BENCHMARKING HOMELAND SECURITY EDUCATION IN THE EU AND THE US

Paper Presented to the* Euro-American Conference for Academic Disciplines*, 21-24 June 2011, Prague, Czech Republic

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

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.

This Policy Project on Homeland Security Education at the International Level (hereinafter the Project) entails the assessment of the state of homeland security (hereinafter HS) education in the US and Europe. The Project was made possible by research support granted by the US Government and European Commission.[1] Four partner institutions are involved in this research project: in terms of the European Union these are Northumbria University (the United Kingdom), and Linaeus University (Sweden). For the United States the partner institutions are the University of Central Missouri and Virginia Commonwealth University. The research partners were interested in investigating the extent to which there could be an increase in knowledge about issues pertinent to homeland security education and pedagogy in academic institutions in the US and Europe. Experts believe that greater US-European cooperation in the field of HS is necessary in order to guarantee better security on both sides of the Atlantic.

An examination of HS academic education is an appropriate means for ultimately enhancing the functions of the HS apparatus. Academia has traditionally served as a forum for public debate and participation. It should provide the role of critical

[1] The contents of this paper were developed under a EU-U.S. Atlantis grant (P116J090056) from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, (FIPSE), U.S. Department of Education. However, those contents do not necessarily represent the policy of the Department of Education, and you should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government.

examination of HS issues with its research capabilities. HS practitioners and policymakers require specific knowledge and abilities to confront HS threats that are of a characteristically multinational nature, and require a multinational effort to successfully confront them. 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. The potential of these contributions has clearly been recognized by US officials directly responsible for HS efforts at the national level. The U.S. Secretary of DHS, Janet Napolitano, in her 2011 "state of homeland security" address likened efforts in homeland security academia to developments that have taken place in "longer-standing fields – like international affairs and criminal justice – as an area where major global challenges are being studied and addressed" (Napolitano, 2011). Her predecessor, Michael Chertoff, in his address to the 2010 Annual Homeland Defense and Security Education Summit, went beyond drawing comparisons to international affairs and explicitly called for an incorporation of such a topic into HS academic curricula. Secretary Chertoff offered seven integral core curriculum elements. One of these dealt with developing a greater understanding of international processes related to homeland security, as well as those "specific to the European Union and its constituent nations" (see Polson *et al.,* 2010).

This paper traces the developments of the Project and outlines the next challenges it will be encountering. In the first part an overview of the developments in European and US government and academic structures concerned with HS are examined. The second part considers the conceptual hurdles to a transatlantic academic dialogue on HS. Part three of the paper examines the development of HS education in the US and in Europe. In doing so discussion focuses on the professional-training model for HS education in the US in light of this prescription by government and accreditation agencies. This is contrasted with the approach seen in Europe for engaging the more traditional academic areas in HS content. The examination then focuses on the provision in US programs for curricular content in transnational and global applications of HS. Part four of the paper turns to a consideration of a means to alleviate what appears to be a significant divide between the US and Europe in approaches to HS pedagogy. In this discussion an examination is made of the feasibility of an internet-based public sphere for US and European academics, researchers, and policy-makers on HS education.

I.

A challenge to the development of a dialog between the US and European academic institutions in the area of HS is that the HS 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 HS and combat terrorism. However, these efforts took on differing approaches. The magnitude of the September 11, 2001 attacks in the US along with the exposure of internal vulnerabilities and the threat of future attacks from a committed and dedicated enemy, Al Qaida, gave cause for the US to embark on a reorganization across the federal government and implementation of new domestic security and border security protection policies. It was

these events and actions and the resulting changes that led to an identifiable homeland security bureaucracy. However, European countries largely preferred to work within their existing institutional architectures to combat terrorism and to respond to other security challenges and disasters, both natural and man-made. Even after the terrorist attacks of the last few years, European countries have continued to view combating terrorism primarily as a task for law enforcement and intelligence authorities'. But this has brought its own set of problems. Again, Archick *et al*. (2006, p. 1) summarize this point well:

> Some critics suggest that many European countries have been slow to bolster domestic protection efforts, reduce societal vulnerabilities, strengthen border controls and transport security, and push the defense of European territory as far out as possible. Others contend that European governments have sought to integrate counterterrorism and preparedness programs into existing Emergency Management efforts, thereby providing greater flexibility to respond to a wide range of security challenges with often limited personnel and financial resources.

