

November 2010

NATIONAL  
SECURITY

An Overview of  
Professional  
Development  
Activities Intended to  
Improve Interagency  
Collaboration



G A O

Accountability \* Integrity \* Reliability

## Why GAO Did This Study

Agencies must engage in a whole-of-government approach to protect the nation and its interests from diverse threats such as terrorism and infectious diseases. However, GAO has reported that gaps in national security staff knowledge and skills pose a barrier to the interagency collaboration needed to address these threats. Training and other professional development activities could help bridge those gaps. GAO was asked to identify: (1) training and other professional development activities intended to improve the ability of key national security agencies' personnel to collaborate across organizational lines and (2) how these activities were intended to improve participants' collaboration abilities.

To address these objectives, GAO asked nine key agencies involved in national security issues to submit information on professional development activities that were explicitly intended to build staff knowledge or skills for improving interagency collaboration. In addition, GAO gathered and analyzed other information such as target audience, participation levels, and participating agencies. GAO also interviewed responsible human capital and training officials. GAO will explore how interagency participation and other factors may influence the success of these activities in a subsequent review.

GAO does not have any recommendations in this report. Technical comments from the agencies reviewed were incorporated where appropriate.

View [GAO-11-108](#) or key components. For more information, contact Bernice Steinhardt at (202) 512-6543 or [steinhardt@gao.gov](mailto:steinhardt@gao.gov).

## NATIONAL SECURITY

### An Overview of Professional Development Activities Intended to Improve Interagency Collaboration

## What GAO Found

GAO identified 225 professional development activities intended to improve participants' ability to collaborate across agency lines. These ranged from ten-month joint professional military education programs and year-long rotations to 30-minute online training courses. Because these activities varied widely across dimensions such as length and learning mode, the activities were grouped to allow for appropriate analysis and comparisons of their characteristics, as shown in the table.

**Types and Quantity of Professional Development Activities Identified**

Activity type	Description	Quantity
Training Courses and Programs	Planned learning for acquiring and retaining the skills, knowledge, and attitudes required to complete specific tasks.	104
Exercise Programs	Scenario-based training that allows for the development, improvement, or display of specific capabilities or skills.	90
Interagency Rotation Programs	Work assignments at a different agency from the one in which the participant is normally employed, with an explicit professional development purpose.	7
Joint Professional Military Education Programs	A subset of military career education intended to foster collaboration across service branches, agencies, and countries for a whole-of-government approach to national security.	13
Leadership Development Programs	Programs with a national security focus, intended to build leadership skills such as communication, teamwork, and staff development.	11

Source: GAO analysis of agency data.

Overall, we found that DOD, State, and DHS provided most of the professional development activities that met our criteria. We found some variation within the different types of activities, mostly related to provider, mode of delivery, or participation levels. DHS, DOD, and State provided the majority of training activities, which primarily consisted of short-term, online, or classroom courses. DOD provided most of the exercise programs and all of the JPME programs. DOD and State provided the majority of interagency rotational programs and all of the leadership development programs that met our criteria. Although agencies could not provide participation data in every instance, the data obtained indicated that overall, interagency participation was lower in activities that required a longer time commitment, such as rotations and full-time joint professional military education.

Analysis of the activities GAO identified showed that they are intended to provide opportunities to (1) build common foundational knowledge of the national security arena; (2) develop specific skills, such as how to plan, lead, and execute interagency efforts; and (3) establish networks among personnel from national security agencies that could lead to improved interagency collaboration. According to human capital and training officials at several agencies, the level of interagency participation may affect how a given professional development activity can improve its participants' ability to collaborate.

---

# Contents

---

<b>Letter</b>		1
	Background	5
	Key Agencies Involved in National Security Issues Offer a Range of Professional Development Activities Intended to Foster Interagency Collaboration	7
	Professional Development Activities Provide Opportunities to Build Foundational Knowledge, Skills, and Networks That Are Intended to Improve Interagency Collaboration	27
	Concluding Observations	28
	Agency Comments	29
<b>Appendix I</b>	<b>Objectives, Scope, and Methodology</b>	31
<b>Appendix II</b>	<b>Inventory of Professional Development Activities Intended to Foster Interagency Collaboration</b>	36
<b>Appendix III</b>	<b>GAO Contact and Staff Acknowledgments</b>	56
<b>Related GAO Products</b>		57
<b>Tables</b>		
	Table 1: Participation Levels and Selected Characteristics of Short-Term Training Courses by Providing Agency	13
	Table 2: Participation Levels and Selected Characteristics of Long-Term Training Programs	15
	Table 3: Exercise Programs and Selected Characteristics by Providing Agency	17
	Table 4: Participation and Selected Characteristics of Interagency Rotational Programs	20
	Table 5: Selected JPME Program Characteristics by Education Level	22
	Table 6: Academic Year 2009 Participation Levels and Selected Characteristics of JPME Programs by Number of Participants from Other Federal Agencies	23

---

Table 7: Participation and Selected Characteristics of Leadership Development Programs by Providing Agency	25
Table 8: Training Courses and Programs	36
Table 9: Exercise Programs	49
Table 10: Interagency Rotational Programs	50
Table 11: Joint Professional Military Education Programs	52
Table 12: Leadership Development Programs	54

---

## Figures

Figure 1: Summary of Professional Development Activity Findings	10
Figure 2: Growing Emphasis on Need for Interagency Participation in Army College Programs Led to Creation of Army Command and General Staff College's Interagency Fellowship Program	21

---

## Abbreviations

DHS	Department of Homeland Security
DOD	Department of Defense
DOE	Department of Energy
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FS	Foreign Service (pay schedule)
GS	General Schedule
JPME	Joint Professional Military Education
NGO	Nongovernmental organization
NDU	National Defense University
NNSA	National Nuclear Security Administration
O	Officer-level (pay schedule)
ROTC	Reserve Officers' Training Corps
SES	Senior Executive Service
SFS	Senior Foreign Service
SL/ST	Senior-Level and Scientific or Professional
State	Department of State
Treasury	Department of Treasury
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USG	United States Government

---

---

This is a work of the U.S. government and is not subject to copyright protection in the United States. The published product may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without further permission from GAO. However, because this work may contain copyrighted images or other material, permission from the copyright holder may be necessary if you wish to reproduce this material separately.



G A O

Accountability \* Integrity \* Reliability

United States Government Accountability Office  
Washington, DC 20548

---

November 15, 2010

The Honorable Daniel K. Akaka  
Chairman  
The Honorable George V. Voinovich  
Ranking Member  
Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal  
Workforce, and the District of Columbia  
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs  
United States Senate

The Honorable John F. Tierney  
Chairman  
The Honorable Jeff Flake  
Ranking Member  
Subcommittee on National Security and Foreign Affairs  
Committee on Oversight and Government Reform  
House of Representatives

With threats to the U.S. as diverse as terrorism, cyber attacks, drug trafficking, infectious diseases, energy security, and the adverse effects of climate change, the national security landscape has recently evolved in complexity and scope. As we have reported, because no single federal agency has the ability to address these threats alone, agencies must work together in a whole-of-government approach to protect our nation and its interests. Our previous work has shown that there are a number of barriers to agencies' collaboration in addressing these threats.<sup>1</sup> One barrier stems from gaps in the knowledge and skills national security professionals need to work together across agency lines. Our work has also shown that participation in interagency training and other professional development activities may help bridge such gaps by enhancing mutual trust and understanding among personnel from different organizations.<sup>2</sup> The 2010 National Security Strategy also underscores the

---

<sup>1</sup>GAO, *Defense Management: Improved Planning, Training, and Interagency Collaboration Could Strengthen DOD's Efforts in Africa*, [GAO-10-794](#) (Washington, D.C.: July 28, 2010). GAO, *Homeland Defense: DOD Needs to Take Actions to Enhance Interagency Coordination for Its Homeland Defense and Civil Support Missions*, [GAO-10-364](#) (Washington, D.C.: Mar. 30, 2010).

<sup>2</sup>GAO, *National Security: Key Challenges and Solutions to Strengthen Interagency Collaboration*, [GAO-10-822T](#) (Washington, D.C.: June 9, 2010).

---

importance of professional development for improving interagency collaboration, calling for adapting the education and training of national security personnel to meet modern challenges.<sup>3</sup>

To help Congress better understand what actions agencies are taking to bridge these gaps in personnel knowledge and skills, you asked us to identify: (1) training and other professional development activities intended to improve the abilities of personnel from key agencies involved in national security issues to collaborate across organizational lines and (2) how these activities were intended to improve participants' collaboration abilities. As you also requested, a subsequent report will address factors that contribute to or challenge the success of such activities and programs.

To address our objectives, we first reviewed our prior work and other literature and interviewed experts on workforce development, education, national security, organizational culture, and collaboration to define the types of activities relevant to our topic. We selected key agencies involved in national security issues—the Department of Defense (DOD), the Department of State (State), the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), the Department of Treasury (Treasury), the Department of Justice (Justice), the Department of Energy (DOE), the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), and the Department of Commerce (Commerce)—based on a review of the prior work and other literature and interviews with subject-matter experts.<sup>4,5</sup> Because there is no central repository of information on professional development activities across the national security community, we collected data directly from each of these agencies. In some cases, we collected information directly from academic and training institutions within these organizations, such as DOD's National Defense University, State's Foreign Service Institute, and DHS's Emergency Management Institute. We then administered a questionnaire to relevant training, education, human capital, and program officials in the agencies

---

<sup>3</sup>National Security Strategy (Washington, D.C.: May 2010).

<sup>4</sup>GAO, *Interagency Collaboration: Key Issues for Congressional Oversight of National Security Strategies, Organizations, Workforce and Information Sharing*, [GAO-09-904SP](#) (Washington, D.C.: September 2009).

<sup>5</sup>We excluded Intelligence Community agencies under the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, which will be addressed in a separate GAO review.

---

asking them to identify and submit information on all professional development activities they were aware of that met these criteria:

- explicitly intends to build knowledge or skills among federal civilian and/or military personnel to encourage or improve collaboration with personnel of other federal departments;
- targets federal civilian and/or military personnel involved in developing or implementing national security policy, strategy, missions, or operations, but not support functions such as administration, financial management, or procurement;
- relates to national security activities; and
- is an ongoing, sustained activity, not a one-time event.

We took several steps to obtain as complete, consistent, and accurate information as possible. We asked agency officials to submit information on relevant professional development activities they hosted, as well as activities their personnel attended at other agencies or training institutions. By comparing these responses, we were able to identify and include some relevant activities that host agencies did not submit. For example, although officials at three agencies said their personnel participated in the National Exercise Program, the two agencies chiefly responsible for organizing the program did not initially include the program in their responses.<sup>6</sup> We followed up with human capital, education, training, and program officials multiple times to reconcile such differences, which may have occurred because agencies have different working definitions of “national security” and “collaboration,” and different ways of understanding how these concepts might intersect.

Agencies submitted a number of activities that they said were important to improving interagency collaboration in the national security arena that we excluded from our analysis because they were not explicitly intended to

---

<sup>6</sup>The National Exercise Program (NEP) Implementation Plan was approved in April 2007 (See <http://www.fema.gov/emergency/nrf/nationalexerciseprogram.htm>). See 6 U.S.C. § 748. Although DHS's Federal Emergency Management Agency is responsible for administering NEP, DOD helps to conduct some of the large-scale NEP exercises through the U.S. Northern Command, the military command responsible for planning, organizing, and executing DOD's homeland defense and civil support missions. See GAO, *Homeland Defense: U.S. Northern Command has a Strong Exercise Program, but Involvement of Interagency Partners and States Can be Improved*, GAO-09-849 (Washington, D.C.: September 9, 2009) and GAO, *National Preparedness: FEMA Has Made Progress, but Needs to Complete and Integrate Planning, Exercise, and Assessment Efforts*, GAO-09-369 (Washington, D.C.: Apr. 30, 2009).

---

improve their participants' collaboration abilities and therefore did not fall within the scope of this report. For example, several agencies submitted information on collaborative work groups convened to address a particular national security concern, such as the Treasury-led Committee on Foreign Investment in the U.S., which brings together personnel from multiple federal agencies to identify and address potential national security risks posed by certain foreign investments.<sup>7</sup> Several agencies also submitted interagency assignments such as details, attachés, and advisors intended to support the agencies' missions, but the agencies did not manage these positions as professional development opportunities, and as such they lacked an explicitly developmental element intended to improve participants' collaboration abilities beyond the specific assignment.<sup>8</sup>

More than 200 of the more than 350 activities that agencies submitted met our criteria and we therefore included them in our inventory. We gathered additional information on these, including available fiscal year 2009 participation data, and analyzed characteristics and statistics such as typical duration, eligibility criteria, participation rates, and participating agencies to identify groups of activities, patterns, themes, and other information. We determined these data to be reliable for the purposes of identifying and describing developmental activities. We further assessed the reliability of the participation data by interviewing knowledgeable agency officials and determined these data to be sufficiently reliable to report approximate participation levels for 2009. The complete inventory of activities is available in appendix II and the electronic supplement [GAO-11-109SP](#).

We conducted our work from September 2009 to November 2010 in accordance with all sections of GAO's Quality Assurance Framework that are relevant to our objectives. The framework requires that we plan and perform the engagement to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to meet our stated objectives and to discuss any limitations in our work. We believe that the information and data obtained and the analysis conducted

---

<sup>7</sup>However, in some cases, we did identify and include training intended to prepare personnel for collaborative work groups and committees.

<sup>8</sup>A range of assignments and other activities that were intended to improve national security collaboration were outside of our focus on collaboration among federal agencies. Some examples include State's rotational assignments involving international organizations such as the United Nations and DHS's rotations and training courses intended to improve collaboration across its component agencies and with its state and local partners.

---

provide a reasonable basis for any findings and conclusions in this product.

---

## Background

In the past, DOD, USAID, and State were the federal agencies primarily responsible for national security. Over the past decade, however, events such as 9/11 and the ongoing operations in Iraq and Afghanistan have underscored the need for a broader and more integrated national security effort. One of the first structural changes Congress made to address this need was to integrate 22 separate agencies with domestic national security responsibilities to create DHS.<sup>9</sup> Today, greater emphasis is being placed on identifying whole-of-government approaches to developing national security policies and carrying out operations. Such an approach emphasizes the contributions of agencies not traditionally associated with national security. For example, Commerce plays a role in monitoring exports of technology to make sure that sensitive items with military uses do not fall into the hands of our enemies.

In light of the challenges that the U.S. government continues to experience in its efforts to coordinate the actions of the agencies involved—whether it be preventing a terrorist attack or overseeing reconstruction and stabilization efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan—there is an ongoing policy debate on how to enhance and sustain interagency collaborative efforts. Among the range of proposals for reform, there is a growing consensus that the government’s professional development efforts could contribute to more effective interagency collaboration, which is seen as key to U.S. national security. Specifically, a number of reports—such as the Project on National Security Reform’s *Forging a New Shield* and the 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review, written by experts working in the national security field—recommended establishing a cadre of national security specialists from all relevant departments and agencies, and placing them in a long-term career development program designed to provide them with a better understanding of the processes and cultures of other agencies. Proponents contend that such a program would help the U.S. government prepare personnel with national security responsibilities to plan, execute, and lead national security missions. More recently, in September 2010, Congressmen Ike Skelton and Geoff Davis introduced the Interagency National Security Professional Education, Administration, and Development Systems Act of 2010 which seeks to create a system to

---

<sup>9</sup>Homeland Security Act of 2002, Pub. L. No. 107-269, 116 Stat. 2135 (Nov. 25, 2002).

