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Abstract

It is vital that U.S. academic institutions pay heed to the important global challenges that HS academics and practitioners must face. This article finds in an overview of the development of prescriptions for curricular outcomes and competencies for homeland security education in the U.S. that there has been little emphasis on curricular goals in the U.S. of the transnational and global application of homeland security strategies and operations. Transatlantic links in homeland security education between U.S. universities and their counterparts in Europe will be hampered by the virtual lack of explicit academic programs in this field in that continent. An examination of program goals and curricular offerings in U.S. post-baccalaureate programs indicates a modest attempt to provide students some grounding in transnational and global applications of homeland security strategies and operations.
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I. Introduction

Any examination or assessment of the subject of homeland security quickly reveals that, by its definition(s) alone, this is a very dynamic, complex, and broad subject area. The reactions to new forms of behavior that threaten a nation’s security have had to be incorporated, resulting in a very fluid area.

Within the American 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 United States (hereinafter U.S.) have been subjected to much reexamination.

Nevertheless, the direction of the government architecture and the profession of homeland security in the U.S. has been domestic in its focus, viewing strategic and contingency analyses through its national levels of preparation and response to threats from overseas sources. This has been replicated in much of the curricular benchmarking efforts in homeland security education, where the focus has tended to be an American one. The same cannot be said in Europe. Here there has neither been a reexamination in government nor academic institutions (McLean et al., 2011). There have been some varying approaches, but generally there has been no creation of an identifiable academic discipline of homeland security in Europe, Academic programs in Europe that most likely provide curricular offerings in homeland security-related subject matter, the programs tend to relate to international relations and global issues, in addition to security.

When attempting to conceptualize and understand homeland security issues, therefore, it is no exaggeration to argue that a clear transatlantic divide exists. This raises something of a problem, for although the global nature of homeland security challenges has been acknowledged by current and former DHS Secretaries, there continues to be a strong insular quality to prescriptions for curricular design for U.S. academic programs. Despite the broad differences in approaches to homeland security found in the U.S. and Europe, the leading calls for curriculum design in the U.S. omit specific content recommendations on comparative or transnational approaches to homeland security threats.

For the homeland security student, practitioner, and policymaker in the U.S. it would seem necessary to develop a transatlantic understanding of the
cooperative arrangements that have been institutionalized, while simultaneously being aware of significant structural differences.

This article examines these issues along the following lines. It begins by presenting an overview of the development of prescriptions for curricular outcomes and competencies for homeland security education in the U.S. The article then moves on to examine specifically the curricular goals in the U.S. of the transnational and global application of homeland security strategies and operations, before moving on to discuss the context of homeland security education in European academic institutions. Thereafter the article examines U.S. post-baccalaureate programs in homeland security for their program goals and outcomes and their curricular offerings in transnational and global applications of homeland security strategies and operations. The article concludes by arguing that in this newly emerging field of homeland security, it is vital that U.S. academic institutions pay heed to the important global challenges that homeland security academics and practitioners must face.

II. Establishing Standards for Homeland Security Education in the U.S.

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 in the U.S. 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 U.S. Congress in the fall of 2002. These two documents helped to facilitate a restructuring of U.S. government institutions. They also helped to identify 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. (Office of Homeland Security, 2002, p. 2).

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 (Office of Homeland Security, 2002) as:

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

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 U.S. 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 government agencies in the U.S., 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.

In November of 2007, the U.S. Assistant Secretary of Defense (hereinafter ASD) for Homeland Defense issued a memorandum that addressed the educational and professional development requirements that would provide knowledge and expertise in preparing the U.S. 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 identified 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

Over the period of several years, the Homeland Security and Defense Education Consortium (HSDECA) was being established as an association for homeland security educational program accreditation. As HSDECA became more established within the academic community (not to mention within the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (hereinafter DHS) and other partnering agencies) it began to focus on accreditation and the role it could play in serving as a leading accreditation organization for homeland security education programs. 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 some close similarities between HSDECA’s core competencies and the Critical Mission Areas of the National Strategy for Homeland Security. Both comprise content areas involving risk analysis and crisis management. The similarities should not be surprising as a number of HSDECA members engaged in the accreditation process have had experience in either the Department of Defense or DHS. Their expertise in understanding the application of strategic documents and national policy in an academic setting is very useful and might help to explain some of the logic behind the established core competencies.
The common descriptive and prescriptive listings for curricular content in homeland security academic programs can be used to develop curricular benchmarks for homeland security education programs in the U.S. However, despite these similarities, a common benchmark standard for post-baccalaureate education in homeland security has not been agreed upon by the relevant government agencies and education associations (McCreight, 2009).

