Homeland Security: The Community College Role in Law Enforcement Training and Readiness

YGNACIO "NASH" FLORES Rio Hondo College
yflores@riohondo.edu

ABSTRACT

In its relatively short existence the idea of homeland security has grown to dominate the national security strategy, a planning device that includes municipal law enforcement capabilities. The September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, growing demographic diversity and a general realization of professional ethics saw the end of the city-centric mission for municipal law enforcement agencies. As law enforcement agencies struggled to change from a reactive performance model to a proactive performance model, the need for a better trained law enforcement officer was apparent to municipal administrators and academia alike.

The purpose of this paper was to study the degree to which community colleges (CCs) have or can provide training to law enforcement personnel. A review of the literature on law enforcement training has shown that even as the CCs have traditionally been part of the training experience for the law enforcement community, their impact on training has been relatively omitted from comprehensive research on law enforcement training. By illustrating how national policy changes have impacted law enforcement training requirements within the last decade this paper will explain the impact of the CCs on law enforcement training. Lastly, this paper points to the potential CCs have on homeland security practitioners, specifically the training of municipal law enforcement personnel.

Law enforcement training has traditionally been delivered by either a law enforcement agency (Glenn, Panitch, Barnes-Proby, Williams, Christian, Lewis, Gerwehr, and Brannan, 2008) or by community colleges (CCs) (American Association of Community Colleges [AACC], 2006). Yet, little research has been directed at exploring the impact of the CC based law enforcement training centers (Altizer, Bradshaw, Courtney, Hill, and Jilani, 2006). Since in depth studies on the impact of CCs on law enforcement training are practically absent in the literature, this paper explores what is known about the role of CCs in professional law enforcement training. Changes are taking place in law enforcement training but the general research community has overlooked a major actor in the training phenomena, that of the CCs (Gose, 2005). This pattern of research needs to open up the academic doors of consideration to CCs, particularly since CCs have enjoyed a long recognized role in training the law enforcement community at the practitioner level in the United States (AACC, 2006).

Unquestionably the law enforcement community faced many challenges as the first decade of the 21st century came to an end (Raymond, Hickman, Miller & Wong, 2005; Hickman & Reaves, 2006). Key among the challenges noted by researchers was the issue of training (Raymond, Hickman, Miller, & Wong, 2008). Contemporary law enforcement training encompasses subjects that include responses to man-made and natural disasters, terrorism, integrity and professionalism (Raymond, et al., 2008). The former law enforcement paradigm of waiting to be dispatched to calls for service have changed into a new paradigm that requires law enforcement officers to be proactive in protecting the communities that they serve (Raymond, et al., 2005).

A sea change came to the law enforcement mission after the September 11, 2001 (9/11) terrorist attacks (9/11 Commission, 2004). Prior to the infamous terrorist attacks on American soil, local law enforcement was basically detached from the national security strategy and was concerned primarily with calls to service and not with responses to terrorist attacks (9/11 Commission, 2004). This feeling was even maintained after the bombing of the Murrah Federal Building on April 19, 1995 by Timothy McVeigh (Gilmore Commission, 2000). The collective expectation of police capabilities by communities across the nation grew exponentially as the American consciousness comprehended its vulnerabilities of trust, openness and transparency in society (Raymond, et al., 2005). The public expectation has since expanded the meaning of *to protect and serve* to include threats from beyond the traditional municipal jurisdiction of local law enforcement agencies as multi purposed joint task forces have become the norm for many law enforcement agencies.

The challenges to law enforcement training often find their genesis in systemic influences such as those from federal, state and municipal agencies and offices. By looking at the influences separately we can better appreciate the difficulty faced by law enforcement trainers and educators. This paper is organized in four sections to provide differing perspectives on how recent changes came to influence the law enforcement community. In addition, the impact of CCs on these differing perspectives will be illustrated. *Homeland Security* discusses how the changes from the 9/11 terrorist attacks and Hurricane Katrina created a homeland security mission for the municipal law enforcement community. *Changes in Law Enforcement Training* explains how the duties expected of law enforcement practitioners have expanded over the last decade. Acknowledging the role of the CCs in the phenomenon of law enforcement training is discussed in *Community College Connections.* As a final discussion *Looking Forward* points the way for future practices and research where the CCs are included in the law enforcement equation.