---

educate, train, and develop interagency national security professionals across the government.<sup>10</sup>

Agencies have historically defined their own professional development activities for their national security personnel. In 2007, however, the Bush Administration launched the National Security Professional Development (NSPD) initiative to integrate professional development activities for national security personnel as part of a larger effort to enhance interagency collaboration. Executive Order 13434, May 17, 2007, entitled National Security Professional Development, required the heads of all agencies with national security responsibilities to identify or enhance current professional development activities for their national security personnel. In addition, the order established an Executive Steering Committee composed of 15 agency Secretaries or Directors (or their designees) to facilitate implementation of the National Strategy for Professional Development.<sup>11</sup> To coordinate NSPD-related activities among agencies, the Executive Steering Committee established the NSPD Integration Office, which created an online repository of information on available training and other professional development activities for national security professionals.

Recently, two studies have been launched to reexamine NSPD and to take a more comprehensive look at the skills, education, training, and professional experiences that interagency national security professionals need at various career stages. While awaiting the results of these studies, the NSPD executive staff is reviewing issues related to the scope and definition of national security professionals and revising the NSPD strategy and implementation plan. Several agencies reported putting implementation of their NSPD-related training and professional development activities on hold pending the results of these reviews, or other direction from the administration. In addition, the online repository of information is no longer available.

---

<sup>10</sup>Interagency National Security Professional Education, Administration, and Development System Act of 2010, H.R. 6249, 111th Cong. (as introduced by House, Sept. 29, 2010).

<sup>11</sup>Executive Order No. 13434, *National Security Professional Development*, 72 *Fed. Reg.* 28,583 (May 17, 2007) named 15 agency officials and provided that the Chairman of the Executive Steering Committee could designate additional members. Two other members (from Commerce and Interior) were later designated to participate.

---

## Key Agencies Involved in National Security Issues Offer a Range of Professional Development Activities Intended to Foster Interagency Collaboration

We identified 225 professional development activities intended to improve participants' abilities to collaborate across organizational lines.<sup>12</sup> These ranged from 10-month joint professional military education programs and year-long rotations to 30-minute online courses. Because these activities varied so widely across dimensions such as length and learning mode, we grouped them in a way that would allow us to analyze their characteristics and make appropriate comparisons. These five general groups included training courses and programs, training exercises, interagency rotational programs, Joint Professional Military Education (JPME), and leadership development programs. We provide further description of these groups in figure 1.

Additionally, six of the eight agencies represented on the Executive Steering Committee established by the executive order—DOD, DHS, Justice, Commerce, State, and DOE—identified training related to the National Security Professional Development (NSPD) initiative.<sup>13</sup> We categorized NSPD separately because, although the developmental activities created under its auspices to date have included mostly online training courses, when fully implemented, NSPD was intended to include a range of activities from training courses to interagency assignments, fellowships, and exchanges. NSPD was intended to play a critical role in informing national security professional development activities, and as such, is included in our review in addition to the five groups listed above.

Overall, we found that DOD, State, and DHS provided most of the professional development activities that met our criteria. We found some variation within the different types of activities, mostly related to provider, mode of delivery, or participation levels. DHS, DOD, and State provided the majority of training activities, which primarily consisted of short-term, online, or classroom courses. DOD provided most of the exercise programs and all of the JPME programs. DOD and State provided the majority of interagency rotational programs and all of the leadership development programs that met our criteria. Each of the other agencies we reviewed provided at least one relevant professional development

---

<sup>12</sup> The complete inventory of activities is available in app. II and the electronic supplement [GAO-11-109SP](#).

<sup>13</sup> USAID does not have a designated official on the Executive Steering Committee.

---

activity.<sup>14</sup> All of the agencies we reviewed reported sending personnel to participate in one or more activities in fiscal year 2009.

Among the activities for which agencies provided participation data, we found that short-term, online training tended to have the highest participation levels. Participation levels associated with longer-term activities—such as interagency rotational programs—were much lower. Figure 1 below summarizes these and other findings and provides more detailed descriptions of our six activity groups.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup>Commerce reported providing a Civilian Response Corps orientation training course featuring a reconstruction and stabilization tabletop exercise; however this information was not received in time to include in our report.

<sup>15</sup>Where available, agencies reported the number of participants in each activity they provided; these numbers cannot be combined to yield total numbers of individuals who participated in activities overall, because some individuals may have participated in multiple activities and would be counted multiple times.

---

This page left blank intentionally.

**Figure 1: Summary of Professional Development Activity Findings**

### Training Courses and Programs<sup>a</sup> identified: 104

Planned learning for acquiring and retaining skills, knowledge, and attitudes. In our review, most were online courses provided by DHS's EMI or DOD's Joint Forces Command, or classroom courses provided by State's FSI.<sup>b</sup>

- Fiscal year 2009 participation: 228,000 in online courses; 13,000 in classroom courses; 2,000 in a combination of online and classroom courses<sup>c</sup>
- Most courses provided a common framework for understanding national security topics or information on how to work with an agency with national security responsibilities.

### Exercise Programs identified: 90

Scenario-based training that allows for the development, improvement, or display of specific capabilities or skills. In our review, most were DOD joint military exercises.

- Fiscal year 2009 participation: data not provided for most<sup>d</sup>
- Most exercises intended to bring participants together to practice working collaboratively within a range of national security-related scenarios.

### Interagency Rotational Programs identified: 7

Work assignments at a different agency from the one in which the participant is normally employed, with an explicit professional development purpose. In our review, most involved sending personnel between civilian agencies and the military.

- Fiscal year 2009 participation: 240
- Most rotations provided participants opportunities to learn about organizational culture and build networks among partner national security agencies.



Photo: DHS/Emergency Management Institute.



Photo: State.



Photo: Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives.

In our review, the majority of training was through DHS Emergency Management Institute's online courses on integrated national emergency response topics (far left) or through State Foreign Service Institute's classroom courses (not pictured). A few other agencies and organizations also provided training courses on specialized topics. For example, DOJ provided a course for law enforcement officials on conducting post-blast investigations (far right), and State's Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization provided a course that develops the skills planners need to conduct interagency conflict assessments in the field (center).

Source: GAO.

<sup>a</sup>This number includes 101 individual courses and 3 programs comprising multiple courses: we could not obtain course-specific information for some of these programs within our reporting time frame.

<sup>b</sup>The U.S. Joint Forces Command, through its Joint Training Directorate/Joint Warfighting Center (J7), coordinates the military's overall joint training efforts while working with a range of partners including the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Staff, the services, combatant commands, and interagency and multinational communities.

<sup>c</sup>Rounded to nearest 1,000. All other participation numbers in this table rounded to nearest 10.

## Joint Professional Military Education programs identified: 13

A subset of military career education intended to foster collaboration across military service branches, agencies, and countries. In our review, most civilian agencies reported sending personnel to these programs.

- Academic year 2009 participation:<sup>e</sup> 5,100
- Programs sought to provide a whole-of-government perspective to national security through curriculum and by exposing students to other agencies' perspectives.

## Leadership Development Programs identified: 11

Programs with a national security focus intended to build leadership skills such as communication, teamwork, and staff development. In our review, programs were provided by State or DOD.

- Fiscal year 2009 participation: 560
- Most programs intended to prepare personnel to lead within a complex, explicitly interagency environment.

## National Security Professional Development activities identified: N/A<sup>f</sup>

A governmentwide initiative established by executive order in 2007 to identify and develop national security professionals at 15 federal agencies.

- Fiscal year 2009 participation: Most NSPD training suspended for fiscal year 2009
- Initial NSPD-related training provided a common framework for understanding national security topics or information on how to work with partner agencies with national security responsibilities. Some provided interagency networking opportunities.



Photo: DOD's National Defense University.



Photo: DOD's National Defense University.



Photo: USAF/Staff Sgt. Ricky A. Bloom/Released.

In our review, DOD provided the majority of professional development activities. These included JPME programs such as the National War College Master of Science in National Security Strategy at the National Defense University (far left) and leadership development programs with a national security focus, such as the Program for Emerging Leaders at the National Defense University's Center for the Study of Weapons of Mass Destruction (top). In addition, DOD conducted numerous joint-military exercises open to interagency participation (near left). DOD also created an office to implement its NSPD program (not pictured).

Source: GAO.

<sup>a</sup>A DOD Office of the Undersecretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness official said it collects exercise-level data from the services and combatant commands on whether exercises included interagency participation, but does not collect data on the number of individuals who participated in the exercises. The official said that this is the level of information needed for management decision making related to its goal to increase interagency participation in joint military exercises. Also, DHS provided participation data for only one of its National Exercise Program exercises.

<sup>b</sup>Most JPME programs reported participation by academic year.

<sup>c</sup>N/A = not applicable. Agencies submitted a range of activities under NSPD and did not consistently provide 2009 participation data.

---

## DHS, DOD, and State Provided Majority of Short-Term Training Courses and DHS Online Courses Had Highest Participation Levels of All Training Activities

According to our analysis, DHS, DOD, and State provided the majority of the 101 short-term training courses that met our criteria. Over half of these courses were provided in a classroom setting; most of the other courses were provided as online independent study courses, and several courses either mixed or offered a choice between the two modes. State's Foreign Service Institute (FSI) provided most of the 52 classroom directed-study courses, which typically lasted several days or longer and covered the range of policy issues that State addresses, such as post-conflict reconstruction and stabilization and commercial and trade activity. DHS's Emergency Management Institute (EMI) and DOD—through its Joint Knowledge Online system—provided the 43 online courses, most of which lasted less than 3 hours. These online courses covered topics ranging from the National Response Framework, which is a framework for how agencies collaborate on national preparedness planning efforts, to the roles and responsibilities of different agencies involved in interagency planning efforts such as Joint Interagency Coordination Groups.<sup>16, 17</sup> DOD's Information Resources Management College at the National Defense University (NDU) provided the six courses that mixed classroom and online learning or offered participants a choice between the two modes. These courses, such as Multiagency Collaboration and Enterprise Strategic Planning, covered organizational management topics in the context of national security and interagency collaboration, and could be taken either in a 10- to 12-week online format or as a 5-day classroom seminar on the NDU campus.

Some of the courses targeted participants of certain career levels or with certain areas of responsibility. For example, EMI's introductory national response framework course targeted executive-level personnel from government and other organizations with responsibilities for emergency response. Other courses, such as FSI's Foundations of Interagency Reconstruction and Stabilization Operations course, did not target a specific employee level or rank but were open to anyone preparing to deploy to Afghanistan, Iraq, or other conflict-prone countries.

---

<sup>16</sup> The National Response Framework presents the guiding principles that enable all response partners to prepare for and provide a unified national response to disasters and emergencies—from the smallest incident to the largest catastrophe.

<sup>17</sup> Joint Interagency Coordination Groups, housed within DOD combatant commands, are intended to serve as a coordinating body among the civilian agencies in Washington, D.C., the country ambassadors, the combatant command's staff, and other multinational and multilateral bodies within the region.

The vast majority of participation in short-term training courses—95 percent—was associated with DHS online courses offered through EMI, which is housed within the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). EMI tracks participation in two categories: (1) FEMA, and (2) all other entities, including participants from other DHS agencies. Therefore, we could not determine how many participants were from DHS and how many came from other agencies. State and most of the other agencies providing classroom courses did track interagency participation. Data show that interagency participation varied widely; some courses had none at all, while others featured a mix of participants from various agencies. For most courses, interagency participation was less than 15 percent. See table 1 for additional information on training courses we identified.

**Table 1: Participation Levels and Selected Characteristics of Short-Term Training Courses by Providing Agency**

Providing agency <sup>a</sup> and subject matter	Number of Courses	Participant time commitment (range)	Approximate FY 2009 participation <sup>b</sup>	
			Total	Percentage from outside of providing agency
<b>Online Courses</b>				
DHS's Emergency Management Institute National Response Framework, National Incident Management System, Incident Command System	26	30 minutes – 5 hours	226,590	Not Available <sup>c</sup>
DOD <sup>d</sup> Joint military and humanitarian operations, roles and responsibilities of partner agencies	17	1-57 hours	1,870	Not Available <sup>c</sup>
<b>Total online courses and participation levels</b>	<b>43</b>		<b>228,460</b>	
<b>Classroom courses</b>				
State or State's Foreign Service Institute Reconstruction and stabilization, foreign assistance, predeployment orientation, economic and commercial activity, crisis management abroad, etc.	36	2 days – 12 weeks	9,050	19
DOD Reconstruction and stabilization, homeland security planning, planning in a collaborative environment	7	1–4 weeks	480	13
USAID Conflict mitigation, reconstruction and stabilization	2	2 days and 2 weeks	1,670	81
Justice Law enforcement, explosives	2	1 week	260	86

Providing agency <sup>a</sup> and subject matter	Number of Courses	Participant time commitment (range)	Approximate FY 2009 participation <sup>b</sup>	
			Total	Percentage from outside of providing agency
Coprovided Nuclear safety and security (DOE and DOD), physical security (DOD and State)	2	1 day – 8 weeks	650	17
DOE Nuclear weapons safety and security	1	1 day	120	23
USDA Security of nation's food supply	1	5 days	30	100
Treasury Terrorist financing and financial crimes policy issues	1	26 hours	60	Not open to other agencies
<b>Total classroom courses and participation levels</b>	<b>52</b>		<b>12,300</b>	

#### Choice between classroom and online

DOD NDU Information Resources Management College Communications, organizational culture, and national security	6	5 days classroom or 10-12 weeks online	190 <sup>e</sup>	27
---	---	---	------------------	----

Source: GAO

<sup>a</sup>Providing agency is the agency that offers the course.

<sup>b</sup>Participation numbers are rounded to the nearest ten. Most participation numbers were reported in terms of federal fiscal years. However, some academic institutions tracked and reported participation by academic year time frames.

<sup>c</sup>For these courses, EMI collected participation information for FEMA participants and non-FEMA participants. Non-FEMA participants may include those from other DHS component agencies, since EMI's current learning management system predate DHS, and would not count as "interagency" as we have defined it for this report (a FEMA official noted that system changes will allow DHS vs. non-DHS tracking by March 2011). Similarly, DOD did not collect information on these online courses that would allow us to determine the percentage of interagency participation as defined in this report.

<sup>d</sup>These online courses were provided through DOD's Joint Knowledge Online system. According to training officials in OUSD-Readiness and Joint Forces Command, because the system's course content is not managed centrally, there may be additional Joint Knowledge Online courses that are intended to improve federal interagency collaboration on national security. One official said that the system is a useful tool to support training for the larger national security community, because Joint Forces Command allows other government and non-governmental organizations, such as DHS and the North American Treaty Organization, to deliver relevant training through the system

<sup>e</sup>Participant information for DOD-provided courses is for academic calendar year 2009, which runs from July through June.