III. The U.S. Context for Comparative or Transnational Applications of Homeland Security

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 analysis of 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 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 homeland security 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. A curricular element of international relations and processes would include border security and immigration (Polson et al., 2010).

These aspirations, however, have not been met with a generous reception. As described above, the benchmarking lists do not incorporate such subject matter unless as a learning-behavioral objective. It is only in its discussions of program outcomes that HSDECA makes such specific reference to this content.

In addition to the core competencies, HSEDCA has identified program outcomes. For graduate-level degree programs HSEDCA has identified as an outcome that graduatates of degree programs must demonstrate a “recognition of transnational and global application of homeland security or defense issues, strategies and operations” (HSDECA, 2010). The HSDECA designation is an ambivalent endorsement. It has not recognized this area as one of core knowledge content, instead HSDECA has identified this area as one for program outcomes. Skills and abilities may be developed in any number of courses/courses that are not necessarily coupled to a single content area. Further, HSDECA would allow these to be satisfied by previous coursework or completion of prerequisites and
advising. 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 security.

Further, 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 less 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).

Missing from these prescriptions of competencies is an explicit recognition that homeland security is becoming an increasingly global undertaking. Instead, one could read the above competencies in such a way that homeland security is really an area ranging from the local to the national, with scant regard given to greater international connectedness, or for the need to understanding international relations, or even to comprehend comparative or transnational applications of homeland security measures.

IV. A Curricular Goal of Transnational and Global Application of Homeland Security—The European Context

A. The EU Context for Homeland Security

Homeland security structures on both sides of the Atlantic differ in significant respects. The terrorist attacks on the U.S. 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 U.S. 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 to respond to other security challenges and disasters, both natural and man-made. Thus, there is no equivalent of a Homeland Security Department within Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Spain, and the UK (although the UK did create an Office for Security and Counter Terrorism within its Home Office (2011) as a response to the 7/7 bombings) (Archick et al., 2006). Further, perceptions may differ on the scope of the danger
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of terrorism and on appropriate counter-measures; comparatively speaking, European governments have been dealing with the threats posed by terrorist groups for longer than those of the U.S.

B. The EU Academic Context

For there to be communication between academic institutions in the U.S. and Europe, it might be essential to include a perspective of homeland security through the prism of the discipline of international relations. Each of the member states of the EU sets its own particular set of institutional and programmatic arrangements within higher education; thus, academic developments regarding homeland security programs must be examined at the country level. Yet, as in the U.S., there is a need in Europe to close the gap between the "intelligence and security services and academia" and to get more ideas and external analysis into the process of challenging terrorist organizations (Larrabee & Lindley-French, 2008).

McLean et al. (2011) reported that 146 EU-based academic programs, delivered in English, concerned themselves with homeland security-related issues. 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 grounding in studies of international relations and globalization for U.S. academics will be needed to engage in a dialogue with their European counterparts.

The U.S. 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 European universities, their approach of working within existing academic disciplines reflects the overall European governmental approach to homeland security efforts since 9-11, which has seen the existing institutional architectures aimed at combating terrorism and responding to other security challenges remain basically unchanged. The efforts to develop a unique area of study in homeland security education in the U.S. are not also seen in
Europe, thus the decade since the 9-11 attacks have witnessed the emergence of differing academic approaches.

V. Curricular Offerings of Transnational and Global Applications of Homeland Security in U.S. Programs

As at least suggested by the HSDECA program outcome of a “recognition of transnational and global application of homeland security or defense issues, strategies and operations,” an approach to homeland security education that includes a curricular component regarding international and comparative issues should have substantial potential for the homeland security profession. 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. To provide one obvious example, the 7/7 attacks in London could not possibly be understood by focusing upon domestic issues alone. It is well-known that the perpetrators were raised in the United Kingdom and were, to all intents and purposes, British. But these attacks had a specific international element, with Mohammad Sidique Khan – the plot’s alleged ringleader – both visiting training camps in Pakistan and receiving ‘bomb making guidance in phone calls’ from Rawalpindi ‘in the days before’ the attacks (BBC News 2011). Overlooking this crucial area therefore leaves one of the key evidential stones unturned in what was the UK’s worst terrorist attack.

A. Master’s and Doctoral Level Homeland Security Programs

The U.S. master’s level and PhD programs examined here were identified through websites that list institutions providing higher education in homeland security. These were the CHDS University and Agency Partnership Initiative (CHDS UAPI, 2011), ASIS International Academic Programs Council (ASIS, 2011), and FEMA Emergency Management Institute, Colleges, Universities and Institutions Offering Emergency Management Courses (FEMA, 2011). Of the 13 PhD programs identified as having homeland security content, only one program used the term “Homeland Security” in its degree title.