Homeland Security
Driving emerging law enforcement expectations on the federal level are various documents that form the foundation of the nation's national security plan (Raymond, et al., 2005). Prior to 9/11 the term *homeland security* was not used in U.S. policy making or mentioned in national strategies (Bush, G. H., 1992;

Clinton, 2000). After the terrorist attacks of 9/11 the concept of homeland security was a driving force in the development of the U.S. national security plan (9/11, 2004). Through the years the national definition of homeland security has morphed to include multiple threats as well as the recognition of a unique American lifestyle as defined in the *Quadrennial Homeland Security Review Report* (QHSR) (2010): "Homeland Security is a concerted national effort to ensure a homeland that is safe, secure, and resilient against terrorism and other hazards where American interests, aspirations, and way of life can thrive" (p. 13).

This definition was based on the real and psychological damage suffered by America on September 11, 2001. This event was soon followed by the devastation of Hurricane Katrina that crippled New Orleans (DHS, 2007). Response to these two types of emergencies revealed similarities in the national response strategy developed by the White House (Bush, G. W., 2003). *All hazards,* was included to cover all threats, natural and man-made (Bush, G.W., 2003). The idea of reacting to threats from all hazards encompasses a community of first responders that includes law enforcement practitioners as major actors in homeland security planning, preparation and response (9/11 Commission, 2004: Raymond, et al., 2005; DHS, 2007).

The idea of what homeland security actually is has yet to be fully comprehended in the law enforcement community or in the mind of the general public (Altizer, et al., 2006). The new duties for municipal law enforcement agencies cover many functions that previously fell within the realm of military responsibility and capabilities. Studies have shown that there are many recommendations on needed capabilities yet the funding to support training for these capabilities has not kept up with the recommendations. Homeland security training has been victim of policies created without forethought or planning in how the training was to be delivered (GAO, 2005).

Pre 9/11 attempts to strengthen law enforcement capabilities on a national scale were revisited under the umbrella of homeland security (Bush, G. H., 1992; Clinton, 2000; 9/11 Commission, 2004). At the highest level of the nation's policy making mechanism, the presidents of the United States have issued various presidential directives to guide the nation's security plans. These commonly understood mechanisms to create law impacting the law enforcement community can be viewed at the Department of Homeland Security website at http://www.dhs.gov/xabout/laws/editorial_0607.shtm. These directives (see Table 1) set in motion training and education requirements for federal, state and municipal law enforcement agencies. An impact of these directives was that the line between military and civil law enforcement duties and capabilities became fuzzy as both groups of professionals developed complementary mission areas to protect the U.S. Homeland.

Together these presidential directives have guided the national strategy in responding to threats against America. Moreover, the presidential directives were the genesis of mandating capabilities for the law enforcement community,

capabilities that often required new or revised training methods. Though post 9/11 presidential directives included law enforcement agencies in the national strategy, and established training and readiness requirements, the directives lacked clear guidance on how or where to obtain the training required meeting the directives' intended capabilities. The United States had been attacked by terrorists prior to 9/11. The World Trade Center was first attacked in 1993 (DOS, 2004). There were six more attacks against American interests between the first attack on the World Trade Center in 1993 and the multiple attacks of 9/11 (DOS, 2004; 9/11 Commission, 2004). The difference in the two World Trade Center attacks were the coordination of the attacks, the scale of damage and the loss of life (9/11 Commission, 2004; DOS, 2004). Between these two attacks, national planning concentrated primarily on a military response to terrorism (DOS, 2000).

Terrorism remained part of the military strategy even after the bombing of the Murrah Federal Building by U.S. citizens on April 19, 1995. Congressman Rohrabacher criticized the FBI response for not properly searching the residence of Terry Nichols, one of the two convicted bombers (Rohrabacher, 2006). A second, much later, search found additional explosives under the floorboards of Nichols' residence. Rohrabacher (2006) concluded that the federal law enforcements agencies involved in responding to and investigating the bombing thought of all non-FBI entities, particularly municipal law enforcement, as a nuisance to their investigation. Rohrabacher (2006) further highlighted that the training of law enforcement professionals prior to the Murrah bombing had not concentrated on terrorists in the U.S., especially homegrown terrorism. The 9/11 Commission's (2004) recommendations highlighted the vulnerabilities of law enforcement agencies not working across jurisdictions. The report further highlighted law enforcement personnel not having the training which might have resulted in critical information being shared among the law enforcement agencies that responded to the Oklahoma City bombing.