There is no dedicated Department of Homeland Security within the UK, Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, and Spain. Indeed, as Archick *et al*. (2006: 1) remind us, in most of these countries, responsibility for different aspects of Homeland Security and counterterrorism is scattered across several ministries, and inter-governmental cooperation plays a key role in addressing threats and challenges to domestic security.

This divergence in government-led efforts has been replicated within academia, with a plethora of HS-nominal programs now being offered by US universities that have resulted in reorganization of existing programs or the development of new academic units, whereas this has not been the case within Europe. Very few European academic institutions offer a dedicated program in Homeland Security. Within the European Union each of the Member States has its own particular set of institutional arrangements within higher education. Governance in higher education provision has not been ceded to the authority of the EU.

Thus, European governments have been less willing to construct new institutional apparatuses dedicated to Homeland Security, preferring instead to tinker with existing institutional arrangements. This has been mirrored in European academia. By contrast American universities have set up a plethora of Homeland Security programs.

II.

At an early phase in this Project's efforts it was realized that there might be substantial conceptual inhibitions to EU-US academic dialogue on HS (McLean et al. 2010). As a policy concept HS did not originate across Western academic discourse. Rather, it was borne out of the 9/11 attacks, and its accepted usage today can be traced back to how the Bush Administration initially defined the concept. Thus for the US, the concept of HS was borne out of the 9/11 attacks, and its accepted usage today can be traced back to how the Bush Administration initially defined the concept. In the National Strategy for Homeland Security, Homeland Security was described as being a:

> Concerted national effort to prevent terrorist attacks within the United States, reduce America's vulnerability to terrorism, and minimize and recover from attacks that do occur (Department of Homeland Security, 2002, p.2).

This description of the concept of Homeland Security raises several points calling for clarification. First, Homeland Security is not precisely defined. In this view, "a concerted national effort" in HS could conceivably relate to policy matters covering specific actions of government agencies as well as covering the fostering of public attitudes to better enable HS activities. Second, with its focus on preventing "terrorist attacks within the United States," HS becomes a unique American concept. There is no mention of whether terrorist attacks on other countries could be seen as even an indirect threat to the security of the domestic US, nor any recognition of the importance of how other Western states might coordinate their defense and intelligence capabilities. The concept of HS as initially conceived in the US is therefore both broad and narrow. It is broad to the extent that it does not mention *specifically* how the US Government might address, prepare for, and respond to terrorist threats or attacks. It is however narrow to the extent that it focuses *specifically* upon terrorist threats to the United States.

Further, conceptual difficulties have arisen in the provision of HS education with the US itself. For McCreight this:

> Entails the reconciliation of Homeland Security and Emergency Management itself. One topic focuses heavily on terrorism preparedness and prevention, while the other aims to build skills in addressing the "all-hazards" spectrum of emergencies. In an educational program finding ways to bridge these differences is not easy (McCreight 2009, p.2).

Additionally, McCreight found an ambiguity to the content of HS programs in the US, and whether or not candidates on successfully completing their studies will require further training. In such cases:

> If graduates require even a moderately extensive period of adjustment to the issues, tasks, and requirements of a career in Emergency Management or Homeland Security, then it is fair to ask whether graduates received a proper and effective education (McCreight 2009, p.3).

McCreight's concerns can be contrasted with the advocacy of a more encompassing approach to HS education that seems less focused on the professional training aspects of the enterprise and more concerned with the development of public servants with a public service ethos, and citizens who embody civic virtues (Klitz 2009, p.1). Under this perspective the HS education mission should foster a strategy that:

> Calls for all of us – government organizations, communities, and individuals – to work together to achieve a shared vision of a free, prosperous and secure homeland. To achieve this broad vision, the primary focus of Homeland Security

> education must be to cultivate public leaders with a public service ethos and to prepare young adults to be citizens who serve the democratic community (Klitz 2009, p.2).