In addition to individual training courses, there were also three long-term programs associated with advanced degrees that met our criteria. The College of International Security Affairs at DOD's NDU provides a part-time certificate or 10-month full-time master's program that teaches students how to develop and implement whole-of-government national and international security strategies for conditions of peace, crisis, and

war. The Interamerican Defense College provides an 11-month Advanced Course on Hemispheric Security and Defense.<sup>18</sup> Although the majority of the participants are from other countries, State and DOD also send personnel to this program, and one of its stated objectives is to foster connections among participants. Finally, DOD's Naval Postgraduate School provides graduate programs ranging from month-long courses to multiyear master's and doctoral programs that focus on various aspects of the defense and national security arenas within an interagency and intergovernmental context.

**Table 2: Participation Levels and Selected Characteristics of Long-Term Training Programs**

Providing agency and institute	Subject matter	Length	Approximate FY 2009 participation <sup>a</sup>
DOD's NDU College of International Security Affairs	Whole-of-government national and international security strategies for conditions of peace, crisis, and war	Part-time certificate program or 10 months full-time	300 <sup>b</sup>
Interamerican Defense College <sup>c</sup>	Hemispheric defense and security efforts	11 months	10
DOD's Naval Postgraduate School	Increasing combat effectiveness to enhance national security	Programs range from month-long courses to multiyear master's and doctoral programs	2210

Source: GAO.

<sup>a</sup>Interagency participation was not available for these programs. Participant information for DOD-provided courses is for academic calendar year 2009, which runs from August through June.

<sup>b</sup>Participation numbers are rounded to the nearest ten.

<sup>c</sup>This program is sponsored by an international educational institution rather than a federal agency.

### Through Its Military Services and Combatant Commands, DOD Provided Majority of Exercise Programs

According to officials in DOD's Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness (OUSD-Readiness), in fiscal year 2009, the military services or combatant commands led an estimated 84 joint-military exercise programs that addressed a range of national security matters and sought to improve the ability of participants to work across agency lines by encouraging interagency participation.<sup>19</sup> In addition, First

<sup>18</sup>The Interamerican Defense College is an international educational institution funded by the Organization of American States and the Inter-American Defense Board. It is collocated with National Defense University at Fort Lesley J. McNair in Washington, D.C.

<sup>19</sup>According to a U.S. Joint Forces Command publication on joint-military exercises, combatant commands are responsible for defense and security related operations by geography or function, and are composed of forces from the various Services. Each has joint training responsibilities, with U.S. Joint Forces Command designated to lead joint training development.

---

Army, which is responsible for U.S. Army Reserve and Army National Guard training, led an exercise program for military and interagency civilian personnel preparing to deploy to Afghanistan provincial reconstruction teams.<sup>20</sup> DOD's Center for Applied Strategic Learning at NDU also provided an exercise program for mid- and senior-level federal personnel and members of Congress, which included crisis simulations in a range of national security areas such as the Horn of Africa, international water rights, and space policy.

During fiscal year 2009, there were also four exercise programs provided by civilian agencies, including State, USDA, and DHS's FEMA, which is responsible for coordinating the National Exercise Program (NEP). Officials from DHS Headquarters and FEMA said that FEMA had conducted five NEP exercises in fiscal year 2009, including one national-level exercise and four principle-level exercises, which targeted senior officials. They also said that although FEMA does not track information on all levels of NEP exercises, up to three more federal strategy or policy-focused exercises are required annually, and there may have been many more conducted regionally throughout the country during fiscal year 2009.<sup>21</sup>

Some of the exercises, such as those conducted by the Center for Applied Strategic Learning, targeted mid- and senior-level leadership of federal agencies and other organizations. However, most of the exercise programs

---

<sup>20</sup>U.S.-led provincial reconstruction teams were designed to improve stability in Afghanistan and Iraq by increasing the host nation's capacity to govern; enhancing economic viability; and strengthening local governments' ability to deliver public services, such as security and health care. Provincial reconstruction teams are also viewed as a means of coordinating interagency diplomatic, economic, reconstruction, and counterinsurgency efforts among various U.S. agencies in Afghanistan and Iraq. See *GAO, Provincial Reconstruction Teams in Afghanistan and Iraq, GAO-09-86R* (Washington, D.C.: October 1 2008).

<sup>21</sup>As we have previously reported (see *GAO-09-369*), the NEP implementation plan identified four tiers of exercises intended to bring together participants from federal, state, and local government and other entities, to test and improve the nation's ability to prevent, prepare for, and respond to events such as terrorist attacks and natural and man-made disasters. According to the 2008 plan, full federal agency participation—which includes all appropriate department and agency principals, among other key organizations—is required for five tier-one exercises and up to three tier-two exercises annually. The NEP Implementation Plan names the following federal departments and agencies as voting members of the NEP Executive Steering Committee with coordination responsibilities: DHS, DOD, DOJ, DOE, State, the Departments of Transportation and Health and Human Services, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

did not specify a rank or career level for their target participant population. See table 3 for more information on the subject matter and number of military and civilian-agency-led exercises.

**Table 3: Exercise Programs and Selected Characteristics by Providing Agency<sup>a</sup>**

Agency	Program	Number of programs FY2009	Exercise subject matter	Participant time commitment
DOD—Military Service or Combatant Command	Various joint military exercise programs	84	Military and civilian response to insurgency, terrorist, and criminal activities, humanitarian assistance and disaster relief, mission rehearsal, logistics and combat operations, etc.	1 day – 6 weeks depending on program, and whether participant helps to plan, conduct, and/or attends as training audience
DOD—First Army	Afghanistan Provincial Reconstruction Team Predeployment Training	1	Interagency provincial reconstruction team predeployment training.	60 – 90 days for military personnel; civilian participants join exercise for 2 – 3 weeks
DOD—NDU's Center for Applied Strategic Learning	Policy-related exercises	1	Crisis-based policy decision making related to humanitarian assistance/disaster relief, international water rights, cybersecurity, the Horn of Africa, anti-terrorism/force protection, space policy issues, etc.	1/2 – 2 days depending on exercise
State	The Interagency Civilian-Military Integration Training Exercise Program	1	Interagency provincial reconstruction team predeployment training	1 week
State	Foreign Emergency Support Team Quarterly Exercises	1	Interagency emergency response overseas crises and emergencies.	Varied depending on exercise
USDA	Food Defense Exercise Program	1	Federal, state, and local response to food crises incidents, food defense	1 day
DHS—Federal Emergency Management Agency	National Exercise Program	1	Coordinated federal, state, and local preparation and response to emergencies such as terrorist attacks or natural disasters, etc.	Varied depending on exercise

Source: GAO.

<sup>a</sup>Participation levels are not included in the table because individual participation numbers were not available for the majority of exercises.

DOD OUSD-Readiness officials identified 84 exercise programs which reported 212 individual joint-military exercises during fiscal year 2009. Although the joint-military exercises were not necessarily created to facilitate interagency collaboration, officials from both OUSD-Readiness and the Joint Forces Command acknowledged the importance of such

---

interagency participation. They recognized that shared training experiences strengthen the collaborative partnerships between the military and civilian interagency communities by making the exercises more realistic and establishing interagency networks among participants.<sup>22</sup> Joint Forces Command has taken steps to increase interagency participation, creating a “Partnership Opportunities Catalog” of joint exercises open to interagency and other partners. It has also begun to collect and assist with requests for interagency participation from military services and combatant commands looking for participants from specific agencies or other partner organizations.

According to DOD, in fiscal year 2009, about 50 percent of the exercise programs—43 of 84—had some interagency participation.<sup>23</sup> However, because DOD included state and local personnel in its definition of interagency participation, it is possible that there were fewer exercise programs with interagency participation as it is defined in this report. Also, even though participation data were not systematically tracked for the two First Army-led fiscal year 2009 Afghanistan provincial reconstruction team predeployment exercises, an Army official estimated that approximately 2,500 military personnel participated. In addition, a USAID official estimated that approximately 40 civilians from USAID and other agencies, such as State and USDA, participated in the interagency modules of these exercises during the same time period.

An official at NDU’s Center for Applied Strategic Learning reported that in fiscal year 2009, through its Strategic Policy Forum and its other policy-related exercises, the Center provided 18 crises simulations for personnel from a range of agencies. Examples of participating agencies include DOD, State, DHS, DOJ, USAID, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and others.

---

<sup>22</sup>According to DOD military training officials, agency personnel could participate in joint military exercises in three ways: (1) helping to plan and develop an exercise, (2) playing a scripted role during an exercise, and (3) taking part in the exercise as a member of the training audience. One official said that it is equally important to have participation in all three ways.

<sup>23</sup>OUSD-Readiness officials explained that the military services and combatant commands identify those exercises that are appropriate for interagency participation. OUSD-Readiness then monitors whether these goals for interagency participation are met in order to identify any gaps in interagency participation and possible solutions.

---

Both State and USDA provided participation data on their fiscal year 2009 exercises, which reported 24 participants for one State-led exercise and 170 for the USDA exercise.<sup>24</sup> While DHS's FEMA did not provide NEP data that differentiated between federal, state, local, and other participants, one FEMA official estimated that approximately 2,500 personnel from more than 230 organizations participated in the 2009 national-level exercise.

---

### Majority of Interagency Rotational Programs Send Personnel between Civilian Agencies and DOD

We identified seven interagency rotational assignment programs that supported participating agencies' efforts to achieve their missions while explicitly seeking to develop participants' abilities to collaborate on national security. Five of these rotational assignment programs involved sending personnel between civilian agencies and the Pentagon or military learning institutions. For example, State's Foreign Policy Advisors program places Foreign Service Officers in the Pentagon and military commands worldwide as personal advisors to senior military commanders. State participants work alongside DOD civilians and officers on a range of national security issues such as international relations and diplomatic practices. The other two programs involved sending civilian agency personnel to other federal agencies or executive offices.

Only one of the rotation programs is open to all levels of personnel. The other programs target personnel at specific ranks or career levels. The three State-sponsored programs target mid- and senior-level personnel, while the DOD-sponsored programs are intended for junior or mid-level personnel and are associated with educational programs. For example, the Military Academic Collaborations program sends select midshipmen, cadets, and some instructors from military officer development programs such as the Academies and university Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs to DOE NNSA laboratories for summer internships. Table 4 describes selected characteristics of each rotational program.

---

<sup>24</sup> According to data provided by State officials, there were 24 participants in the week-long Integrated Civilian-Military Afghanistan Predeployment Training Exercise. Officials did not provide participant data for the Foreign Emergency Support Team training exercises because they said such data were sensitive.

**Table 4: Participation and Selected Characteristics of Interagency Rotational Programs**

Program name	Participating agencies	Target population <sup>a</sup>			Length of assignment	Participation FY 2009 <sup>b</sup>
		GS- 7 - 12	GS-13 - 15	SES		
DHS's Rotational Assignments Program	DHS and other federal agencies	✓	✓	✓	At least 60 days	80 <sup>c</sup>
Military Academic Collaborations	DOD and DOE's National Nuclear Security Administration.	✓			3-12 weeks	10
U.S. Army Command and General Staff College Interagency Exchange Program and Intermediate Level Education Interagency Fellowship Program	DOD and various federal agencies.		✓		9-12 months	20 <sup>d</sup>
Navy Washington DC Intern Program	DOD and various Washington, D.C. area agencies.		✓		2 5-month internships	1
State Rotations at JPME and other Federal Learning Institutions	State and various JPME colleges or other institutions such as the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.		✓	✓	1-3 years	30
State Rotations at Federal Agencies and Executive Offices	State and various federal agencies or executive offices that play a role in developing and implementing national security policy.		✓	✓	1-3 years	30
State Rotations at DOD	State and DOD.		✓	✓	1-3 years	70

Source: GAO.

<sup>a</sup>May also target military or Foreign Service equivalents to General Schedule levels.

<sup>b</sup>We rounded participation numbers to the nearest 10, unless they were below 5.

<sup>c</sup>This number represents outbound rotations, in other words the number of participants from DHS rotating to other agencies. Participation in intraagency rotations (from one DHS component to another) is not included here.

<sup>d</sup>This number represents outbound rotations, in other words the number of participants from Army rotating to other agencies.

One of the programs, the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College's Interagency Fellows Program, went beyond the scope of a typical rotation, temporarily assigning military personnel to a civilian agency to enable civilian personnel from that agency to attend a long-term JPME program. See figure 2 for more information on that program.

**Figure 2: Growing Emphasis on Need for Interagency Participation in Army College Programs Led to Creation of Army Command and General Staff College's Interagency Fellowship Program**

## Army Command and General Staff College's Interagency Fellows Program

Officials from DOD, USAID, State, and other agencies say that the disparity in the size of the military and civilian workforces can make it difficult for civilian agencies to "keep up" with the military in participating in longer-term training programs. In particular, officials point out that military staffing levels take into account the need for extended training at standard career intervals, while civilian agency staffing levels do not. According to officials at the Army Command and General Staff College and USAID, the Interagency Fellows Program was created to help alleviate such resource limitations, while providing Army participants with valuable developmental opportunities.

Established in 2010 after a 2-year pilot phase, the Interagency Fellowship Program sends field-grade Army officers to work at federal agencies, and in return, participating agencies send personnel to study or teach at the college, alongside their military counterparts. College officials say that interagency students and faculty enrich the curriculum and classroom discussions by sharing firsthand experiences and perspectives. In return, officials say that Army participants learn about the culture, capabilities, and constraints of the

agencies where they work, and share with their colleagues the Army's approach to planning and decision-making. Military and civilian officials concur that it is important to bring students together from a mix of organizations to provide a realistic whole-of-government perspective.

A USAID official involved in the program said that it is not a perfect exchange, and that the agency is still learning how to most effectively make use of the Interagency Fellows. For example, she explained that there is a learning curve for people on rotation to a new agency, and that it can take a while to get them up to speed. She also said that Interagency Fellows are not always of an equivalent rank to the USAID personnel away at the College, which means they cannot always truly cover their responsibilities. However, despite these challenges, she said, she believes that the program provides a creative solution to participation barriers and will continue to improve over time. An Army official at the College agreed that it's a "win-win situation" for the College, the agencies, and the participants.



*Photos: Noah Albro, Army Command and General Staff College.*

A student from the Department of State participates in the Interagency Fellows program (above). Interagency students join military students in a class at the Army Command and General Staff College (below).

Source: GAO.

## Interagency Participation Varied across DOD-Led JPME Programs

According to our analysis, DOD provides relevant JPME programs through 13 academic institutions operated by one of the four military services or NDU. These programs must meet specific JPME curriculum requirements established for intermediate, senior, and executive-level education, which include learning objectives related to a whole-of-government approach to national security, among other objectives.<sup>25</sup> Such whole-of-government approaches seek to identify or incorporate all agencies' contributions to

<sup>25</sup> JPME programs are subject to periodic reviews according to a formal Process for Accreditation of Joint Education, intended to assure, among other things, that the learning objectives are met.

addressing national security challenges. The Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines each have command and staff colleges that provide intermediate-level JPME and war colleges that provide senior-level JPME, within military service-specific graduate programs. NDU has three colleges—the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, the National War College, and the Joint Forces Staff College—that incorporate senior-level JPME curriculum into 10-month-long master’s programs, among other offerings. NDU also administers Capstone, an executive-level JPME program that met our criteria. The program length and target participant populations varied depending on the level of education, as described in table 5.