After the Oklahoma City bombing two incidents drew national attention and helped change the role of law enforcement trainers. Immediately after 9/11, law enforcement officers were expected to know about intelligence operations, counter-surveillance and responding to terrorist attacks (9/11 Commission, 2004). Hurricane Katrina added the operational mission of responding to natural disasters under the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), an agency that was absorbed by the Department of Homeland Security in 2002. These trends made the selection and training of qualified law enforcement officers a concern of administrators across the governmental spectrum ranging from local to federal agencies as the duties for peace officers expanded in the post 9/11 environment (POST, 2006).

The Homeland Security Act of 2002 included the establishment of the Department of Homeland Security by bringing together over 20 federal agencies responsible for the security of the United States (DHS, 2008a). The emphasis on forming the Department of Homeland Security was to coordinate intelligence, law enforcement and emergency response efforts in a variety of federal agencies

under one umbrella organization. Added to the Department of Homeland Security's terrorist concerns was the inadequate response by federal and municipal agencies in Hurricane Katrina (Bush, G.W., 2003). People affected by Hurricane Katrina naturally looked to the most visible authority they saw, law enforcement officers, for immediate and continuing assistance. To the hurricane victims, the municipal law enforcement officers were the face of government response and stability (Rostker, Hix, & Wilson, 2007). With these incidents law enforcement officers saw themselves referred to more frequently as *first responders*, civil servants responding to all hazards not just routine law enforcement calls to service. These disasters highlighted the need for training of law enforcement practitioners in areas outside the actual enforcement of civil and criminal laws.

One purpose of the Department of Homeland Security was to have all public safety related agencies enhance their responsibility and accountability for preparedness of the nation in order to prevent and respond to terrorist attacks and large scale disasters (GAO, 2005). The direct impact of this charter created a new industry in law enforcement training as higher education curricula was revised to prepare homeland security professionals for the growing job market (Altizer, et al., 2006). Training in homeland security has focused on programs primarily delivered by CCs that are concerned with the career technical education arena (AACC, 2006).

The need to be trained in the variety of homeland security capabilities led the varied public safety agencies to compete for coveted training dollars received from the national coffers under the Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) grants program (GAO, 2005). The UASI program was successful in providing new equipment to public safety agencies but the training programs were left up to the receiving agencies to develop and manage (DHS, 2009). Federal funding for new training equipment did not often integrate well with the idea of getting trained which left gaps in capability or capacity at the municipal level of law enforcement (GAO, 2005). Often the delivery of state-of-the-art equipment came with little or no training, thus making the equipment practically useless. An interesting note on competition for federal dollars is that the community colleges are not always considered as eligible participants for funding (Gose, 2005). This would seem strange when community colleges have claimed to prepare and train 85% of first responders throughout the U.S. (Gose, 2005).

While homeland security training does not focus on any one job discipline, most homeland security related training programs center on the fields of criminal justice, transportation, intelligence operations and emergency management (Altizer, et al., 2006). Although Altizer and his associates (2006) highlighted higher education's benefit to homeland security in their article, the emphasis was on educating behind the desk analysts instead of on the street peace officers. One possible solution to address this issue is for agencies to form articulation agreements with career technical education and vocational training programs at CCs (Gose, 2005).

Changes in Law Enforcement Training
Law enforcement leaders are and have been faced with challenges besides those created by the events of 9/11 (Raymond, et al., 2005). This century began with a noted loss of public confidence in law enforcement leadership due to scandals and unprofessional behavior of law enforcement officers throughout the nation (National Center for Women & Policing [NCWP], 2003a). This public distrust was partially responsible for the RAND report on the Los Angeles Police Department (Glenn et al., 2008). As part of a consent decree the Los Angeles Police Department was ordered to become more professional and ethical in its practices (Glenn, et al., 2008).