Because of the diversity of the master’s level programs, 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. The focus on master’s level programs that are nominally homeland security was to examine programs that hold themselves out as "homeland security" programs, in that this is how such programs are marketing themselves, if not also embracing the designation of "homeland security" as an academic area. Thus, degrees that carried the label
“homeland security,” “international security,” “security studies,” “terrorism studies,” or “intelligence” in their title, were included. Two post-baccalaureate certificate programs and 13 doctoral-level programs were included for this analysis. From this, a pool of 61 programs from 51 different institutions was identified. This examination of these programs prefers a focus on the program goals and outcomes in addition to a wide variety of curricular content. Thus, to avoid an unnecessary distraction of concerns with repute or standing, the authors believed it best to not identify these universities.

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 28 master’s level programs in homeland security were identified as containing at some level of international or comparative content. Seven programs of the 13 institutions offering PhD level programs similarly contain such content. In total there were 35 programs examined at 30 institutions.

In this section 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 implemented at the institution.

1. Program Goals and Learning Outcomes

Twelve of these PhD and master’s level programs contained no reference to international or comparative issues in their goal or learning objectives in the publically available information on their websites. Those that 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 U.S., and then to either a generalized concern for comparative approaches and cooperative arrangements or a more specific concern focused on homeland security threats for these approaches and arrangements. Thus, there is a range of goals and outcomes starting with a concern for the understanding of the international scope of the homeland security threat, moving to that of the international impact of the threat, then to an international approach to cooperative arrangements generally as well as those focused on homeland security threats.
2. Examples of the Range of International Scope, Impact, and Approaches to Homeland Security Threats

There can be seen a recognition of the international dimension of the threat to the homeland security of the U.S., without an articulation of the need for understanding the international impact and the cooperative efforts to combat this new threat. This recognition of an international level of threat is seen in the goals established for nine programs. At one institution, the focus of the master’s curriculum is on international and domestic security and preparedness issues that relate to all hazards including terrorist threats.

Beyond an international dimension of the threat, two institutions clearly profess a goal to have students understand the international as distinguished from a domestic impact from these threats. Students in a master’s of professional studies program in homeland security are given the opportunity to see the global dimension of the impact of human-sourced threats, where they will recognize how natural and man-made catastrophes affect society and the domestic and global economy.

There is a recognition of a student’s need to understand comparative approaches to homeland security in twelve programs. For example in one program there is an emphasis on 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 an international security studies program, there is a comparative emphasis to homeland security studies and an articulation of a goal of international cooperation among homeland security experts. In this program graduates will be prepared to evaluate the role of force in international politics and understand the challenges of strategy and statecraft within the spectrum of security issues as they relate to conflict.

Twelve programs provide a goal for the examination of international approaches generally relevant to homeland security threats, whereas ten allow for an examination of the approaches in terms specific to homeland security.

3. Implementation of Goals--Curricular Offerings

The same pattern seen with goals and outcomes is observed with the curricular offerings. Here a continuum can be observed ranging from courses examining the international scope, impact, and approach to threats to homeland security. In the programs where the goal is limited to fostering a recognition of an international scope to threats to homeland security, one might anticipate that this goal would be satisfied by curricular offerings limited to international terrorism. Such is the case
with the programs in four of the universities examined here. A further program 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 actual breadth of curricular offerings which cover comparative issues. For example, at a master’s level program there are curricular offerings in its required core, which include international political economy and comparative politics. Further there is the required course involving healthcare and homeland security, where the description for the content suggests a comparison of preparedness and security efforts in the U.S. to those of other nations.

There is a range of curricular offerings among the programs examined. However, not all programs provide the entire range of offerings in transnational and comparative issues in homeland security. Some programs provide courses with descriptions indicating a focus on the international scope of the threat to homeland security with courses furthering an understanding of the international approaches to homeland security threats. Others will provide courses at the level of international approaches without curricular offerings at the other end of the range, merely acquainting students with the international scope of the threat. Five of the programs examined here provide curricular offerings that do not extend beyond an examination of the international scope of the threat, whereas 28 provided courses that extend beyond this, with 15 examining international approaches specific to homeland security. The program at one university did not provide any curricular offerings that could be linked to the goal of international and comparative issues in homeland security, thus, likely viewing its goal regarding the international scope of the threat as merely linked to a learning program instilled by the program as a whole.

4. Curricular Offerings Where Statement of Goals Omitted Reference to International Concerns

Thirteen programs did not provide on their public websites an indication of program goals or learning outcomes dealing with international and comparative issues in homeland security. However, the curricular offerings for a majority of both master’s and doctoral level programs seem to welcome the furthering of their students’ understanding of these issues.

a. Master’s Level

The Center for Homeland Defense and Security (CHDS) at the Naval Postgraduate School in Monterey, CA, using a curriculum designed around
policy, practice, and program needs does include a curricular offering on comparative government for homeland security. This homeland security graduate-level program, although unavailable to private-sector attendees, is viewed as a sound model for development of a quality graduate program (Polson et al. 2010).