**Table 5: Selected JPME Program Characteristics by Education Level<sup>a</sup>**

Provider	Target participant rank	Program length	Subject matter examples
<b>Intermediate-level education</b>			
<b>Military service colleges</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Air Command and Staff College</li> <li>Army Command and General Staff College</li> <li>College of Naval Command and Staff</li> <li>Marine Corps Command and Staff College</li> </ul>	Major Lieutenant Commander GS-12	3 – 10 months	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>War fighting at the operational level</li> <li>Introduction to theater strategy and plans, national military and national security strategy</li> <li>Joint services doctrine and concepts, planning and execution, etc.</li> </ul>
<b>National Defense University</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Joint and Combined War Fighting School at the Joint Forces Staff College<sup>b</sup></li> </ul>			
<b>Senior-level education or combined intermediate- and senior-level education</b>			
<b>Military service colleges</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Air War College</li> <li>Army War College</li> <li>College of Naval Warfare</li> <li>Marine Corps War College</li> </ul>	Lieutenant Colonel- Colonel Commander-Captain GS-13 – 15	10 months	<b>Military service colleges</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strategic leadership, national military strategy and theater strategy</li> </ul> <b>National Defense University</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National security strategy</li> </ul> <b>Military service colleges and National Defense University</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National strategies, planning systems, and processes, joint warfare, theater strategy, and campaigning in a joint, interagency, intergovernmental, and multinational environment, joint leadership, etc.</li> </ul>
<b>National Defense University</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industrial College of the Armed Forces</li> <li>National War College</li> <li>Joint Advanced Warfighting School at the Joint Forces Staff College</li> </ul>			

Provider	Target participant rank	Program length	Subject matter examples
<b>Executive-level education</b>			
National Defense University Capstone	General/Flag Officer	6 weeks	• Joint matters and national security
	Senior Executive Service		• Interagency process • Multinational operations

Source: GAO.

<sup>a</sup>This table is not inclusive of all levels of JPME or all JPME institutions or courses and focuses only on those relevant to our review. For additional information on the full continuum of JPME, see Office of Professional Military Education Policy, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction 1800.01D, July, 15 2009, Annex A to Appendix A to Enclosure A.

<sup>b</sup>Although shown here under intermediate-level education, the Joint and Combined War Fighting School incorporates senior-level learning objectives in its curriculum and counts intermediate (O-4) and senior military officers (O-5 and O-6) among its participants. The course grants an advanced JPME certificate in an intensive 10-week format.

Six of the nine agencies we reviewed—DOD, DHS, State, USAID, DOJ, and DOE—said they sent personnel to one or more of DOD’s JPME programs. According to information DOD provided for academic year 2009, some programs, such as those at Air University, had few or no participants from federal agencies outside of DOD. NDU’s National War College and its Industrial College of the Armed Forces, which offered senior-level JPME programs, had the greatest number of interagency participants. See table 6 for information on participation levels at each institution.

**Table 6: Academic Year 2009 Participation Levels and Selected Characteristics of JPME Programs by Number of Participants from Other Federal Agencies**

DOD academic institution	Education level	Approximate number of participants in academic year 2009 <sup>a</sup>		
		Total <sup>b</sup>	DOD military & civilian	Other federal agency
NDU, Industrial College of the Armed Forces	Senior	320	250	40
NDU, National War College	Senior	220	160	30
Army Command and General Staff College	Intermediate	1430	1290	20
Naval War College, College of Naval Warfare	Senior	260	200	20
NDU, Capstone	Executive	200	180	10
Marine Corps Command and Staff College	Intermediate	200	160	10
Army War College <sup>c</sup>	Senior	340	280	10
Naval War College, College of Naval Command and Staff	Intermediate	320	280	10
Marine Corps War College	Senior	30	20	10

DOD academic institution	Education level	Approximate number of participants in academic year 2009 <sup>a</sup>		
		Total <sup>b</sup>	DOD military & civilian	Other federal agency
NDU, Joint Advanced Warfighting School at Joint Forces Staff College	Senior	40	30	4
Air University, Air War College	Senior	240	190	3
Air University, Air Command and Staff College	Intermediate	510	430	2
NDU, Joint and Combined Warfighting School at Joint Forces Staff College	Intermediate/ Senior	1010	910	0

Source: GAO.

<sup>a</sup>The reporting year for the various DOD colleges varies. For example, most NDU colleges reported participation during a July through June academic year time frame. Other colleges used the standard federal fiscal year report time frame. We rounded participation numbers to the nearest 10, unless they were below 5.

<sup>b</sup>Columns do not add to total because DOD totals include students from outside of federal government, such as military officers or civilians from other nations as well as personnel from other levels of government, non-governmental organizations, private industry, and elsewhere.

<sup>c</sup>Army War College also offers a master's degree and intermediate-level JPME certification through its Distance Education Program

## State and DOD Reported Relevant Leadership Development Programs with Varying Degrees of Interagency Participation

According to our analysis, DOD and State offer 11 leadership development programs that include a focus on interagency collaboration in the national security arena. Several programs include participation in other activities described elsewhere in this report, such as JPME or interagency rotations. For example, the Defense Senior Leadership Development Program combines specialized courses with attendance in a 10-month JPME program and a short-term rotation, as indicated by the participant's individual development plan, to help participants gain the competencies needed to lead people and programs and achieve national security goals in joint, interagency, and multinational environments.

These programs varied in length, mode of delivery, target population, and interagency participation. The length of time and mode of delivery of these courses ranged from 1 day of classroom training to 14 weeks of in-resident training to a series of courses and seminars to be completed over a 3-year period. Most of the programs targeted personnel at GS-12 or above, because, according to officials at several agencies, these employees had the experience needed to benefit from and contribute to training and development programs with an interagency focus. For more information about the target population and interagency participation of these programs, see table 7.

**Table 7: Participation and Selected Characteristics of Leadership Development Programs by Providing Agency**

Providing agency	Program name	Target population <sup>a</sup>			Participation (FY 2009)	
		GS-7 – 12; FS 6-4; O-1 – O-4	GS-13 – 15; FS 3-1; O-5 – O-6	SES; SL/ST; SFS; O-7-O-10	Total <sup>b</sup>	Percentage from other agencies
DOD	Defense Senior Leader Development Program		✓		40	Not open to other agencies
DOD	Executive Leader Development Program	✓	✓		60	3
DOD	Defense Information Systems Agency Executive Leadership Development Program	✓	✓	✓	30	Not open to other agencies
DOD/ NDU	Center for the Study of Weapons of Mass Destruction: Program for Emerging Leaders	✓	✓		50	32
DOD/ NDU	Information Resources Management College, Advanced Management Program: Government Strategic Leadership Certificate	GS-12	✓	✓	0 <sup>c</sup>	0 <sup>c</sup>
State	Ambassadorial Seminar			✓	70	Not open to other agencies
State	Deputy Chief of Mission/Principal Officer Seminar			✓	60	Not open to other agencies
State	Interagency Effectiveness: Strategies and Best Practices	✓	✓	✓	40	8
State	Interagency Policy Seminar Series		✓	✓	50	0
State	Senior Executive Threshold Seminar			✓	110	1
State	National Security Executive Leadership Seminar		✓	✓	60	27

Source: GAO.

<sup>a</sup>Also targets military or Foreign Service equivalents to General Schedule and Senior Executive Service levels. See appendix A for more information.

<sup>b</sup>Participation numbers are rounded to the nearest ten.

<sup>c</sup>College officials explained that although there were students in the Advanced Management Program in 2009, none of them elected to participate in the Government Strategic Leadership Certificate track during the 2009 academic year.

Of the 11 reported programs, 6 leadership development programs were open to and encouraged interagency participation. Two of these 6—the Program for Emerging Leaders at NDU’s Center for the Study of Weapons of Mass Destruction, and State’s National Security Executive Leadership Seminar—intended to create an interagency cohort of leaders who can work together seamlessly on national security issues. For example, to

---

promote a professional network among future U.S. government leaders in the field of weapons of mass destruction, NDU's Center for the Study of Weapons of Mass Destruction offered Program for Emerging Leaders students a variety of ways to connect outside the classroom, such as a members-only Web site for online dialogue, school-sponsored social events, and off-campus site visits.

Five of the 11 programs were closed to participation from other agencies. For example, the Ambassadorial Seminar offered by State's FSI only prepares ambassadors-designate for their unique positions of leadership at the head of an embassy, which requires extensive collaboration with personnel from multiple agencies and other organizations.

---

### Some Training Provided as Part of Agencies' NSPD Programs

Six of the eight agencies represented on the Executive Steering Committee—DOD, DHS, State, Justice, Commerce, and DOE—reported making NSPD-related training available to their personnel with national security responsibilities.

DOD and DHS reported developing some training specifically for their NSPD programs, which consisted primarily of online courses on key national security policies and procedures. Some agencies, however, directed their national security personnel to take existing training, such as EMI's various online courses on national emergency response topics. Other agencies augmented existing training with NSPD-specific materials. Several of the existing courses that agencies used or modified under the auspices of NSPD were included in previous sections of this report. Officials from Commerce and DOE reported that in addition to taking advantage of existing courses, they also sent their personnel to attend in-person orientation sessions or seminars, where they had the opportunity to network with personnel from other agencies.

According to officials at most of these agencies, although they have continued to work on planning and implementation efforts, much of the actual training activity has slowed or stopped altogether since fiscal year 2008. As mentioned previously, many of these agencies have put implementation of their NSPD-related training and professional development activities on hold pending the results of executive-level review of this governmentwide initiative.

---

---

## Professional Development Activities Provide Opportunities to Build Foundational Knowledge, Skills, and Networks That Are Intended to Improve Interagency Collaboration

Based on our analysis, the relevant professional development activities were intended to improve the ability of national security personnel to collaborate across agency lines by focusing on three general approaches: providing foundational knowledge, developing skills, and providing networking opportunities. We found that the activities included one or more of these approaches to improving their participants' abilities to collaborate:

- Building common foundational knowledge of the national security arena. Some of the activities establish a common foundation of shared knowledge for understanding partner agencies' roles, responsibilities, authorities or capabilities, or specific national security subject matters. According to agency officials, such training can help reinforce a common vocabulary or framework for understanding complex policy issues. This is important for allowing personnel who may normally approach national security issues from sometimes disparate diplomatic, defense, commercial, or law enforcement perspectives to employ a whole-of-government approach to national security. For example, DHS offers an introductory online course on the National Incident Management System, which is available to personnel across federal, state, and local government and provides an overview of the roles and responsibilities of various agencies and how they are supposed to work together in different emergency situations such as responding to terrorist attacks and other national security-related incidents.
- Developing skills for interagency collaboration on national security. Some of the activities agencies identified build specific skills needed for interagency collaboration, such as how to plan, lead, and execute interagency efforts. For example, the Whole-of-Government Planning for Reconstruction and Stabilization course, offered by NDU in cooperation with State, teaches skills to coordinate, facilitate, or participate in the planning process for reconstruction and stabilization operations. These skills include the ability to work effectively with federal agency and other partners involved in whole-of-government planning.
- Establishing networks across national security agency lines. Some of the activities were explicitly designed to facilitate networks among personnel from two or more national security agencies. For example, NDU's Capstone course for Generals, Flag Officers, and members of the civilian Senior Executive Service brings together participants from the four military services and a range of federal agencies to deepen their understanding of the whole-of-government-approach to national

---

security, among other things. One of Capstone's learning objectives is that participants establish a peer network for future cooperation and the program is designed to maximize peer-to-peer interaction.

The way these approaches manifest themselves in the activities we reviewed varied. For example, activities that required the least time commitment, such as EMI's online courses and NSPD online orientations, primarily provided basic foundational knowledge of a specific partner agency or national security topic. Conversely, more time-intensive activities, such as JPME and some of the leadership development programs and classroom courses that lasted several months or brought participants together on a recurring basis tended to incorporate two or more approaches to improving participants' abilities to collaborate across agency lines. For example, a 10-month program at NDU's College of International Security Affairs included coursework on foundational knowledge of national security issues and specific skills related to interagency planning and management, along with interagency networking events.

According to human capital and training officials we interviewed at several agencies, the level of interagency participation may affect how a given professional development activity can improve its participants' abilities to collaborate. Agency officials noted that interagency collaboration in the development and design of activities can lead to a more accurate portrayal of different agencies' policies and processes. Moreover, agency officials said a mix of interagency participants can provide a realistic perspective of their respective agencies' cultures, capabilities, and constraints. Greater interagency participation can also lead to the development of professional networks, and improve working relationships. Several military officials we interviewed emphasized that in order to work effectively side by side, civilian and military personnel should train together to learn how operate before they are out in the field. Several agency officials agreed, noting that even when a professional development activity is designed to build foundational knowledge, skills, or networks, lack of interagency participation can limit the extent to which this occurs. For example, as a DHS official pointed out, if only one agency participates in an exercise, there is clearly no opportunity to establish a network that could facilitate future interagency collaboration.

---

## Concluding Observations

Training, interagency rotations, exercises, and other professional development activities can help to improve participants' abilities to collaborate in an increasingly complex national security arena. However,

---

with national security responsibilities and associated personnel located throughout the U.S. government, it could be challenging for agency officials to identify the relevant training and professional development opportunities available to the national security community. Our review is a first step in describing the broad spectrum of professional development activities that are intended to build foundational knowledge, skills, and networks among federal national security professionals. According to agency officials who develop and oversee these professional development activities, interagency participation can be key to the activities' success, enhancing the knowledge and skills participants acquire and the professional networks they establish. Although agencies could not provide participation data in every instance, the data we were able to obtain indicated that overall, interagency participation was lower in activities that required a longer time commitment, such as rotations and full-time joint professional military education. This raises questions about barriers to participation and other factors that may influence the success of such professional development activities, which we will explore in a subsequent review.

---

## Agency Comments

We provided a draft report for review and comment to the Secretaries of State, Defense, DHS, the Treasury, Commerce, Agriculture, and Energy, the Administrator of USAID, and the Attorney General. State, DHS, Commerce, Energy, USDA and USAID provided technical comments which we incorporated where appropriate. DOD, DOJ, and Treasury did not provide comments.

---

As agreed with your offices, unless you publicly announce the contents of this report earlier, we plan no further distribution until 30 days from the date of this letter. We will then send copies of this report to the Secretaries of State, Defense, Homeland Security, the Treasury, Commerce, Agriculture, and Energy, the Administrator of USAID, and the Attorney General, and other congressional committees interested in improving collaboration among agencies involved in national security issues. In addition, the report will be available at no charge on GAO's Web site at <http://www.gao.gov>.

---

If you or your staffs have any questions about this report, please contact me at (202) 512-6543 or [steinhardtb@gao.gov](mailto:steinhardtb@gao.gov). Contact points for our Offices of Congressional Relations and Public Affairs may be found on the last page of this report. GAO staff who made major contributions to this report are listed in appendix III.



Bernice Steinhardt  
Director, Strategic Issues

---

# Appendix I: Objectives, Scope, and Methodology

---

The objectives of our review were to identify:

- training and other professional development activities intended to improve the abilities of personnel from key agencies involved in national security issues to collaborate across organizational lines and
- how these activities were intended to improve participants' collaboration abilities.