Community oriented policing (COPS) is a leading program that brings the public and law enforcement together in a working relationship (Mac Donald, 2000). The focus on community oriented policing has resulted in studies that view training as a means of properly preparing law enforcement officers for the emerging focus on proactive and community collaborative policing (NIJ, 2005; Raymond, et al., 2005; Glenn et al., 2008). The idea behind community oriented policing is for law enforcement officers to be part of the community and not just an authoritative figure that is disconnected from the human element of the environment (Raymond, et al., 2005). Community oriented policing has been credited with collaboratively controlling crime in a partnership with the public (Chappell, 2008). Working with the community as active partners requires law enforcement curriculum to consider the civilian population as a member of the law enforcement team (Chappell, 2008).

Law enforcement administrators have also been urged to change how they select recruits (NCWP, 2003; 2003a; Ridgeway, Lim, Gifford, Koper, Matthies, Hajimiri & Huynh, 2008). Advocates of equality (NCWP, 2004) have said many agencies are "testing for the 'wrong things'" when looking for new recruits (p. 63). Though research primarily focused on women issues of inequality in law enforcement recruiting and retention, the National Center for Women & Policing report (2004) highlighted several points that law enforcement leaders could learn from by seeking non-traditional type recruits into their organizations. Women recruits might be less prone to use excessive force (NCWP, 2002a), or could have better reasoning and communication skills than the traditional paramilitary type recruit (NCWP, 2003a). These calls for changes to selection, initial and ongoing training began to shift the rudder in how training was developed and delivered within the law enforcement community.

The threats law enforcement officers are faced with now include chemical, biological, radiological or nuclear weapons in addition to every form of natural disaster. Training for responses to these incidents had once been the realm of the military, including the National Guard, but now needed to find a suitable segue to the civilian law enforcement community. The questions asked by law enforcement researchers seemed to be consistent in looking at emerging law enforcement training challenges as a parochial agency concern (Raymond, et al., 2005; Glenn, et al., 2008; Ridgeway, et al., 2008) and not considering the

potential of collaborating with the experience of the CC vocational training systems (AACC, 2006; Altizer, et al., 2006). Overall, the evolution of training for the law enforcement community has come far in the last few decades however, recent terrorist attacks around the world have changed the direction it is headed in the future.

Formal law enforcement training was unheard of seventy years ago. The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) established the *Police Training School* at their Quantico, Virginia training center in 1935 (FBI, 2009). The purpose of the school was to train law enforcement leaders in the emerging science of investigative techniques, management principles and weapons training (FBI, 2009). The Police Training School eventually transitioned into the current FBI National Academy, and is considered the premier center for law enforcement training and research (FBI, 2009). The National Academy continues to train senior level law enforcement officers in management principles and police science (FBI, 2009). Prior to this period, municipal law enforcement training basically consisted of on the job training (OJT) under the tutelage of a mentor, usually a senior officer who had *seen it all*. California led the way in formalized police training for municipal agencies by chartering the California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) in 1959 as the first state agency responsible establishing training and hiring standards in law enforcement (POST, 2008). POST has since maintained its lead in conducting research and establishing professional guidelines and training requirements for police officers, deputy sheriffs, correctional officers and state police officers (POST, http://www.post.ca.gov). Since 1959, almost every state in America has created a similar training compliance organization (POST, 2008).

While POST and the FBI are recognized as leaders in law enforcement training (POST, 2008; FBI, 2009), contemporary studies were clear that the current operational and training requirements are beyond the scope of the standards dictated by these two organizations (GAO, 2004; Raymond, et al., 2004; Glenn, et al., 2008; Ridgeway, et al., 2008). Researchers agree law enforcement training is in need of reform at the organizational, curricular and delivery levels (9/11 Commission, 2004; GAO, 2005; GAO, 2007; Raymond, et al., 2005; Ridgeway, et al., 2008; Glenn, et al., 2008). The recognized gap between what is taught in police academies and what actually takes place on the streets is a cause for concern by law enforcement administrators that have to answer to the citizens they are charged to protect (Bradford & Pynes, 1999). As an example, law enforcement personnel are now required to know about responding to terrorist attacks, natural disasters, and intelligence gathering. The organizational performance problems consisting of instructors not following the curriculum; revision of testing and recruiting standards; and instilling an understanding of professional duty of the San Diego and Los Angeles Police Departments were directly related to study recommendations calling for the reforming of the departments' training programs (Glenn, et al., 2008; Ridgeway, et al., 2008). These findings point to a presumption that if these large and reputable law enforcement agencies have an underrepresentation of theses skills and abilities the

same problems could be present in other agency training programs and police academies. The roots of the problems illustrated by the San Diego and Los Angeles Police Departments studies were further linked to leadership and agency organizational shortcomings (National Institute of Justice [NIJ], 2005; Glenn, et al., 2008; Ridgeway, et al., 2008).