The objectives of this comparative course are: (1) to understand the transnational nature of homeland security threats, (2) to assess strategies employed by liberal democracies around the world; (3) to distill and extrapolate policy implications from these examples; and (4) to apply these lessons to the organizational and functional challenges faced by U.S. homeland security leaders. The CHDS catalog states that the course will prepare students to engage with their international partners at the local, state or federal levels as homeland security acquires an increasingly global mission and all levels of government in the U.S. move towards conducting greater international extension (CHDS, 2011). While the CHDS program is not open to the general public, other institutions throughout the U.S. have developed partnerships with CHDS and incorporated its academic program, although not all have included its course on comparative government.

At other master’s level programs, one 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. Additionally this program requires a course on counter-terrorism, which provides some comparative aspects involving the history and role of terrorism in world politics over the last two centuries. Students in a program at another university 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 in addition to a course that has international perspectives on terrorism.

b. Doctoral Level

In a doctoral level program on emergency management an elective is available on curricular offering on the politics of disaster, which situates disaster phases in the political context at the local, national, and international levels. A further doctoral level program in public health offers an elective course that examines bioterrorism, which considers how national and global governance should manage the challenges it raises, with a special focus on international cooperation in dealing with bioterrorism.

For other doctoral level programs in emergency management there are elective courses offered at two universities that provide a specific focus on homeland security regarding an international approach to homeland security threats. At a third institution, the doctoral level emergency management program
contains core-required courses that examine the international impact of the threat in addition to the international scope of the approach to homeland security threats.

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. Further, a PhD program in biological defense with homeland security or international security concentrations provides that for either concentration, a course in international relations is required. 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 alternative homeland security concentration.

This segregation of international security from homeland security is similarly reflected in a master’s levels programs at the two other institutions. In both, as with the PhD in biological defense program, there is a choice of concentrations between homeland security and international security. 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 homeland security for the alternate homeland security concentration. However, it does result in a diminishment of importance of these issues in the homeland security concentrations in these degree programs as they exclude discussion of international approaches to homeland security focusing on the international scope or impact of the homeland security threat.

VI. Conclusions

As part of its goal to benchmarking homeland security education in the U.S. 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.

Clearly many programs have gone beyond HSDECA’s program learning outcome of transnational understanding to specific curricular offerings. And it should not be forgotten that homeland security is a nascent academic field, so it is unsurprising to observe how academic institutions have often taken different approaches to understanding both the concept itself and the areas that is ought to cover. This study, though, provides an analytical tool for examining the learning goals and curricular offerings along a continuum of engagement with international content concerning homeland security threats.
Of the sample of 61 nominally homeland security masters and doctoral homeland security programs, 35 refer to aspects of transnational and global homeland security efforts in their statements on goals and learning objectives or in their curricular offerings. Of those that do, only ten programs do so in the context of furnishing a broader understanding of multilateral or comparative approaches specific to homeland security threats.

The curricular offerings provide a view of a greater use of this educational goal. Here 15 institutions have required or elective courses, that provide an understanding of an international approach to the threat to homeland security. For programs offering this international content, there likely needs to be a modified reconceptualization of the goals and objectives. Too frequently a program omitted mention of this learning outcome, when there were curriculum offerings. Also several of the programs provided for curriculum offerings at the more engaging level of international approaches to homeland security threats while minimizing the statement of goals and objectives to less engaging instruction on the international scope of the threat.

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 U.S. This may be understandable in light of the direction of leading proposals for curricula in homeland security academic programs. Inclusion of international and comparative approaches to homeland security threats would have not contradicted the opening definition of homeland security as first recognized by National Homeland Security Strategy of 2002. Here the definition though focused on the reduction of danger to the U.S. does not minimize the need to examine comparative and transnational approaches to homeland security threats that ultimately could impact U.S. national interests.

These findings 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 academic programs concerning international relations and globalization, and, to a lesser extent, security. From the perspective of a goal of fostering multilateral understanding in homeland security efforts between U.S. and European academic institutions and the students who graduate from these programs, the conceptual gap in U.S. homeland security education is problematic. If the goal of educational institutions and ultimately policy-makers is to produce a coherent global response to threats to the homeland, U.S. academic programs must be cognizant of a lack of relevance to Europe of a U.S. definition of homeland security. Perhaps U.S. institutions who desire for their students an “ability to analyze the global complexities and implications” of security policy
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should heed the call of former U.S. 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” (Polson et al., 2010, p. 11).
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