To address our objectives, we first reviewed our prior work and other literature and interviewed experts on workforce development, education, national security, organizational culture, and collaboration to define the types of activities relevant to our topic. We then selected key agencies involved in national security issues—the Department of Defense (DOD), the Department of State (State), the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), the Department of Treasury (Treasury), the Department of Justice (Justice), the Department of Energy (Energy), the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), and the Department of Commerce (Commerce)—based on a review of our prior work and other literature and interviews with subject-matter experts.<sup>1</sup> We excluded the Office of the Director of National Intelligence and its member agencies because it overlapped with similar work we have underway.<sup>2</sup>

In order to identify and obtain key information on national security collaboration-related professional development activities, we undertook extensive data collection efforts involving both formal data collection instruments and intensive interactions with the agencies noted above. There were two main phases to this effort. In each, several steps were taken to ensure the reliability of the information obtained, including its consistency, completeness, and accuracy.

---

<sup>1</sup>GAO, *Interagency Collaboration, Key Issues for Congressional Oversight of National Security Strategies, Organizations, Workforce and Information Sharing*, [GAO-09-904SP](#) (Washington, D.C.: September 2009)

<sup>2</sup>Certain offices or component agencies of the departments in our scope have multiple functions that include intelligence and are under the Office of the Director of National Intelligence umbrella. We interviewed officials from these organizations to ensure that we obtained information on their relevant non-intelligence-related professional development activities. These components included the Justice's Federal Bureau of Investigation and Drug Enforcement Administration, Treasury's Offices of Terrorism Financing and Intelligence and Analysis.

In the first phase, we developed a data collection instrument (DCI) to obtain a broad list of activities potentially applicable to our review as well as a number of key general characteristics of the activities including, for example, overall goals, how the program prepares participants to collaborate across department lines, agencies involved, and general information about participation levels.

We validated the DCI by conducting pretests of the instrument with points of contact (POCs) in four agencies. These pretests included in-depth probing on the clarity of instrument, the criteria for including activities in the instrument, respondent burden, and usability of the instrument spreadsheet. The GAO engagement team staff worked with their technical advisors to revise the DCI as appropriate to address issues that arose over these topics during the pretesting process.

A key element of this first phase of data collection was defining the criteria to guide agency POCs in determining the appropriate professional development activities for submission. These criteria were included in the instrument itself, with instructions to the POCs to include all programs open to their staff that met all of the following four criteria:

- (1) The activity explicitly prepares federal civilian and/or military personnel to collaborate with personnel of other federal departments. In particular, the activity: (a) can involve personnel of other entities—such as contractors or NGOs—or can include only personnel from the POC’s department; (b) may be provided by the POC’s department or it may be provided by another organization; and (c) must prepare personnel for interagency collaboration. POCs were not to include activities that focused solely on intraagency collaboration (e.g., collaboration among DHS component agencies or among other services within DOD). This criterion excludes programs that bring personnel of multiple agencies together for specific assignments but did not have preparation for future interagency collaboration as an explicit purpose.
- (2) The activity targets agency personnel involved in developing or implementing national security policy, strategy, missions, or operations, but not support functions such as administration, financial management, or procurement.
- (3) The activity relates to the agency’s national security activities. In particular, an activity can and should be included despite having a broader focus than interagency national security collaboration as long as it includes a component on this topic; for example, a leadership

---

development program may have a module on interagency collaboration or provide an interagency rotation to a national security mission.

(4) The activity is ongoing and sustained, not a one-time event.

We identified POCs in each of the selected agencies who were to determine which activities met our criteria and complete the DCI for each. We identified the POCs during our initial conference with agency personnel and then in subsequent meetings or conversations, in which we requested the names of individuals who could work with us to identify the appropriate offices, bureaus, or functional areas that should receive our questionnaire, disseminate our questionnaire to the appropriate contacts throughout the agency, and consolidate their responses. We sent DCIs to POCs and asked them to provide the requested information for all activities that met our criteria. In addition to completing the DCIs, POCs also provided other relevant information including course manuals and evaluations.

We then compiled all of the DCIs received from the nine agencies into one master file. A key element of this effort was to eliminate from the master list duplicate activities reported by POCs in multiple offices or agencies. In general, we relied on submissions from the agency we determined to be the “lead agency” for administering the activity. In some cases, however, an activity was identified by an agency that participated in, but did not provide, the activity. For example, although officials at three agencies said their personnel participated in the National Exercise Program, the two agencies chiefly responsible for organizing the program did not initially include the program in their responses. To reconcile such differences, which may have occurred because agencies have different working definitions of “national security” and “collaboration,” and different ways of understanding how these concepts might intersect, we followed up with our POCs. In some cases, the titles of activities were similar but not identical and to determine whether they were the same we contacted the relevant POCs for clarification. This process resulted in more than 350 total activities.

The final step in phase 1 of our work was to review the entire list of activities identified to verify that they conformed to our four criteria. To make this assessment and to ensure its reliability, two analysts separately analyzed the list, identifying those activities that conformed and did not conform to our criteria. In cases where the analysts differed they had a third analyst review the information and then met to reconcile these differences. In cases where the data provided were ambiguous we

contacted our agency POCs to obtain additional information in the form of additional interviews and/or documentation. This process reduced the number of activities in our review to 225.

In the second phase, we collected more detailed information on the activities that met our criteria for inclusion, as follows:

- (1) The number of participants in each activity in fiscal year 2009, both from the agency that hosted the activity and from outside the agency;
- (2) The levels or ranks of staff targeted for participation in the activity, if any. Agencies described target populations in terms of General Schedule (GS) levels, Foreign Service (FS) levels, and/or Officer grade (O) levels. At the executive level, target populations were described as Senior Executive Service (SES), Senior Foreign Service (SFS), Senior-Level and Scientific or Professional (SL/ST), or Generals/Flag Officers (O-7–O-10). In some cases, the equivalent levels from other federal pay schedules or personnel systems were noted; and
- (3) The methods of evaluation the agency might use to evaluate the effectiveness or impact of the activity.

A second DCI was developed for this purpose. For each POC, we customized this data collection instrument with information about activities they had reported to us in phase 1. Like the first phase of data collection, this second phase involved close interaction with the POCs, and in some instances POCs provided information to us in forms other than the data collection instrument (e.g., published program materials, or e-mails containing the information we requested). Data collected during this phase were compiled and combined with data from the first phase to yield an overall set of data on activities that met our criteria for inclusion. We analyzed data for these activities, such as typical duration, eligibility criteria, participation rates, and participating agencies, to identify groups of activities, patterns, themes and other information. We determined these data to be reliable for the purposes of identifying and describing such activities.

Upon reviewing the data the agencies provided, we found that activities varied widely across dimensions such as length and learning mode, and decided to group the activities in a way that would allow us to analyze their characteristics and make appropriate comparisons. To develop these categories of training and professional development activities, we reviewed activity data, conducted a limited literature search of GAO

reports and agency guidance, and met with human resource professionals. These five general groups included training courses and programs, training exercises, interagency rotational programs, Joint Professional Military Education, and leadership development programs.

After the data had been compiled, we conducted a series of follow-up interviews with POCs to gauge the completeness and accuracy of the participation data we had received. POCs were asked about the sources of counts of participants, how these counts had been stored, whether they had been checked for accuracy, and other topics relevant to verifying the reliability of these data. All of the participation data used in the present report were judged reliable for the purpose of establishing approximate levels of participation in the national security collaboration activities.

As part of the data collection instrument used in phase I, we asked agency officials to describe how each activity they submitted was intended to improve the ability of national security personnel to collaborate across agency lines. We reviewed the answers they provided as well as other materials such as course descriptions and catalogues of exercises and JPME programs to identify common themes. Based on our analysis, we determined that these activities generally employed one or more of the following approaches: building foundational knowledge of the national security arena such as other agencies' roles, responsibilities, authorities or capabilities; developing skills for interagency collaboration, such as how to plan, lead, and execute interagency efforts; or establishing networks among national security professionals. We also discussed these approaches with agency officials during our interviews, and they concurred that they were appropriate and accurate.

# Appendix II: Inventory of Professional Development Activities Intended to Foster Interagency Collaboration

**Table 8: Training Courses and Programs**

Activity name	Activity description	Target audience	2009 approximate participation
<b>Department of State</b>			
Afghanistan Familiarization Course	A 5-day, in-person course that introduces a common framework for understanding Afghanistan and its political situation, providing information about Afghanistan's history and culture and the U.S.'s role in the region.	USG personnel preparing to deploy to Afghanistan.	220
Afghanistan Provincial Reconstruction Team Orientation	A 5-day, in-person course that provides knowledge and skills for working in an interagency organization in a combat environment.	Federal personnel about to deploy to Afghanistan to serve on a provincial reconstruction team.	140
Advanced Negotiation	A 4-day course that teaches advanced skills in negotiation to an interagency student population through case studies, practical exercises, and role-play simulations. Participants often represent the USG in leadership roles in interagency delegations.	Foreign and civil service employees (FS-02 - 01 level and above).	10
Crisis Management Training	A 3-hour, in-person course that provides a common vocabulary for dealing with crisis management situations and includes a tabletop exercise.	Embassy personnel from multiple agencies.	2990
Iraq Familiarization Course	A 5-day, in-person course that introduces a common framework for understanding Iraq and its political situation, providing information about Iraq's history and culture and the U.S.'s role in the region.	USG personnel preparing to deploy to Iraq.	940
Iraq Provincial Reconstruction Team Orientation	A 5-day, in-person course that provides the knowledge and skills for working in an interagency organization in an unstable operating environment.	USG personnel about to deploy to Iraq to serve on a provincial reconstruction team.	440
Orientation for Foreign Service Generalists	A 5-week, in-person orientation that includes 2 days dedicated to information on the roles and responsibilities of other agencies that work closely with State on foreign policy.	New foreign service generalists.	710
Political-Economic Counselors' Seminar	A 5-day, in-person course designed to teach new Political and Economic Counselors skills for operating in the interagency environment of an Embassy's country team.	New Political-Economic Counselors.	20
Commercial Tradecraft	A 5-day, in-person course that provides information about partner agencies that are working on trade policy with State, such as the Department of Commerce.	USG personnel who are responsible for assisting U.S. businesses overseas.	70
Oil and Petroleum Course	A 5-day, in-person course that introduces a common framework for understanding international energy concerns.	USG personnel who are responsible for energy policy positions such as extraction, refinement, or transport of oil.	30

**Appendix II: Inventory of Professional  
Development Activities Intended to Foster  
Interagency Collaboration**

<b>Activity name</b>	<b>Activity description</b>	<b>Target audience</b>	<b>2009 approximate participation</b>
Aviation Course	A 3-day, in-person course that provides information about partner agencies that are working on civil aviation policy with State, such as the Departments of Transportation and Homeland Security.	USG personnel with civil aviation responsibilities.	20
Coal/Power Technology	A 5-day, in-person course that provides information about the DOE: a partner agency working with State on commercial, economic, and environmental issues.	USG personnel who are responsible for energy activities such as monitoring developments in the extraction and use of coal.	20
Intellectual Property Rights	A 2-day, in-person course that provides information on partner agencies that are working with State on enforcing intellectual property rights worldwide.	USG personnel who are responsible for activities involving intellectual property rights.	10
Combating Terrorist Financing	A 3-day, in-person course that provides information about the members of the intelligence community and the partner agencies that are working with State to track the movement of funds for criminal or terrorist purposes, such as Treasury.	USG personnel who are responsible for combating illegal efforts to finance terrorist activity.	60
Resource Economic Seminar	A 5-day, in-person course that provides information on economic, mining, and environmental issues that play a role in national security policy.	USG personnel who are responsible for issues related to natural resources and economic development.	10
Environmental, Science, Technological and Health Training for Foreign Service Nationals	A 2-week, in-person course on core issues in the environmental, technological, health and science fields and how they relate to national security policy.	Foreign Service Nationals.	30
Washington Energy Seminar	A 3-day, in-person course that introduces a common framework for understanding U.S. international energy policy.	USG personnel who are responsible for international energy issues.	100
U.S. Role in Multilateral Development Banks	A 2-day, in-person course that provides an overview on multilateral development banks such as the World Bank and the U.S. government's approach to funding projects.	USG personnel with domestic responsibilities for countries where Multilateral Development Banks operate.	10
U.S. Global Investment Policy	A 2-day, in-person course that provides an overview of U.S. investment policy and information about the partner agencies working with State on global investment issues.	USG personnel with domestic responsibilities covering investment issues.	10
Economic Issues	A 3-week, in-person course that covers a wide range of economic issues such as financial crises and trade disputes and provides information about the partner agencies working with State on economic policy.	USG personnel responsible for international economic issues.	20
Hub Officer Orientation	A 3-day, in-person course that provides information about the partner agencies working with State on environmental policy.	New regional Environmental Hub Officers.	0

**Appendix II: Inventory of Professional  
Development Activities Intended to Foster  
Interagency Collaboration**

<b>Activity name</b>	<b>Activity description</b>	<b>Target audience</b>	<b>2009 approximate participation</b>
Environmental Science, Technology and Health Tradecraft	A 2-week, in-person course that provides information about the partner agencies and members of the intelligence community that are working with State on environmental science, technology, and health issues with transnational implications.	USG personnel responsible for environmental science, technology, and health issues.	40
Political Economic Tradecraft	A 3-week, in-person course that presents an overview of global issues such as terrorism, foreign assistance, and economic competitiveness, and provides information about the partner agencies that are working with State on these issues.	Entry-level State personnel.	340
Arms Control and Nonproliferation	A 5-day, in-person course that provides subject area expertise and information about partner agencies that are working with State on arms control and proliferation issues, such as DOD. This course engages an interagency student population in a collaborative policy planning exercise involving critical national security issues.	USG personnel (GS-9—15 and above; FS and military equivalents).	30
Intelligence and Foreign Policy	A 3-day course on the role of intelligence in foreign affairs policy making that presents an overview of the intelligence community.	USG personnel (GS-9—15 and above; FS and military equivalents).	60
Foreign Policy Advisors Orientation Course	A 2-day, in-person course that provides information about the differences between State and DOD cultures and teaches the skills needed for navigating the interagency policy environment.	Senior-level State officers detailed as political advisors to U.S. military commanders.	30
Managing Foreign Assistance Awards Overseas	A 3-day, in-person course on U.S. funding priorities that provides information about the partner agencies that are working with State on overseeing foreign assistance awards, such as DOD and USAID.	USG personnel responsible for overseeing foreign assistance awards overseas.	80
International Negotiations	A 5-day, in-person course that develops skills needed to engage in interagency settings, such as communication and negotiation.	USG personnel (GS-9—15 and above; FS and military equivalents).	90
Political Military Affairs	A 4-day, in-person course on the roles and responsibilities of DOD and State on political-military issues.	USG personnel (GS-9—15 and above; FS and military equivalents).	60
International Terrorism	A 3-day, in-person course that explores the root causes of international terrorism and provides information on the partner agencies that are working with State to combat the international terrorist threat.	USG personnel (GS-9—15 and above; FS and military equivalents).	50
Foundations of Interagency Reconstruction and Stabilization Operations	A 2-week, in-person course that introduces a common framework for understanding post-conflict reconstruction and stabilization operations and builds the skills needed to work together in an interagency environment.	USG civilian and military members of the Civilian Response Corps.	240