As a direct response to these needs, state and federal policy directives have been implemented in an effort to bring law enforcement training more in line with the actual patrol duties and responsibilities of peace officers (GAO, 2005; Glenn, et al., 2008; POST, 2008). Primary among training reforms at the federal level are the emphasis on homeland security, maintaining ethical standards for law enforcement officers, and community oriented policing (COPS). The California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) has emphasized development of similar direction in the validation of contemporary training requirements (NCWP, 2003; 2003a; POST, 2006), organizational leadership (Glenn, et al, 2008; Ridgeway, et al., 2008), and emergency response procedures (POST, 2006). These focal points form a web of interconnected issues that need all actors in law enforcement training to work together to solve the training challenges facing the law enforcement community (AACC, 2006; Glenn, et al., 2008).

To properly understand the contemporary challenges to the law enforcement community two definitions need to be clarified. First is determining the etymology of *homeland security*. The second is, understanding what the difference is between training and education. Homeland security in its short addition to the American lexicon has transformed from preparing for and responding to terrorist attacks to the additional inclusion of preparing for and responding to all hazards, natural disasters included (Bush, G. W., 2001; 2001a; 2003; 2003a). Homeland security, in its current use encompasses all man-made and natural threats and hazards to the U.S., its territories, citizens and national infrastructure (Bush, G. W., 2001; 2001a; 2003; 2003a). Responsibility for the preparedness and response to hazards under the definition of homeland security include the law enforcement community as a first line of defense as well as being first responders.

The author has found the simplest way to illustrate the difference between training and education is with an anecdote about sex education in high school. Would the audience rather have their teenage kids receive *sex education* or *sex training* while in school? Training for this paper then is the process by which law enforcement practitioners are brought to an established standard of proficiency through instruction and experience. Education is the learning that takes place in a traditional academic setting. The rest of this paper will primarily concentrate on the training aspect of law enforcement readiness. Law enforcement education will be mentioned where it supports the theme of this paper.

The scope of law enforcement training and related challenges can be better appreciated when the size of the municipal law enforcement career field is

illustrated. As an example there are 633,710 people in law enforcement careers (US Bureau of Labor Statistics [USBLS], 2009) and in California there are currently 61,300 people employed in law enforcement with an estimated increase up to 72,200 people expected by the year 2016 (Employment Development Department [EDD], 2007). This sizable profession has mandatory federal, state and local training requirements to maintain knowledge, skills and abilities (POST, 2006) yet very few agencies have mandatory educational requirements calling for academic degrees or certificates as part of their continuing education programs.

With the creation of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) came a new appreciation for the overarching group of professionals called first-responders. A first responder is a member of an occupation who's mission includes the initial response to an emergency incident (9/11 Commission, 2004). Preparation of first responders is accomplished through a combination of training and education. At the basic level of training for first responders, that includes law enforcement personnel, are training in short term courses where people could practice the manipulative use of select equipment or procedures. In comparison, at the advanced level of education are graduate programs under the Department of Homeland Security, like the Masters of Homeland Security degree program at the Naval Postgraduate School in Monterey, California (Center for Homeland Defense and Security [CHDS], 2008) or the Department of Defense's think tank, the Asia Pacific Center for Security Studies, in Honolulu, Hawaii [APCSS] (2008). With the differences understood between training and education there is a significant need for more training of practitioners in the field. Delivery of training though is not free.