The significance of this view contrasts with a narrow professional training perspective promoted by McCreight's critique of higher education for HS. Klitz contended that:

> Higher education has a responsibility to carefully question the extent to which state power is justified in the name of Homeland Security. Among our duties are to create informed discussion and search for the truth no matter where it leads, to questions assumptions and information, and develop individuals who can think critically and be engaged citizens in the polis. (Klitz 2009, p.4).

Out of this debate arise two competing views on the nature of HS education in the US. The first, a professional training approach, argues that HS should be taught by experts within the field, and ought to pay specific attention to policy and development to preparation for a specific disaster. The second view sees HS education in broader terms. Rather than focus upon specific policy details, this school of thought urges the academic community to embrace wider issues that implicate HS. In line with a traditional "liberal" education, these issues include the public service ethos, ethical concerns, and inculcating students with civic virtues.

III.

Homeland Security education within the United States has generally developed along the "narrower" path, whereas HS English language educational provision within the EU has tended to view Homeland Security in much broader terms. It is to specific educational provision to which the examination of these issues by the Project turned (see Wallace et al., 2011).

As a complement to the guiding definition of HS for policy makers in the US the Homeland Security Act of 2002 delineated clearly defined "critical mission areas" that have become a floor for which to measure curricular offerings in HS education. Efforts to specifically prescribe HS curricula have largely duplicated these critical mission areas. These mission areas have been very influential in how US 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. Additionally, each mission area represents multiple career opportunities to graduates in HS programs. The six critical mission areas were identified as:

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

The U.S. Department of Defense through the US Assistant Secretary of Defense (ASD, 2007) for Homeland Defense took up the task to delineate the educational and professional development requirements that would provide the requisite knowledge and expertise in preparing the US to prevent and to respond to catastrophic events, either human-made or natural. In a November of 2007, the ASD 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, and included findings for "competencies" in educational and professional development programs. The competencies are:

- 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

During this time, the Homeland Security and Defense Education Consortium (HSDECA) was being established as an association for homeland security and homeland defense educational program accreditation. To this end HSDECA has developed a list of core competencies for master's level programs, which have been incorporated into its developing accreditation program (HSDECA, 2010). These core competencies are:

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

There are significant overlaps of HSDECA's core competencies to 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.

A. US PhD Programs

The prescriptions of mission areas for HS and core competencies for HS education have had an effect upon US doctoral level programs in HS or related fields. This Project was able to examine thirteen such PhD programs; only one 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

Despite the range of related fields that proffer themselves as providing HS-related doctoral program, their curricular offerings shared much in terms of content with the Six Critical Mission Areas of Homeland Security derived from the Core Knowledge/Content Areas and HSDECA's prescribed curriculum for a master's level program in HS. 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 ten out of the thirteen programs made reference to these terms in program goals or objectives as well as ten of the programs referenced these terms in their core course descriptions. It was also noted that seven out of the thirteen programs made reference to emergency response, preparedness or management in elective courses. Emphasis on the term "intelligence" was noted in ten of the programs goals and objectives. However, only four programs listed "intelligence or warnings" in the core and elective courses. Although the use of the terms "counterterrorism or terrorism" was not reflected in most program goals and objectives, they were prominent in six 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.

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 two of the programs made reference to risk in their program goals and/or objectives while eight programs referenced "risk" in their core course descriptions. The other area worthy of note in the HSDECA core competencies is "Emergency Management." Here seven programs made reference to the term in their goals and objectives and ten programs addressed emergency management in their core courses.

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

Core Knowledge/Content Areas	**Number of Universities**	**Number of Universities**	**Number of Universities**
(Six Critical Mission Areas of Homeland Security)	**Listing under Goals and Objectives**	**Listing as Core Courses**	**Listing as Electives**
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
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 thirteen doctorial programs it is evident that the "field" of homeland security education in the U.S. though broad and encompasses multiple disciplines has been largely shaped by the professional training needs identified as necessary by HSDCEA and McCreight, and less influenced by the goals of civic engagement and traditional liberal arts ideals identified by Klitz.

In developing academic programs in the US the stated needs of stakeholders in the profession have become a driving force (see Poulson et al.) 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. Yet, of the curricular areas of Discipline-Specific Knowledge, Skills and Abilities, mentioned least often at the workshop were those of cooperation and communication between U.S. 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 (HSDECA & Texas A&M, 2007).