**Appendix II: Inventory of Professional  
Development Activities Intended to Foster  
Interagency Collaboration**

<b>Activity name</b>	<b>Activity description</b>	<b>Target audience</b>	<b>2009 approximate participation</b>
Maritime Policy and International Shipping	A 2-day, in-person course that provides an overview of maritime commerce and security issues including information about the partner agencies that are working with State, such as the Departments of Transportation and Homeland Security.	USG personnel responsible for maritime commerce.	20
Washington Tradecraft	A 4-day, in-person course that provides information on how to work within the interagency policy process.	Foreign service officers returning for a first tour in Washington, D.C.	140
Information Assurance and Cybersecurity Training Program	A series of in-person courses that can range from 3 to 5 days depending on the audience that introduces a common framework for addressing information security challenges required to support U.S. foreign policy in a global threat environment.	Federal information security officers and other personnel who are responsible for cybersecurity issues.	1380
Basic Regional Security Officer Course	A 12-week, in-person course that provides information about the partners working with State on national security and law enforcement issues.	Special Agents about to start their initial overseas assignments in regional security offices.	130
Orientation for Foreign Service Specialists	A 3-week, in-person orientation that includes a half day dedicated to information on the roles and responsibilities of other agencies that work closely with the Department of State on foreign policy.	New foreign service specialists.	540
<b>Department of Homeland Security</b>			
Introduction to the Incident Command System	A 3-hour, online course that introduces a common framework for understanding the Incident Command System and its relationship to the National Incident Management System.	Personnel involved with emergency planning and response or recovery efforts who require a basic understanding of the Incident Command System.	60790
Introduction to the Incident Command System for Law Enforcement	A 3-hour, online course that introduces a common framework for understanding the Incident Command System as it applies to law enforcement.	Law enforcement personnel who have a direct role in emergency planning and recovery efforts.	11510
Introduction to Incident Command System for Federal Workers	A 3-hour, online course that introduces a common framework for understanding the Incident Command System as it applies to incidents involving federal assistance.	Federal workers involved with federal disasters.	70
Incident Command System for Single Resources and Initial Action Incidents	A 3-hour, online course that introduces a common framework for understanding how to operate efficiently during an incident or event within the Incident Command System.	Personnel who are likely to assume a supervisory position within the Incident Command System during an incident.	43840
Introduction to the National Incident Management System	A 3-hour, online course that introduces a common framework for understanding the National Incident Management System, which is intended to enable federal, state, and local agencies to work together during domestic incidents.	DHS personnel and individuals responsible for emergency management.	44160

**Appendix II: Inventory of Professional  
Development Activities Intended to Foster  
Interagency Collaboration**

<b>Activity name</b>	<b>Activity description</b>	<b>Target audience</b>	<b>2009 approximate participation</b>
National Incident Management System Multiagency Coordination Systems	A 5-hour, online course that introduces a common framework for understanding Multiagency Coordination Systems within the National Incident Management System, and teaches how these systems can be used to improve incident response.	A broad audience of individuals responsible for emergency management.	3370
National Incident Management System Public Information Systems	A 3-hour, online course that introduces a common framework for understanding the use of public information systems described in the National Incident Management System.	Local and state public information officers.	1410
National Incident Management System Communications and Information Management	A 2-hour, online course that introduces a common framework for understanding the Communications and Information Management component of the National Incident Management System.	A broad audience of individuals responsible for emergency management.	240
Introduction to the National Response Framework	A 5-hour, online course that introduces a common framework for understanding the concepts and principles of the National Response Framework, and how agencies collaborate on national preparedness planning efforts.	DHS personnel, senior-level government and private executives.	39820
Introduction to FEMA Emergency Support Function 1: Transportation	A 30-minute, online course that introduces a common framework for understanding National Response Framework principles for transportation activities.	State and local officials, government executives, private-sector and NGO leaders, and any other federal department or agency heads who are responsible for providing effective response.	1390
Introduction to FEMA Emergency Support Function 2: Communication	A 30-minute, online course that introduces a common framework for understanding National Response Framework principles for communication activities.	State and local officials, government executives, private-sector and NGO leaders, and any other federal department or agency heads who are responsible for providing effective response.	1350
Introduction to FEMA Emergency Support Function 3: Public Works and Engineering	A 30-minute, online course that introduces a common framework for understanding National Response Framework principles for activities related to public works and engineering.	State and local officials, government executives, private-sector and NGO leaders, and any other federal department or agency heads who are responsible for providing effective response.	830
Introduction to FEMA Emergency Support Function 4: Firefighting	A 30-minute, online course that introduces a common framework for understanding National Response Framework principles for firefighting activities.	State and local officials, government executives, private-sector and NGO leaders, and any other federal department or agency heads who are responsible for providing effective response.	1360

**Appendix II: Inventory of Professional  
Development Activities Intended to Foster  
Interagency Collaboration**

<b>Activity name</b>	<b>Activity description</b>	<b>Target audience</b>	<b>2009 approximate participation</b>
Introduction to FEMA Emergency Support Function 5: Emergency Management	A 30-minute, online course that introduces a common framework for understanding National Response Framework principles for emergency management activities.	State and local officials, government executives, private-sector and NGO leaders, and any other federal department or agency heads who are responsible for providing effective response.	1750
Introduction to FEMA Emergency Support Function 6: Mass Care, Emergency Assistance, Housing and Human Services	A 30-minute, online course that introduces a common framework for understanding National Response Framework principles for activities related to mass care, emergency assistance, housing and human services.	State and local officials, government executives, private-sector and NGO leaders, and any other federal department or agency heads who are responsible for providing effective response.	2120
Introduction to FEMA Emergency Support Function 7: Logistics Management and Resource Support Annex	A 30-minute, online course that introduces a common framework for understanding National Response Framework principles for activities related to logistics management and resource support annex.	State and local officials, government executives, private-sector and NGO leaders, and any other federal department or agency heads who are responsible for providing effective response.	1550
Introduction to FEMA Emergency Support Function 8: Public Health and Medical Services	A 30-minute, online course that introduces a common framework for understanding National Response Framework principles for activities related to public health and medical services.	State and local officials, government executives, private-sector and NGO leaders, and any other federal department or agency heads who are responsible for providing effective response.	1480
Introduction to FEMA Emergency Support Function 9: Search and Rescue	A 30-minute, online course that introduces a common framework for understanding National Response Framework principles for search and rescue activities.	State and local officials, government executives, private-sector and NGO leaders, and any other federal department or agency heads who are responsible for providing effective response.	1520
Introduction to FEMA Emergency Support Function 10: Oil and Hazardous Materials Response Annex	A 30-minute, online course that introduces a common framework for understanding National Response Framework principles for activities related to oil and hazardous materials response annex.	State and local officials, government executives, private-sector and NGO leaders, and any other federal department or agency heads who are responsible for providing effective response.	1150
Introduction to FEMA Emergency Support Function 11: Agriculture and Natural Resources	A 45-minute, online course that introduces a common framework for understanding National Response Framework principles for activities related to agriculture and natural resources.	State and local officials, government executives, private-sector and NGO leaders, and any other federal department or agency heads who are responsible for providing effective response.	770
Introduction to FEMA Emergency Support Function 12: Energy	A 30-minute, online course that introduces a common framework for understanding National Response Framework principles for energy activities.	State and local officials, government executives, private-sector and NGO leaders, and any other federal department or agency heads who are responsible for providing effective response.	760

**Appendix II: Inventory of Professional  
Development Activities Intended to Foster  
Interagency Collaboration**

<b>Activity name</b>	<b>Activity description</b>	<b>Target audience</b>	<b>2009 approximate participation</b>
Introduction to FEMA Emergency Support Function 13: Public Safety and Security Annex	A 30-minute, online course that introduces a common framework for understanding National Response Framework principles for public safety activities and security annex.	State and local officials, government executives, private-sector and NGO leaders, and any other federal department or agency heads who are responsible for providing effective response.	2240
Introduction to FEMA Emergency Support Function 14: Long Term Community Recovery	A 30-minute, online course that introduces a common framework for understanding National Response Framework principles for activities related to long-term community recovery.	State and local officials, government executives, private-sector and NGO leaders, and any other federal department or agency heads who are responsible for providing effective response.	1060
Introduction to FEMA Emergency Support Function 15: External Affairs	A 1-hour, online course that introduces a common framework for understanding National Response Framework principles for external affairs activities.	FEMA External Affairs staff and all federal agencies that are signatories of the National Response Plan, along with state and local partners.	840
Introduction to FEMA National Response Framework Support Annex	A 1.5-hour, online course that introduces the National Response Framework, which describes the roles and responsibilities of federal departments and agencies, the private sector, volunteer organizations, and NGOs during an incident.	Emergency practitioners and state and local officials, government executives, private-sector and NGO leaders, and any other federal department or agency heads who are responsible for providing effective response.	340
Critical Infrastructure and Key Resources Support Annex	A 1-hour, online course that introduces a common framework for understanding the relationship between the Critical Infrastructure and Key Resources Support Annex and the National Response Framework, and identifies the process for ensuring that critical infrastructure and key resource considerations are integrated into incident response efforts.	State and local officials, government executives, private-sector and NGO leaders, and any other federal department or agency heads who are responsible for providing effective response.	880
<b>Department of Defense</b>			
NDU, College of International Security Affairs: Strategic Security Studies	A part-time certificate program or a 10-month, full-time master's program (both in-person) that teaches students how to develop and implement whole-of-government national and international security strategies for conditions of peace, crisis, and war.	USG and international military officers, civilians, and congressional staff.	300
NDU, College of International Security Affairs: Whole-of-Government Planning for Reconstruction and Stabilization, Level I	A 3-week, in-person course that provides theoretical and practical training on the whole-of-government planning process for reconstruction and stabilization operations, including the skills to work effectively with other agencies.	Civilian Response Corps members and other USG personnel such as provincial reconstruction team officers GS-7 and above and military and FS equivalents.	20

**Appendix II: Inventory of Professional  
Development Activities Intended to Foster  
Interagency Collaboration**

<b>Activity name</b>	<b>Activity description</b>	<b>Target audience</b>	<b>2009 approximate participation</b>
DOD National Security Studies Program at the George Washington University, Elliot School of International Affairs: Executive Course on National and International Security	A 2-week, in-person course that examines the U.S. defense environment, which includes the Executive Branch and national and international policy communities. Through lectures, briefings, site visits, tabletop exercises, and a simulation, participants acquire an analytic framework for understanding the challenges facing U.S. national security and defense policy making. Taught by faculty from the Elliot School and Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Security Studies program.	SES members and General/Flag Officers.	30
DOD National Security Studies Program at the George Washington University, Elliot School of International Affairs: Senior Managers Course in National Security	A 4-week, in-person course that builds senior managers' knowledge of the roles and responsibilities of public and private organizations involved in national security matters and develops the skills needed for effective implementation of strategy and coordination of efforts. The course involves lectures, briefings, site visits, and a simulation. Taught by faculty from the Elliot School and Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Security Studies program.	DOD personnel at the GS-15 or O-6 level.	50
DOD National Security Studies Program at the George Washington University, Elliot School of International Affairs: Defense Policy Seminar	A 3-day, in-person course that strengthens participants' knowledge of and capacity for crisis management and decision making in a complex and fast-paced environment, using a simulation based on a real-world scenario.	SES members and General/Flag Officers.	25
NDU, Information Resources Management College: Multiagency Information-Enabled Collaboration	A 5-day, in-person or 10- to 12-week, interactive, online course that focuses on multiagency national security collaboration, examining current and proposed approaches to improved collaboration; impediments to collaboration and lessons learned; behaviors and skills of collaborative leadership; and collaborative tool sets. One of six courses NDU recommended for national security professionals.	USG national security professionals GS-13 and above; FS and military equivalents with national security responsibilities).	40
NDU, Joint Forces Staff College: Homeland Security Planner's Course	A 40-hour, in-person certificate program that teaches national policies and strategies, homeland defense and homeland security strategies, and the joint and national planning process through classroom seminars and a computer-assisted exercise.	Military and civilian homeland security planners (O-4—6), with priority given to combatant command and federal agency personnel.	190

**Appendix II: Inventory of Professional  
Development Activities Intended to Foster  
Interagency Collaboration**

Activity name	Activity description	Target audience	2009 approximate participation
NDU, Joint Forces Staff College: Joint, Interagency, and Multinational Planner's Course	A 5-day, in-person course that provides knowledge of the latest developments in interagency coordination and serves as a forum for the exchange of best practices, to enable students to discover new approaches to solving complex problems. Includes a computer-assisted exercise requiring a comprehensive approach to solve a theater-level interagency problem.	Military civilian planners (O-4—O-6) and their civilian interagency counterparts.	130
Introduction to Homeland Security/Homeland Defense Planning	A 5-day, in-person course that introduces homeland security planning, doctrine, methods, and techniques. It provides a first step in educating planners to think through the depth and breadth of homeland security challenges; integrating homeland security and military planning; and developing a complete homeland security plan.	DOD and DHS personnel interested in the fundamentals of planning; personnel who support homeland security planning; current and future homeland security planners and leaders.	40
Naval Postgraduate School	Through multiple degree- and certificate-granting programs ranging from month-long courses to multiyear master's and doctoral programs (online or in-person) and research on the defense and security at specialized research centers such as the Center for Homeland Defense and Security, the Naval Postgraduate School seeks to increase the combat effectiveness of the Naval Services and other Armed Forces of the U.S. and its partners, and to enhance national security.	USG and international military officers, interagency civilians, and a limited number of defense contractors.	2210
NDU, Information Resources Management College: Enterprise Strategic Planning	A 5-day, full-time, in-person or 10- to 12-week, interactive online course that reviews the interagency national security strategic planning process, the U.S. National Security Strategy, and related plans. The course also teaches scenario-based planning and other approaches to strategy development in the face of uncertainty. One of six courses NDU recommended for national security professionals.	USG national security professionals (GS-13 and above; FS and military equivalents).	10
NDU, Information Resources Management College: Organizational Culture for Strategic Leaders	A 5-day, full-time, in-person or 10- to 12-week, interactive online course that explores the effects of culture on mission performance, with an examination of how culture can influence organizational excellence and stimulate change. One of six courses NDU recommended for national security professionals.	USG national security professionals (GS-13 and above; FS and military equivalents).	40
NDU, Information Resources Management College: Global Strategic Landscape	A 5-day, full-time, in-person or 10- to 12-week, interactive online course that focuses on how global changes may affect future U.S. national security strategy and the implications of such changes for information-age government with national security responsibilities. One of six courses NDU recommended for national security professionals.	USG national security professionals (GS-13 and above; FS and military equivalents).	50