The current trends in law enforcement training addressing the expanded duties of homeland security is a result of Al' Qaeda's terrorist attacks against American interests in 2000 and 2001, especially the attacks of 9/11 that saw first responders performing the functions of First Aid, search and rescue, and directing casualties to safe zones. Functional capabilities for first responders as those recognized by the 9/11 Commission (2004) comes at a cost to the tax payers. Immediately after these attacks, the Department of Defense spent $38 billion dollars from 2001 to 2003 to combat terrorism (Roth, et al, 2004).

With the formation of the Department of Homeland Security in 2002, federal funding channels were created to provide training of state and municipal law enforcement agencies under the Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI) (GAO, 2007). Nevertheless, getting the funding to the local level was a challenge in addition to determining how training capabilities would be managed. In 2006, $1.7 billion dollars were provided to states, localities and territories to prevent and respond to terrorist attacks (GAO, 2007). Law enforcement agencies also received an influx of new military related equipment used in response to acts of terrorism (GAO, 2004) such as armored vehicles, software programs on information management and advanced weapons.

The operational recommendations and new equipment often required training to make the intended capabilities effective or practical (GAO, 2005; Raymond, et al., 2005). Law enforcement training however has many masters to answer to as evidenced by the 114 Congressional commissions that provided 59 recommendations on the National Strategy for Homeland Security (GAO, 2004). These recommendations also included specific recommendations for civil communities to receive training in emergency preparedness and response (GAO, 2004). Just as important were recommendations eliminating duplicative training requirements for law enforcement agencies that were established by state and/or federal regulations (GAO, 2004). The GAO (2004) study emphasized the consolidation of training delivery and coordination of training effort as a solution to these duplicative training requirements.

Leading studies of the law enforcement community have recommended the need to consider all sources of law enforcement training to improve preparedness and response capabilities (AACC, 2006; Gose, 2006; Altizer, et. al.; 2006; Glenn, et al., 2008). Leveraging knowledge from existing programs prevents the proverbial reinvention of the wheel (GAO, 2004). This trend was pointed out in the Naval Postgraduate School's Center for Homeland Defense and Security's (CHDS) University and Agency Partnership Initiative (UAPI) program that willingly shares its curriculum on homeland security studies to member institutions, colleges and universities (CHDS, 2008). Raymond's research team provided an alternative saying that if law enforcement agencies are to continue protecting the public within the ever-growing framework of homeland security, law enforcement officers must be properly trained to fulfill their duties (Raymond, et al., 2005). Altizer et al. (2006) further stressed that professional training for law enforcement needs to include higher education as a resource of meeting this goal.

Community College Connections
Nationally, the CCs have also been significant providers of education and or training for first responders as reported by the American Association of Community Colleges in their report, *First Responders: Community Colleges on the Front Line of Security.* The report was based on a survey of 760 community colleges throughout the U.S. (AACC, 2006). While the number of respondents was significant the AACC report (2006) was short in its findings as it reported out in 15 pages a snapshot of homeland security programs offered by the respondent CCs and not on the interactions the colleges had with their constituent industry partners. However, the AACC report (2006) recognized that "the *community* nature of community colleges suggests that they are in and of their communities" (p. vii). This unique standing in society calls for CCs to sit as an equal among the agencies and organizations responsible for the training and readiness of law enforcement practitioners.

Despite the AACC report's (2006) statement that the CCs are primary providers in law enforcement training Gose (2005) and Altizer, et al. (2006) argue that the CCs have been largely ignored by law enforcement leaders and researchers. Part of this oversight may be attributed to the interchangeability of the terms education

and training in research. The research of CCs as a variable in law enforcement training does not match with the fact that over 80% of the law enforcement officers in the United States are trained by CCs (AACC, 2006). This trend may be attributed to the concept that all law enforcement agencies operate their own training centers or police academies. Other than the larger agencies like the Los Angeles Police Department or the New York Police Department that have funded training bureaus most municipal law enforcement agencies do not have the means to operate a singular police academy. A telling example of this phenomenon is within the county of Los Angeles that has up to forty agencies that do not operate agency police academies. Instead these agencies look to the larger agency operated academies or CC based training centers and academies to meet their initial and ongoing training requirements. Many police agencies or associations have *adopted* CC operated police academies by being members of the advisory committees and providing officers to deliver training to cadets and in service officers. Training in the CC law enforcement training programs has and should continue to provide answers to the many operational and practical training issues faced by the law enforcement community.