B. European Education in HS Issues

This Project also examined the state of HS education in the EU. At the 2011 ISA Convention in Montreal members of the Project reported that 146 EU-based academic programs, delivered in English, concerned themselves with homeland security-related issues (McLean et al., 2011). However, these programs, unlike US academic programs focused on professional training, were located in traditional academic programs. These were identified by using search terms that describe the definitions 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/courses 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 facilitate the comprehension of the academic developments in homeland security issues in European institutions, a foundation in studies of international relations and globalization for U.S. academics may be appropriate for engagement in a dialogue with their European counterparts.

C. US Curricular Offerings In Transnational And Global Applications of HS

Within the framework of professional training as the basis for academic education in HS in the US, the Project decided to examine the offerings to determine whether room had been made in HS curricular offerings for transnational and global applications of HS. Though HSDECA had not identified such content in its core competencies, in its prescribed core outcomes it had listed that graduate level programs must demonstrate that their students have mastered a "recognition of transnational and global application of homeland scrutiny or defense issues, strategies and operations." The content of 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.

HSDECA limited its prescription to an ambivalent program outcome, not recognizing this area as one of core knowledge content. The necessary skills and abilities required for a program outcome may be developed in any number of courses/courses that are not necessarily coupled to a single content area. Despite this

limitation, the Project examined program goals and outcomes along with specific curricular offerings of U.S. master's level and PhD programs. The master's level programs were those that programs providing a master's level degree in homeland security or a concentration in homeland security for a master's level degree. The PhD programs were examined above. In this 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. From this search of a total pool of 61 programs, 28 master's level programs in homeland security were identified as containing at some level of international or comparative content. From this pool less than half the programs, 28 provided either required or elective curricular offerings that went beyond the international scope and impact of HS threats to a clear content focus covering international approaches to these threats.

IV.

With the fostering of academic programs in the US that focus on professional training along the core mission areas identified shortly after 9-11 and the lack of impetus for post-baccalaureate programs to take seriously the challenges of curricular offerings for transnational and global applications of HS. This Project may have come back full circle to the dilemmas early identified in its work. There is not much to foster linkages for academics in EU and US on HS education. A majority of US institutions with post-baccalaureate programs in HS suggest at best a modest concern with transnational and global homeland security efforts in homeland security. The lack of linkage in the US to traditional academic programs is problematic for fostering dialogue with their European counterparts who more likely come from established programs in international relations or globalization.

This dilemma poses the need for a dialog to take place among academics and professionals from both the US and Europe to develop a better understanding of challenges posed for a greater shared enterprise in the development of educational opportunities that would meet these challenges. To that end a Habermas-style of a public sphere is needed where academics, professionals, and policy-makers would be able to "discursively interact in order to exert some influence over public policies and issues of public concern" (see Clark, 2006, p. 15). Through such participation, there could be the beginnings of a necessary discourse that could ultimately benefit these participants in HS education.

To satisfy the obligations under the grant, the last of the requirements of this Project is to develop a Global HS Education Network (hereinafter GHSEN). As originally proposed this would be an Internet-based network that will allow for an observatory network of academic institutions that will provide continuous updating of academic policy and curricular benchmarking developed in the project. Through a dedicated website, shared by the partners of the Project, information will be shared through an electronic discussion board. The website will also serve as a platform for an electronic journal in which submissions on HS education are received to allow for

continuous examination of further research and developments in HS and comparative HS education.

It is thought that the GHSEN could approximate a public sphere idealized by Habermas. Though asked in a different context, the question posed by Clark (2006, p.15) is relevant to the issue presented here: "How can academic practice play a part in the enhancing of spaces of deliberation and opening up flows of communication?" It becomes important to ensure that an attempt to create and develop an internet-based network worthy of being considered a public sphere, these need to be "much more than 'talking shops' based on routine and instrumentality. What we are potentially engaged in here is the opening up of discourses capable of challenging and extending our own perspectives and the dominant agendas surrounding" (Clark, 2006, p. 19) the issue of concern in this paper, homeland security education.

The Project has examined several of the existing websites that might approximate these goals. These are websites that provide some aspects of a contemplative venue such as that contemplated for the GHSEN.

A. US Based Websites

Pertinent websites based in the US range from those hosted by government agencies to those hosted by universities.