**Appendix II: Inventory of Professional  
Development Activities Intended to Foster  
Interagency Collaboration**

Activity name	Activity description	Target audience	2009 approximate participation
NDU, Information Resources Management College: Decision Making for Government Leaders	A 5-day, full-time, in-person or 10- to 12-week, interactive online course that examines the environment, opportunities, and challenges of leadership decision making in government agency and interagency settings from individual, managerial, and multiparty perspectives. One of six courses NDU recommended for national security professionals.	USG national security professionals (GS-13 and above; FS and military equivalents).	10
NDU, Information Resources Management College: Strategic Communication for Government Leaders	A 5-day, full-time, in-person or 10- to 12-week, interactive online course that introduces communications theories and applications and explores the role of communications for government leaders in achieving organizational and national strategies. One of six courses NDU recommended for national security professionals.	USG national security professionals (GS-13 and above; FS and military equivalents).	20
Planning Course: Operation Enduring Freedom	A 1-hour, online course that provides participants with basic knowledge of DOD's Joint Operational Planning Process, including information about interagency roles and the importance of including stakeholders in the planning process.	Reservists and other military personnel individually deploying to Combined Joint Task Force 82 in Afghanistan.	370
Joint Staff Business Processes Course	A 3.5-hour, online course that provides participants with a common understanding of the Joint Staff structure and function within the National Security arena, the National Security Council decision-making process for developing and implementing U.S. national security policy, and related information.	Military enlisted personnel (E-4—E-9), officers (O-2—O-6), and federal civilians (GS-7—15).	10
The Interagency Process Course	A 20-hour, online course, developed by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's Partnership for Peace program, that provides participants with information on interagency structures, policy decision-making, and advance planning processes for crisis response to security threats in the Western hemisphere.	Military enlisted personnel (E3-E9) and federal civilians (GS-7-13).	160
Critical Infrastructure Awareness Course	A 3-hour, online course, developed by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's Partnership for Peace program, that provides information on issues related to critical infrastructure protection in the context of global and national security. The course focuses on public safety and security, national security, emergency planning, and operational planning.	Military enlisted personnel (E4-E8), officers (O2-O6), and federal civilians (GS-9-13).	30
Joint Operation Planning and Execution System Executive Presentation Course	A 2-hour, online course that gives participants an overview of the Joint Operation Planning and Execution System and provides a common framework for understanding it. This system has been used to facilitate interagency coordination for joint military and humanitarian operations, such as the USG response to Hurricane Katrina and the earthquake in Haiti.	Military enlisted personnel (E-7 and above), officers (O-5 and above), and federal civilians (GS-14 and above).	4

**Appendix II: Inventory of Professional  
Development Activities Intended to Foster  
Interagency Collaboration**

Activity name	Activity description	Target audience	2009 approximate participation
Department of Defense 101: Interagency Course	A 1-hour, online course that provides knowledge of DOD procedures and processes in an interagency, national security context.	DOD and other USG personnel.	160
Department of State 101: Interagency Course	A 1-hour, online course that provides knowledge of Department of State procedures and processes in an interagency, national security context.	DOD and other USG personnel.	160
USAID 101: Interagency Course	A 1-hour, online course that provides knowledge of U.S. Agency for International Development procedures and processes in an interagency, national security context.	DOD and other USG personnel.	90
Joint Interagency Coordination Group Course	A 14-hour, online course that provides an overview of a Joint Interagency Coordination Group, a part of a combatant commander's staff that facilitates interagency information sharing. The course prepares interagency personnel to participate in the group.	Personnel to be assigned to a Joint Interagency Coordination Group.	30
The Interagency Process: Full Spectrum Implementation Presentation	A 1-hour, online course that provides basic knowledge about how combatant commanders and staff participate in the interagency process, highlights major issues in the interagency process, and examines some new organizational tools developed to improve interagency coordination. The course also provides an introduction to the Joint Interagency Coordination Group.	Not available.	30
Interagency Coordination Course: Operation Enduring Freedom	A 1-hour, online course that provides basic knowledge of interagency coordination activities and challenges related to Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan and explains the authorities and roles of State and DOD.	Not available.	350
Homeland Security and Defense Course	A 20-hour, online course that provides basic background knowledge of key joint homeland and security defense subjects to prepare Joint Task Force Headquarters staff to more effectively accomplish their tasks during joint exercises and real-world operations.	Personnel assigned to Joint Task Force Headquarters.	110
Defense Support of Civil Authorities Course	A 5-hour, online course that provides an overview of the Defense Support of Civil Authorities, including its organization, structure, and role in homeland security and defense missions.	Not available.	140
Joint Deployment Distribution Operations Center Course	A 17-hour, online course that provides participants with foundational knowledge about the Joint Deployment Distribution Operations Center, which is intended to integrate military, interagency, and intergovernmental deployment and distribution operations.	DOD governmental and NGO personnel assigned to and/or working with the Joint Deployment Distribution Operations Center.	160

**Appendix II: Inventory of Professional  
Development Activities Intended to Foster  
Interagency Collaboration**

<b>Activity name</b>	<b>Activity description</b>	<b>Target audience</b>	<b>2009 approximate participation</b>
Joint Information Operations Orientation Course	An 18-hour, online course that provides military and civilian participants with knowledge of joint information operations doctrine and a foundation for duty as joint information operations officers. Information operations include safeguarding national information and responding to information campaigns from USG adversaries, among other priorities.	USG personnel (O-3 — O-6).	40
Joint Task Force State Staff Course	A 57-hour, online course (with 31 distinct lessons) that provides National Guard participants with the knowledge and skills they need to work with joint, interagency, interjurisdictional, and intergovernmental organizations.	National Guard personnel.	20
Standing Joint Force Headquarters Course	A 4-hour, online course that provides introductory knowledge that joint staff or interagency participants at a standing joint force headquarters need to participate as a member of the staff.	Standing Joint Force Headquarters staff and other joint staff working on operational and/or strategic issues.	40
<b>Department of Energy</b>			
Joint Surety Days Conference	A 1-day conference that serves as a forum for discussions between DOE and DOD on nuclear weapon surety topics such as latest technologies, best practices, and overviews of organizational structures and responsibilities to aid in interagency collaboration.	DOE and DOD personnel that work on issues related to nuclear weapon surety.	120
<b>Department of Justice</b>			
Home Made Explosives Course	A 5-day, in-person course that introduces a common vocabulary and framework for conducting investigations related to the criminal manufacture and use of explosives.	Personnel from the law enforcement, military, and intelligence communities.	150
Post Blast Investigative Techniques	A 5-day, in-person course that introduces a common vocabulary and framework for conducting post-blast investigations.	Military, civilian, and federal law enforcement personnel responsible for conducting post-blast investigations.	110
<b>Department of the Treasury</b>			
Terrorist Financing and Financial Crimes Policy Advisor Training Course	A 26-hour, in-person course that provides an overview of Treasury's national security activities related to terrorist financing and financial crimes, international and domestic frameworks and tools for countering illicit finance, and information on Treasury's role in working with other federal agencies, foreign governments, and international bodies in the development and implementation of policies and programs to counter illicit finance.	GS-7—12 terrorist Financing and Financial Crimes Policy Advisors.	60
<b>U.S. Agency for International Development</b>			
Tactical Conflict Assessment and Planning Framework <sup>a</sup>	A 2-day, in-person course that introduces a common vocabulary and framework for identifying and mitigating sources of conflict.	Military and civilian personnel about to deploy to an unstable environment.	1650

**Appendix II: Inventory of Professional  
Development Activities Intended to Foster  
Interagency Collaboration**

<b>Activity name</b>	<b>Activity description</b>	<b>Target audience</b>	<b>2009 approximate participation</b>
USAID Civilian Response Corps Orientation	A 2-week, in-person course that describes the roles and responsibilities of USAID and how it works with other agencies involved in the Civilian Response Corps. The course includes lectures, case studies, and exercises.	USAID members of the Civilian Response Corps.	20
<b>U.S. Department of Agriculture</b>			
Food Emergency Response Network Civil Support Team Food Course	A 5-day, in-person course that provides information on roles and responsibilities in a food emergency crisis and hands-on laboratory exercises on a variety of topics such as detection of toxins and food sampling.	GS-7—12 members of the National Guard Civil Support Team.	30
<b>Coproviders</b>			
Joint Nuclear Surety Executive Course	A 1- to 3-day, in-person course coprovided by DOD and DOE that provides technical, programmatic, and process information to facilitate an overview-level understanding of nuclear weapon surety, which includes safety, security, and control matters.	Mid and senior-level personnel.	170
Marine Security Guard School	An 8-week, in-person course coprovided by DOD and State that introduces a common vocabulary or framework for protecting classified information and addressing external threats to U.S. embassies.	Marines (O-1 and above).	480
<b>Other</b>			
Advanced Course on Hemispheric Security and Defense	An 11-month, full-time, JPME-certified academic study program provided by the Interamerican Defense College on hemispheric defense and security efforts. One objective is to foster connections among participants. Most participants are foreign, but some are also from U.S. federal agencies.	Military and civilian personnel from member states of the Organization of American States who are in strategic advisory positions related to hemispheric defense and security.	12

Source: GAO.

**Appendix II: Inventory of Professional  
Development Activities Intended to Foster  
Interagency Collaboration**

**Table 9: Exercise Programs**

<b>Activity name</b>	<b>Activity description</b>	<b>Target audience</b>	<b>2009 approximate participation</b>
<b>Department of Homeland Security</b>			
National Exercise Program	A program of exercises that examines and evaluates national policies, such as the National Preparedness Guidelines, National Incident Management System, and the National Response Framework, on domestic incident management and response to terrorism or nonterrorist catastrophic events.	Federal department and agency principals and other key officials responsible for domestic incident management of terrorism or nonterrorist catastrophic events.	Not Available
<b>Department of Defense</b>			
First-Army: Afghanistan Provincial Reconstruction Team Predeployment Training	A 60- to 90-day training exercise providing the knowledge and skills for operating effectively in an Afghanistan provincial reconstruction team. Military team members participate for 60 days; team leaders for 90 days; and civilian members join their military counterparts for the last 2-3 weeks of the exercise.	Primarily military and some civilian personnel scheduled to deploy to an Afghanistan provincial reconstruction team.	2540
NDU, Center for Applied Strategic Learning: Policy-Related Exercises	These half-day to 2-day, in-person crisis simulations provide policy and decision-making experiences, encouraging interagency dialogue and whole-of-government approaches to future national security challenges.	Midlevel to senior-level civilian and military leadership (GS-13, O-5 and above) and members of Congress.	Not Available
Joint Military Exercises Programs <sup>a</sup>	Joint exercises range in duration and can be hosted by a military Service or combatant command. They are typically training events or simulations of wartime operations and could include multinational, nongovernmental, joint, or single-service participants. Rather than focusing solely on DOD's military missions, joint exercises address areas such as counterterrorism, homeland defense and security, combat operations, domestic and foreign consequence management, stability operations, noncombatant evacuations, humanitarian assistance, and disaster response.	Various.	Not Available
<b>Department of State</b>			
The Interagency Civilian-Military Integration Training Exercise Program	A 1-week field exercise program at the Muscatatuck Urban Training Center in Butlerville, Indiana, that provides information about the roles and responsibilities of federal agencies working in Afghanistan and the skills needed to work together in a post-conflict, interagency environment.	USG personnel deploying to Afghanistan to serve on or work with civilian-military platforms, such as provincial reconstruction teams.	20

**Appendix II: Inventory of Professional Development Activities Intended to Foster Interagency Collaboration**

<b>Activity name</b>	<b>Activity description</b>	<b>Target audience</b>	<b>2009 approximate participation</b>
Foreign Emergency Support Team Quarterly Exercises	Quarterly exercises intended to teach Foreign Emergency Support Team members how to work together to assess an emergency involving an embassy and how to best respond to a crisis overseas.	USG members of an interagency team responsible for responding to incidents and crises around the world.	Not Available
<b>U.S. Department of Agriculture</b>			
Food Defense Exercise Program	A 1-day food defense exercise program hosted several times annually by USDA's Food Safety and Inspection Service that focuses on building effective and efficient coordination of state, local, federal agencies, and industry stakeholder responses to food crises incidents, food defense.	GS-13 and above (or equivalent) employees from federal, state, and local government, private industry, and academia.	170

Source: GAO.

<sup>a</sup>This entry for joint military exercises represents 84 individual exercise programs which conducted multiple exercises during fiscal year 2009.

**Table 10: Interagency Rotational Programs**

<b>Activity name</b>	<b>Activity description</b>	<b>Target audience</b>	<b>2009 approximate participation</b>
<b>Department of Homeland Security</b>			
Rotational Assignments Program	A 60-day or longer interagency rotational assignment between DHS and other federal agencies that provides opportunities to obtain breadth and depth of experience while exchanging knowledge with other organizations.	SES, managers, supervisors; personnel in SES candidate or other career development programs (GS-7 —SES).	80 <sup>a</sup>
<b>Department of Defense</b>			
U.S. Army Command and General Staff College: Interagency Exchange Program and Intermediate Level Education Interagency Fellowship Program	A 9- to 12-month rotational assignment that places Army officers in intermediate-level positions at other federal agencies and allows them to learn about the culture of the host agency, hone collaborative skills such as communication and teamwork, and establish networks with their civilian counterparts.	Field-grade Army officers, typically majors.	20
Navy Washington DC Intern Program	This program places mid-level Naval officers who are pursuing a master of arts degree in organizational management from George Washington University in two different 5-month, part-time internships at federal agencies such as DHS and State.	Navy Officers, O-4—O-5.	1

**Appendix II: Inventory of Professional  
Development Activities Intended to Foster  
Interagency Collaboration**

<b>Activity name</b>	<b>Activity description</b>	<b>Target audience</b>	<b>2009 approximate participation</b>
<b>Department of Defense and Department of Energy</b>			
Military Academic Collaborations Program	A 3- to 12-week program that provides internship opportunities at NNSA sites with a focus on science, technology, engineering, national security, and other relevant fields. Interns work closely with a senior researcher or team and have the benefit of a dedicated mentor. NNSA sites may also offer briefings, networking, and other opportunities to expose participants to a variety of programs that support DOD and to interact with other onsite military personnel.	Cadets, midshipmen, and instructors from U.S. Military Academies and ROTC programs at universities throughout the country.	10
<b>Department of State</b>			
State Rotations at DOD	A 1- to 3-year rotational assignment that places State personnel at the Pentagon or at military commands to work alongside DOD civilians and military officers. These include Foreign Policy Advisors, State-Defense Exchange Officers, and State positions with the Joint Interagency Coordination Groups. Participants have opportunities to develop their knowledge of military culture, roles and responsibilities, while providing a foreign policy perspective to military planning and operations. These assignments also provide opportunities to establish networks between diplomats and military staff who must work together on global issues.	Mid to senior-level State Foreign Service officers.	70
State Rotations at JPME and other Federal Learning Institutions	A 1- to 3-year rotational assignment that places State personnel as faculty at one of the JPME colleges, or other DOD or federal learning institutions such as the U.S. Coast Guard Academy. Participants have opportunities to establish networks with other faculty members from the interagency community while providing a foreign policy perspective to curriculum development and classroom discussions.	Mid to senior-level State Foreign Service officers.	30
State Rotations at Federal Agencies and Executive Offices	A 1- to 3-year rotational assignment that places State personnel at another federal agency or executive office. Participants have opportunities to learn about the roles and responsibilities of the host agencies and to establish professional networks with personnel from different agencies working on similar issues.	Mid to senior-level State Foreign Service officers.	30

Source: GAO

<sup>a</sup>This number represents outbound rotations, in other words the number of participants from DHS rotating to other agencies. Participation in intraagency rotations (from one DHS component to another) is not included here.