Although systemic problems in professional performance of law enforcement officers have resulted in court interventions, many of the remedies are found in the revision of training programs (NCWP, 2002A; 2003; Wimshurst & Ransley, 2007; Glenn, et al., 2008). There is little in U. S. research that connects higher education to police training (Wimshurst & Ransley, 2007). This is peculiar as the international law enforcement community often looks to the U. S. as the standard of how to address their own problems (Wimshurst & Ransley, 2007). The American experience of integrating higher education and law enforcement has been at the individual level of the law enforcement officer and not systemically at the institutional level of law enforcement preparation (GAO, 2000). Wimshurst and Ransley (2007) explored the systemic influence of mandatory higher education on basic police training in Australia. Their findings were less than expected in regards to the mixing of higher education and police training (Wimshurst & Ransley, 2007).

Wimshurst's and Ransley's study (2007) found that the intentions of the Australian government's mandate to improve police professionalism and ethical practices by placing police academies in four-year university programs did not meet intended program objectives. The police training did not fit well with contemporary law enforcement training in curriculum or practice. The expected outcome of professionalizing the police forces in Australia by exposing them to a liberal university environment was flawed by design. The sought after benefits of the university experience were not realized because the police academies were isolated from the main campus. In addition, the program was built around a certificate program that saw more attention drawn to maintaining the traditional police academy culture and experiences than professionalizing the police organization as part of a true *university experience*. Wimshurst's and Ransley's findings (2007) point to the value CCs can provide as a venue for successfully training law enforcement practitioners in a higher educational environment

(AACC, 2006). The minimum POST requirements for law enforcement cadets in their basic course, police academy, equate to a professional certification allowing a successful candidate to pursue a career in law enforcement (POST, 2006). Academically, these same candidates earn college credits fulfilling the requirements for a certificate, credits that can also be applied towards a degree program.

There was also a failed American attempt to provide an educated police force during the early 21st century that offered funded education for law enforcement officers through a federal grant program called the Police Corps program (GAO, 2000). Intending to expose law enforcement officers to an educational experience beyond that of their training experience the Police Corps program did not realize a corps of better law enforcement officers. This program was victim to the inadequate organizational leadership of the program office (GAO, 2000). The Office of Justice Programs (OJP) took the reins of the floundering Police Corps Program from the Office of the Police Corps after it failed to deliver an educated corps of police officers as the program had intended (GAO, 2000). Later a GAO study (2000) found that the majority of the funds for fully funding individual police officers for up to four years of university education were unused. This program was similar to the benefits received through the G.I. Bill after serving a minimum of four years of active military service (GAO, 2000). The OJP faulted the program's lack of participation on the inability to have a dedicated staff to manage the program (GAO, 2000). Lack of funding for recruiting and administrative costs were also cited as a cause for the program's ineffectiveness. Despite the OJP's administration of the program, only 19 officers took advantage of the program and graduated from a college in 2003 (OJP Press Release, 2003). The efforts, though grand, were flawed from the beginning as concept did not transfer to implementation. Here was an opportunity for law enforcement officers to receive a college education and the cost was only four years of service as a law enforcement officer anywhere in the United States after graduation. The program's outcomes never lived up to the original expectations of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 that sought to fight violent crime through an educated police force (GAO, 2000). In fact, the ideas that established the Police Corps program were reaffirmed by the 9/11 Commission when they recommended one of the solutions to terrorism was the creation of a better educated cadre of law enforcement officers (9/11 Commission, 2004).

Unfortunately, for too long the paradigm among many law enforcement officers was that professional training was accepted whereas formal education was rarely desired or accepted within a serious context. Education above the mandatory training requirements for people in the law enforcement community has for the most part been a voluntary choice. The Police Corps program and the Australian experiment exposed a problem between law enforcement practitioners and formalized educational programs. As an example, Chief Gonzales from National City in California confirmed this belief when he commented that higher education was once considered a liability for promotion (National University, 2007). Fortunately, this perceived liability for pursuit of education has changed as

evidenced by the biographies of many serving chiefs of police that include graduation from the FBI National Academy and or graduation from graduate programs at leading colleges and universities.