1. Homeland Security Information Network (HSIN)– www.dhs.gov/files/programs/gc_1156888108137.shtm

This website is sponsored by the US Department of Homeland Security. Approved membership is required for access. The Homeland Security Information Network (HSIN) is described as "a national secure and trusted web-based portal for information sharing and collaboration between federal, state, local, tribal, territorial, private sector, and international partners engaged in the homeland security mission." The HSIN is held out as being made up of a growing network of communities, labeled Communities of Interest (COI).

> COIs are organized by state organizations, federal organizations, or mission areas such as emergency management, law enforcement, critical sectors, and intelligence. Users can securely share within their communities or reach out to other communities as needed. HSIN provides secure, real-time collaboration tools, including a virtual meeting space, instant messaging and document sharing. HSIN allows partners to work together instantly, regardless of their location, to communicate, collaborate, and coordinate.

The COI provides the basis of membership. Thus, to become a member, the applicant first decides which COI(s) meet the applicant's needs. Once the COI of interest to the applicant is identified, the applicant will then need to be nominated and vetted into the COIs. The content of the website is described as including: Document Libraries, Instant-messaging tool, Web conferencing, Incident reporting, Common Operational Picture (COP) provides situational awareness and analysis, Integrated Common Analytical Viewer (iCAV) gives geographical visualization, Announcements, Discussion Boards,

Task Lists, Requests For Information/For Your Information (RFIs/FYIs), Calendars, Really Simple Syndication (RSS) Feeds, and Online training materials

2. Homeland Security Centers of Excellence - http://www.dhs.gov/files/programs/editorial_0498.shtm

This page lists all the DHS designated centers of excellence. These centers "bring together leading experts and researchers to conduct multidisciplinary research and education for homeland security solutions. Each center is led by a university in collaboration with partners from other institutions, agencies, laboratories, think tanks and the private sector." Thus, there may be opportunities for dialogue among interested parties within each of these centers of excellence as they are intended to create "linkages between the Department and other customers as well as providing enduring cross-cutting technology and basic research needs for the Department and the nation." However, these opportunities for dialogue are likely limited to the partner institutions and experts that are included in these centers and their focus is not on educational issues in HS, but on security-based research and information provided to the Department and other customers.

3. Homeland Security Studies and Analysis Institute - http://www.homelandsecurity.org/

The Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Section 305 of Public Law 107-296, as codified in 6 U.S. Code 185) authorizes the Secretary of Homeland Security, acting through the Under Secretary for Science and Technology, to establish one or more federally funded research and development centers or Fords to provide independent analysis of homeland security issues. Analytic Services Inc. operates the Homeland Security Studies and Analysis Institute (HSI) as an FFRDC for the Homeland Security Department under contract HSHQDC-09-D-00003. According to this website, the Institute provides the government with the necessary expertise to conduct cross-cutting mission analysis, strategic studies and assessments, development of models that baseline current capabilities, development of simulations and technical evaluations to assess mission tradeoffs, creation and evolution of high-level operational and system concepts, development of top-level system and operational requirements and performance metrics, operational analysis across the homeland security enterprise, and analytic support for operational testing evaluation in tandem with the government's acquisition process. The Institute also works with and supports other federal, state, local, tribal, and public- and private-sector organizations that make up the homeland security enterprise. With a focus on providing research and development not identified in this list of organizations are educational institutions providing HS education programs.

4. National Academic Consortium for Homeland Security Web Site - http://www.academiccontinuity.org/?q=node/310

This website is housed at Ohio State University. There appears to be a focus on US interests and the development of policy and research for "preserving academic continuity in wake of a crisis."

The primary role of the Consortium is to promote, support and enhance

academic research, technology development, education and training, and service programs dealing with all aspects of international and homeland security, through collaboration and information- sharing among academic institutions, researchers and scholars. Our vision is that the Consortium also becomes an effective sounding board and consultative body to assist federal-government decision makers in developing more effective national policies and programs concerning academic research and technology development, education and training, and related service programs pertaining to national security.