**Appendix II: Inventory of Professional Development Activities Intended to Foster Interagency Collaboration**

**Table 11: Joint Professional Military Education Programs**

<b>Activity name</b>	<b>Activity description</b>	<b>Target audience</b>	<b>2009 approximate participation</b>
<b>Department of Defense</b>			
NDU, National War College: Master of Science in National Security Strategy	A 10-month, full-time, in-person program that provides a grounding in national security strategy and policy and military strategy and operations. Through seminars, lectures, and exercises, the program emphasizes national security organizations and decision-making processes, the domestic and international contexts in which national security policy is developed, and the formulation and implementation of military strategy.	Senior-level officers (O-5—O-6), civilian equivalents (GS-14 — GS-15), and international equivalents.	220
Air University, Air Command and Staff College: Master of Military Operational Art and Science	A 10-month, full-time, in-person program that prepares participants to develop, employ, and command air, space, and cyberspace power in joint, multinational, and interagency operations.	Midlevel officers (O-4) and civilian interagency and international equivalents.	510
Air University, Air War College: Master of Strategic Studies	A 10-month, full-time, in-person program that prepares students to lead in a joint environment at the strategic level across the range of military operations with a focus on the mastery of joint air, space, and cyberspace power and how such power contributes to national security.	Senior-level officers (O-5—O-6) and civilian interagency and international equivalents.	240
Army War College: Master of Strategic Studies	A 10-month, full-time, in-person program that prepares students for strategic leadership in a joint, interagency, intergovernmental, and multinational environment with core courses, a strategic decision-making exercise, a national security seminar, and other academic work.	Senior-level officers (O-5—O-6) and civilian interagency and international equivalents.	340
Naval War College, College of Naval Command and Staff: Master of Arts in National Security and Strategic Studies	A 10-month, full-time, in-person program intended to produce critically thinking, operational-level leaders who are skilled in Navy and joint planning and are able to apply operational art to maritime, multiservice, multiagency, and multinational warfighting.	Midlevel officers (O-4) and civilian interagency and international equivalents.	320
Marine Corps Command and Staff College: Master of Military Studies	A 10-month, full-time, in-person program intended to produce critically thinking, operational-level leaders who are skilled in Marine and joint planning and are able to apply operational art to maritime, multiservice, multiagency, and multinational warfighting.	Midlevel officers (O-4) and civilian interagency and international equivalents.	200
NDU, Industrial College of the Armed Forces: Master of Science in National Resource Strategy	A 10-month, full-time, in-person program that prepares participants for strategic leadership and success in developing national security strategy and in evaluating, marshalling, and managing resources in the execution of that strategy.	Senior- to executive-level officers (O-5 and above), USG civilians (GS-14 and above), and international and private industry equivalents.	320

**Appendix II: Inventory of Professional  
Development Activities Intended to Foster  
Interagency Collaboration**

<b>Activity name</b>	<b>Activity description</b>	<b>Target audience</b>	<b>2009 approximate participation</b>
NDU, Joint Forces Staff College: Joint Advanced Warfighting School Master of Science in Joint Campaign Planning and Strategy	An 11.5-month, full-time, in-person program that develops expert operational and strategic planners, with coursework and research on history and theory of war, national security, military strategy, operational skills and campaigning, adaptive planning, and decision making.	Senior- to executive-level officers (O-5 — O-6), and civilian interagency and international equivalents.	40
NDU, Joint Forces Staff College: Joint and Combined Warfighting School	A 10-week, full-time, in-person course that develops effective operational-level warfighting planners for joint and combined forces, focusing on national security strategy; joint, interagency, intergovernmental, and multinational capabilities; military theater strategy and campaigning; and joint military planning process and systems.	Senior-level officers (O-4 and above) and civilian interagency equivalents preparing to take a joint duty or similar assignment.	1010
Army Command and General Staff College	A 10-month, full-time, in-person program that prepares selected military and civilian participants to be critically thinking, operational-level leaders, skilled in Army and joint planning, and able to apply operational skills to maritime, multiservice, multiagency, and multinational war fighting.	Senior-level officers (O-4 and above) and civilian interagency equivalents.	1430
Marine Corps War College: Master of Strategic Studies	A 10-month, full-time, in-person program that prepares its students for decision-making across the range of military operations in a joint, interagency, and multinational environment through the study of national military strategy and theater strategy and plans, within the context of national security policies, decision making, objectives, and resources.	Senior-level officers (O-5—O-6) and civilian interagency and international equivalents.	30
Naval War College, College of Naval Warfare: Master of Arts in National Security and Strategic Studies	A 10-month, full-time, in-person program that produces broadly educated, strategic leaders skilled in critical thinking, strategic analysis, planning, and warfighting in maritime, multiservice, multiagency, and multinational environments.	Senior-level officers (O-5—O-6) and civilian interagency and international equivalents.	260
NDU: Capstone	A 6-week, in-person course consisting of seminars, case studies, informal discussions, visits to key domestic U.S. military commands, and overseas field studies involving interactions with combatant commanders, American ambassadors, embassy staffs, and senior political and military leaders of foreign governments.	General and flag officers, interagency civilian SES members, and other executive-level civilian equivalents.	200

Source: GAO.

**Appendix II: Inventory of Professional  
Development Activities Intended to Foster  
Interagency Collaboration**

**Table 12: Leadership Development Programs**

<b>Activity name</b>	<b>Activity description</b>	<b>Target audience</b>	<b>2009 approximate participation</b>
<b>Department of Defense</b>			
Defense Senior Leader Development Program	A leadership development program that requires four in-person seminars, a 10-month full-time, in-person professional military education program at NDU or one of the DOD war colleges, and interagency rotational assignments. The program provides the enterprise-wide perspective to lead organizations and programs and achieve results in joint, interagency, and multinational environments.	Senior civilian personnel at DOD (GS- 14 – 15 or equivalents).	40
Executive Leader Development Program	A leadership development program that requires 95 contact days over a 10-month period of in-person training and a different week-long deployment each month for 6 months to various military facilities to expose civilians to military experiences.	Primarily DOD civilian personnel at GS-12 – 14; some participants from military or other civilian agencies such as DHS and Transportation.	60
Defense Information Systems Agency Executive Leadership Development Program	A 3-year program that includes 17 in-person and online courses, 4 developmental conferences, participation in a mentoring program and action learning project, and 3 6-month rotations, to support the development of the Defense Information Systems Agency's technical, professional, and leadership talent.	Senior-level civilian personnel (GS-14 – 15) and military officers (O-5 – O-6).	30
NDU, Information Resources Management College: Advanced Management Program, Government Strategic Leadership Certificate	A 14-week, full-time residential classroom program that teaches skills for strategic thinking, collaboration, and cross-boundary leadership with a focus on the roles, challenges, and opportunities of organizations within the context of homeland, national, and global security; provides participants with a network to share knowledge, and analyze and leverage strategic human, technological, and financial resources.	USG personnel (GS-13 and above; FS and military equivalents).	0
NDU, Center for the Study of Weapons of Mass Destruction: Program for Emerging Leaders	A specialized leadership development program with approximately 66 in-person contact hours to be completed during a 3-year period, created to foster a community of rising U.S. government leaders with the awareness and skills needed to respond to the dangers of weapons of mass destruction.	Early to mid-career national security professionals.	50
<b>Department of State</b>			
Ambassadorial Seminar	A 2-week leadership development program that prepares ambassadors-designate and their spouses for their unique positions of leadership in the interagency environment of State's missions abroad.	Ambassador-designates.	70

**Appendix II: Inventory of Professional  
Development Activities Intended to Foster  
Interagency Collaboration**

<b>Activity name</b>	<b>Activity description</b>	<b>Target audience</b>	<b>2009 approximate participation</b>
Deputy Chief of Mission/Principal Officer Seminar	A 3-week leadership development program intended to teach the leadership skills needed to manage in an interagency environment.	New Deputy Chiefs of Mission and Principal Officers.	60
Interagency Policy Seminar Series	A 2-day, in-person seminar that brings together senior leaders to discuss key policy issues related to national security, such as democracy building; develop leadership skills such as teambuilding; and establish networks.	USG personnel (GS-15 and above; FS and military equivalents).	50
Interagency Effectiveness: Strategies and Best Practices	A 1-day leadership development program that teaches analysis, communication, and negotiation skills needed to operate in an interagency environment.	USG personnel (GS-15 and above; FS and military equivalents).	40
National Security Executive Leadership Seminar	A leadership development program that meets 2 days per month over the course of 5 months and provides the knowledge and skills needed to navigate the interagency policy implementation process as well as opportunities to establish professional networks.	USG personnel (GS-15 and above; FS and military equivalents).	60
Senior Executive Threshold Seminar	A 10-day leadership development program designed to prepare newly promoted senior executives in the foreign affairs community for the challenges they face in leading across agency and national boundaries.	Newly promoted senior FS officers and senior Civil Service personnel in the foreign affairs community. (Open to interagency personnel as of 2010).	110

Source: GAO.

<sup>a</sup>In 2010, USAID changed the name of this course from Tactical Conflict Assessment and Planning Framework to District Stability Framework.

---

# Appendix III: GAO Contact and Staff Acknowledgments

---

## GAO Contact

Bernice Steinhardt at (202) 512-6543 or [steinhardtb@gao.gov](mailto:steinhardtb@gao.gov)

---

## Acknowledgements

Elizabeth Curda and Laura Miller Craig managed this assignment. Jessica Nierenberg, Kate Hudson Walker, Albert Sim, Melanie Papasian, David Dornisch, and Russ Burnett made key contributions to all aspects of the report. Esther Toledo, Mark Kehoe, David P. Owen, Lauren Levine, Andrew Stavisky, John Mingus, Jr., John Pendleton, Marie Mak, Alissa Czyz, William Trancucci, Judith Kordahl, and Crystal Robinson also provided assistance. In addition, Lois Hanshaw and Karin Fangman provided legal support and Donna Miller developed the report's graphics.

---

# Related GAO Products

---

*Defense Management: DOD Needs to Determine the Future of Its Horn of Africa Task Force.* [GAO-10-504](#). Washington, D.C.: April 15, 2010.

*Homeland Defense: DOD Needs to Take Actions to Enhance Interagency Coordination for Its Homeland Defense and Civil Support Missions,* [GAO-10-364](#). Washington, D.C.: March 30, 2010.

*Interagency Collaboration: Key Issues for Congressional Oversight of National Security Strategies, Organizations, Workforce, and Information Sharing.* [GAO-09-904SP](#). Washington, D.C.: September 25, 2009.

*Military Training: DOD Needs a Strategic Plan and Better Inventory and Requirements Data to Guide Development of Language Skills and Regional Proficiency.* [GAO-09-568](#). Washington, D.C.: June 19, 2009.

*Influenza Pandemic: Continued Focus on the Nation's Planning and Preparedness Efforts Remains Essential.* [GAO-09-760T](#). Washington, D.C.: June 3, 2009.

*U.S. Public Diplomacy: Key Issues for Congressional Oversight.* [GAO-09-679SP](#). Washington, D.C.: May 27, 2009.

*Military Operations: Actions Needed to Improve Oversight and Interagency Coordination for the Commander's Emergency Response Program in Afghanistan.* [GAO-09-61](#). Washington, D.C.: May 18, 2009.

*Foreign Aid Reform: Comprehensive Strategy, Interagency Coordination, and Operational Improvements Would Bolster Current Efforts.* [GAO-09-192](#). Washington, D.C.: April 17, 2009.

*Iraq and Afghanistan: Security, Economic, and Governance Challenges to Rebuilding Efforts Should Be Addressed in U.S. Strategies.* [GAO-09-476T](#). Washington, D.C.: March 25, 2009.

*Drug Control: Better Coordination with the Department of Homeland Security and an Updated Accountability Framework Can Further Enhance DEA's Efforts to Meet Post-9/11 Responsibilities.* [GAO-09-63](#). Washington, D.C.: March 20, 2009.

*Defense Management: Actions Needed to Address Stakeholder Concerns, Improve Interagency Collaboration, and Determine Full Costs*

*Associated with the U.S. Africa Command.* [GAO-09-181](#). Washington, D.C.: February 20, 2009.

*Combating Terrorism: Actions Needed to Enhance Implementation of Trans-Sahara Counterterrorism Partnership.* [GAO-08-860](#). Washington, D.C.: July 31, 2008.

*Information Sharing: Definition of the Results to Be Achieved in Terrorism-Related Information Sharing Is Needed to Guide Implementation and Assess Progress.* [GAO-08-637T](#). Washington, D.C.: July 23, 2008.

*Highlights of a GAO Forum: Enhancing U.S. Partnerships in Countering Transnational Terrorism.* [GAO-08-887SP](#). Washington, D.C.: July 2008.

*Stabilization and Reconstruction: Actions Are Needed to Develop a Planning and Coordination Framework and Establish the Civilian Reserve Corps.* [GAO-08-39](#). Washington, D.C.: November 6, 2007.

*Homeland Security: Federal Efforts Are Helping to Alleviate Some Challenges Encountered by State and Local Information Fusion Centers.* [GAO-08-35](#). Washington, D.C.: October 30, 2007.

*Military Operations: Actions Needed to Improve DOD's Stability Operations Approach and Enhance Interagency Planning.* [GAO-07-549](#). Washington, D.C.: May 31, 2007.

*Combating Terrorism: Law Enforcement Agencies Lack Directives to Assist Foreign Nations to Identify, Disrupt, and Prosecute Terrorists.* [GAO-07-697](#). Washington, D.C.: May 25, 2007.

*Results-Oriented Government: Practices That Can Help Enhance and Sustain Collaboration among Federal Agencies.* [GAO-06-15](#). Washington, D.C.: October 21, 2005.

---

## GAO's Mission

The Government Accountability Office, the audit, evaluation, and investigative arm of Congress, exists to support Congress in meeting its constitutional responsibilities and to help improve the performance and accountability of the federal government for the American people. GAO examines the use of public funds; evaluates federal programs and policies; and provides analyses, recommendations, and other assistance to help Congress make informed oversight, policy, and funding decisions. GAO's commitment to good government is reflected in its core values of accountability, integrity, and reliability.

---

## Obtaining Copies of GAO Reports and Testimony

The fastest and easiest way to obtain copies of GAO documents at no cost is through GAO's Web site ([www.gao.gov](http://www.gao.gov)). Each weekday afternoon, GAO posts on its Web site newly released reports, testimony, and correspondence. To have GAO e-mail you a list of newly posted products, go to [www.gao.gov](http://www.gao.gov) and select "E-mail Updates."

---

## Order by Phone

The price of each GAO publication reflects GAO's actual cost of production and distribution and depends on the number of pages in the publication and whether the publication is printed in color or black and white. Pricing and ordering information is posted on GAO's Web site, <http://www.gao.gov/ordering.htm>.

Place orders by calling (202) 512-6000, toll free (866) 801-7077, or TDD (202) 512-2537.

Orders may be paid for using American Express, Discover Card, MasterCard, Visa, check, or money order. Call for additional information.

---

## To Report Fraud, Waste, and Abuse in Federal Programs

Contact:

Web site: [www.gao.gov/fraudnet/fraudnet.htm](http://www.gao.gov/fraudnet/fraudnet.htm)

E-mail: [fraudnet@gao.gov](mailto:fraudnet@gao.gov)

Automated answering system: (800) 424-5454 or (202) 512-7470

---

## Congressional Relations

Ralph Dawn, Managing Director, [dawnr@gao.gov](mailto:dawnr@gao.gov), (202) 512-4400  
U.S. Government Accountability Office, 441 G Street NW, Room 7125  
Washington, DC 20548

---

## Public Affairs

Chuck Young, Managing Director, [youngc1@gao.gov](mailto:youngc1@gao.gov), (202) 512-4800  
U.S. Government Accountability Office, 441 G Street NW, Room 7149  
Washington, DC 20548

