that hold themselves out as "homeland security" programs, in that this is how these programs are marketing themselves, if not also embracing the designation of "homeland security" as an academic area. As this research project continues other programs will be included in the analysis. This broader analysis of programs will also entail the PhD programs that are identified with homeland security. However, this focus seemed an appropriate starting point.

The institutions that have post-baccalaureate programs with a concentration choice of either homeland security and international security may suggest that only a modest concern with transnational and global homeland security efforts for the homeland security student may be sufficient for homeland security education in the US. This may be understandable in light of the composite of leading proposals for curricula in homeland security academic programs. There is a diminished importance placed on this aspect.

However, this finding should be viewed in the context of educational programs in Europe where homeland security curricular offerings are not being delivered in newly developed homeland security degree programs. Here they are most likely to be found in international relations and globalization academic programs. From the perspective of a goal of fostering multilateral understanding in homeland security efforts between US and European academic institutions and the students who graduate from these programs, the conceptual gap in homeland security education is problematic. Perhaps US institutions who desire for their students an "ability to analyze the global complexities and implications" of security policy should heed the call of former US Secretary of Homeland Security Chertoff to include a "curricular element of international relations and processes," as well as those "specific to the European Union and its constituent nations."

This paper has presented a discussion of the development of curricular statements for homeland security education in the US. In an application of these statements in the examination of doctoral-level programs in HS, it is evident that the "field" of homeland security is indeed



broad and encompasses multiple disciplines. Thus, it is essential for academia to prepare both scholars and practitioners in these disciplines. Without academic programs within the field of homeland security the fundamental principles of prevention, preparedness and response to threats of terrorism and natural disasters cannot be achieved nor sustained. In the report prepared by the National Research Council of the National Academies, *Frameworks for Higher Education in Homeland Security*, the question was asked, "What is the Role of the Higher Education Community in Homeland Security?" It was agreed by the participants of the workshop that addressed this question that the roles of higher education should include:

1. Access to homeland security careers for students.
2. Relevant content knowledge both specialized and generalized for those who need it.
3. More Informed citizens.
4. A forum for public debate.<sup>17</sup>

The workshop participant findings are reinforced by the doctoral programs that have been created over the past decade since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 and the creation of the Department of Homeland Security. All of which could be viewed as the genesis for the academic discipline of homeland security.

---

<sup>17</sup> National Research Council, *Frameworks for Higher Education in Homeland Security*, Committee on Educational Paradigms for Homeland Security 2005, National Academies Press