Resources in a variety of forms are included on the website, including:

- Articles: information items of note related to academic continuity
- Documents: reports, plans, and other documents
- *Events* of possible interest to practitioners and people interested in the field
- Interviews: with key people in the field on pertinent issues
- News: items from the media which report important related developments
- Surveys and polls: designed to gather information from practitioners about current issues or informational needs related to the field

5. START consortium- http://www.start.umd.edu/start/education/

The National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism (START) is a university-based research center committed to the scientific study of the causes and human consequences of terrorism in the United States and around the world. Based at the University of Maryland, START supports research efforts of leading social scientists at more than 50 academic and research institutions, each of whom is conducting original investigations into fundamental questions about terrorism. In addition, START has developed educational programs, including an Undergraduate Minor in Terrorism Studies available to students at the University of Maryland and an online Graduate Certificate in Terrorism Analysis program, available to qualified students around the world.

START is a part of the collection of Centers of Excellence supported by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security's Science and Technology Directorate and also receives funding and support from a variety of Federal agencies, private foundations, and universities. All of START's research is conducted using non-classified materials. START's aim is to bring brand-new, cutting-edge research from the social and behavioral sciences into classrooms. START also emphasizes the importance of immediacy and impact in developing novel educational programming.

The website notes that interested parties can find course materials and syllabi related to the study of terrorism and responses to terrorism through links to pages that provide a syllabi repository, where START collects and compiles undergraduate and graduate syllabi from relevant courses throughout the world, and curriculum units, where START supports the development of individual curriculum units based on START-funded research projects by faculty members and advanced doctoral students. In addition, START periodically offers small grants to support the development of new curriculum units, which fund faculty members and advanced doctoral students affiliated with START to develop sets of materials that can be

incorporated into new and existing courses by both the grant recipient and other members of the START community.

6. University and Agency Partnership Initiative (UAPI)- https://www.chds.us/?special/info&pgm=Partner

The goal of the University and Agency Partnership Initiative (UAPI) is to bring together institutions nationwide dedicated to advancing homeland security education.

> This effort seeks to increase the number and diversity of students receiving homeland security education, accelerate the establishment of high-quality academic programs, and provide opportunities for collaboration that create an intellectual multiplier effect that furthers the study of homeland security.

The Naval Postgraduate School Center for Homeland Defense and Security (CHDS) makes available through the UAPI its curriculum, distance learning technology, Homeland Security Digital Library, and all other resources. In return, partners share their curriculum and specialized expertise with other UAPI partners. This "brings synergy to addressing critical research issues, accelerates the development of the homeland security academic discipline, and more rapidly serves knowledge to support the nation's security efforts." Additionally each year, the UAPI program hosts or co-sponsors a number of workshops and conferences for homeland security educators. These have included the annual Homeland Defense and Security Education Summits, the Semi-Annual Conferences for Homeland Security Educators, and the Faculty Development Workshops. Homeland Security educators and educational program administrators may request access to the UAPI website. Participants in the UAPI program may link to the UAPI site for shared course materials and online discussions.

B. European-Based Websites

There are European-based websites that focus on facilitating a platform for productive collaboration, practical research, and exchange of expertise or analysis of relevant scholarly findings. Yet, these do not appear to be engaged with pedagogical issues in HS education.

1. International Centre for Counter-Terrorism – the Hague

An example would include the International Centre for Counter-Terrorism (http://www.icct.nl/index.php) -- The International Centre for Counter-Terrorism – the Hague, is an "independent knowledge centre that focuses on information creation, collation and dissemination pertaining to the preventative and international legal aspects of counter-terrorism." By connecting the knowledge of experts to the issues that policymakers are confronted with, ICCT – The Hague strives to contribute to the strengthening of both research and policy.

2. Transnational Terrorism, Security, and the Rule of Law (TTSRL)

This European research project provides a similar example of research oriented website. TTSRL (http://www.transnationalterrorism.eu/index.php) was a multi-faceted

research project that aimed to help Europe better understand terrorism. The research was conducted between 2006 and 2009, where it combined the knowledge and experience of researchers at six research institutions from four EU member states. The Internet website provides a background of the project, and allows access to several publications on transnational terrorism in Europe.

C. Directions for GHSEN

Ideally the public sphere required for an enabling and productive website would need to ensure that academics from around the world would have access to materials and the ability to discuss issues regarding pedagogical concerns of homeland security education. An open message board, such as the IACSP Message Board: http://www.secureworldnet.com/forumdisplay.php?f=13, allowing input for an open-ended constituency would likely not be conducive to this goal. The Homeland Security Information Network (HSIN), National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism (START) and the University and Agency Partnership Initiative (UAPI) provide the models for intriguing facets of for such a website. HSIN provides Discussion Boards to its selected members. START contains a repository of course syllabi and curriculum units. The UAPI allows partners to share curriculum. However, the domestic focus on US homeland security at these entitles may not be sufficiently inviting for academics at non-US universities to see a value in engagement.

Jürgen Habermas and his notion of an ideal public sphere as a space capable of sustaining rational and meaningful forms of public communication within the spaces of civil society would seem to implicate the goals of Internet-based venue for contemplation and discussion of HS education and pedagogy. The advent of electronic media technologies capable of sustaining multiple flows of online interaction has altering many traditional modes of mass communication. Implementing practical discourse, involves fostering a political culture in which constituents actively participate in public debate and consciously adopt the discursive attitudes of responsibility, self-discipline, respect, cooperation, and productive struggle necessary to produce consensual agreements. For success for such a internet-based network there must be a recognition of the value of cross national exchanges of experience and perspective, the identification of shared issues of concern, the use the network as a form of personal education, and the development of the abilities to be able to look at issues of shared concern from a number of different perspectives (see Clark, 2006).

In the aftermath of the September 11th attacks, assessments and analyses came to common conclusions for the U.S. – a lack of information sharing gave cause to the successes of the attacks. The lack of clear understanding of roles, responsibilities, and assigned statutory authorities contributed to the failures in information sharing. Since the attacks significant changes have been made across U.S. government agencies, new policies, laws and programs have been created. However, in order to sustain the necessary level of focus and understanding of the continued threats, both man-made and natural, an educated workforce is essential. The approach taken in the U.S. appears to be that the institutionalization of homeland security must rely on academia to create the professional who will make the world a more secure and safer place. The inference that might be taken from this U.S. direction is that Europe may be in danger of

losing the necessary level of focus and understanding for ensuring security of its homeland, since it has not enlisted its academic structure in a process of institutionalizing homeland security. This dichotomy of approaches has been at the core of this Atlantis Policy Project and presents a challenge for the development of a Global Homeland Security Network that seeks to develop an observatory network of academic institutions for the continuous updating of academic policy and curricular benchmarking in homeland security education.

References

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. Available at: www.fas.org/sgp/crs/homesec/RL33573.pdf.

ASD (2007). Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense, "Homeland Defense and Homeland Security Professional Competencies" (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Defense, 2007).

Clark, Wayne (2006). The Public Sphere And The Academic Conference: Deliberation, Communication And Participation. *Journal of the Institute of Justice & International Studies, 6,* 15-21.

HSDECA (2010). HSDECA Self Study Guidelines for Graduate Degree Programs--Guidelines for Accreditation Applications and Self Study Reports for Homeland Security or Homeland Defense or Similarly Named Programs. Available at https://www.hsdeca.org.

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

Klitz, L. (2009) “Civic mission of HS education: A response to McCreight”, *Journal of Homeland Security and Emergency Management*, Volume 6, issue 1, article 57.

McCreight, Robert (2009). Educational Challenges in Homeland Security and Emergency Management, Journal of Homeland Security and Emergency Management, 6, issue 1, article 34. Available at: http://www.bepress.com/jhsem/vol6/iss1/34/.

McLean, C., Wallace, D., Soppitt, S., Parrish, W., Silander, D., and Irving, A. (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, Montreal.

McLean, C., Soppitt, S., and Welsh, D. (2010) Examining Homeland Security Academic Education Provision in the Transatlantic Context, paper presented at the ISA Annual Convention, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA.

Napolitano, Janet (Jan. 27, 2011). State of America's Homeland Security Address, George Washington University. Available at: http://www.dhs.gov/ynews/speeches/sp_1296152572413.shtm.

Office of Homeland Security (2002) *National Strategy for Homeland Security*, p. 2. Available at: http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/nat_strat_hls.pdf.

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

Wallace, Don, McLean, Craig, Parrish, William, Soppitt, Sarah, and Silander, Daniel (2011). 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.*