Higher education has experienced minimal recognition for its role in preparing and recruiting people for municipal law enforcement careers (Gose, 2005; Altizer, 2006; Wimshurst & Ransley, 2007). This peculiarity is considered substantial by criminal justice researchers (Wimshurst & Ransley, 2007; Ridgeway, et al., 2008; Glenn, et al., 2008) since, as discussed earlier, higher education, CCs specifically, have been charged by state educational programs with preparing a viable career technical workforce through vocational education (California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office [CCCCO], 2008). The CCs strength in law enforcement instruction is their near monopoly on delivery of training programs as opposed to purely educational programs.

Community colleges can be viewed as complex organizations with various stakeholders as described by Birnbaum (1988) in his seminal work on the structure and operation of higher education. Birnbaum (1988) also viewed the community college as an organization that is vested in the community as a partner. This partnership concept is demonstrated by the various professional advisory groups that are formally linked to the career technical and vocational programs at CCs (Birnbaum, 1988). The CCs are distinctive in not only how they operate but also in whom they train (Dowd, 2003). Many are adult learners, like law enforcement practitioners, are not seeking a path to a higher degree but rather a path to immediate employment (Dowd, 2003). An additional benefit among the career technical and vocational education programs is the federal funding community colleges receive under the Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act (VTEA) (U.S. Congress, 2006). This Act could help fund training programs, saving agencies valued fiscal recourses (Birnbaum, 1988; Dowd, 2003).

In California the career technical education (CTE) functions primarily fall under the direction of the California community college system (CCCCO, 2008). The CCCCO has 110 CCs throughout the state and all of these colleges offer criminal or administration of justice degree programs or have law enforcement training programs (CCCCO, 2008). Nationally, the role of training law enforcement practitioners has fallen to the CCs' mission to train the work force (AACC, 2006). Nonetheless it is not clearly explained why the college connection is often disregarded in research as in the Ridgeway report (2008) on the San Diego Police Department which has its academy at a CC. Community college relevance to training in homeland security careers is further recognized by the articulation agreement between the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and Frederick Community College (FCC) in Maryland (FEMA, 2008; Frederick Community College, 2009). FEMA independent study courses are accepted by Frederick Community College and can be used for their Emergency Management Program, Associates of Applied Sciences degree (FCC, 2009).

Training, preparation, and readiness are the foundation that supports all law enforcement capability. Responsibility for law enforcement training has routinely fallen to either individual agencies (Glenn, et al., 2008) or professional programs taught in CCs (AACC, 2006). Training requirements for law enforcement personnel took a new direction after 9/11. Many CCs were on the front line of implementing the new post 9/11 training requirements as part of their existent career technical education and vocational training programs (Gose, 2005). However, the role of the CCs has received little reference in major studies discussing post 9/11 law enforcement training, even in a study that specifically reviewed a police academy located and operated by a CC (Raymond, et al., 2008; Glenn, et al., 2008; Ridgeway, et al., 2008). Ignoring the CCs as a viable variable in law enforcement training is a significant academic oversight as the relationships between CCs and law enforcement training is well established in many states.

The American Association of Community College study (2006) emphasized that the training paradigm for law enforcement practitioners, as first responders, include the recognized benefits of CCs as an actor in law enforcement training, not just as a venue to recruit police officers. The CCs can also provide the added benefit of access to a population that many agencies are mandated to recruit by consent decree (AACC, 2006; Glenn et al, 2008). A good example of including community colleges as partners in law enforcement training is POST's history of working with CCs soon after its inception in 1959 (POST, 2008). This working relationship has had the benefit of adding an academic influence and rigor to training within the law enforcement community as well as access to alternate funding sources like those supporting vocational training.

The link between the California community college system and law enforcement training in California can be illustrated by the nearly 50 year relationship it has had with the California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST). Currently, of the 39 POST certified law enforcement training centers in California, 49% of the training centers are operated by CCs (POST, 2008). Of the remaining 20 law enforcement training centers, they all have articulation agreements with CCs that are based on the awarding of college credit and revenue sharing agreements. This statistic provides a strong argument for Altizer, et al.'s (2006), and Gose's (2005) position that CCs can address training shortfalls in professional performance in addition to meeting the demands of homeland security training requirements.

Glenn's team of researchers (2008) noted that instructors in their study did not always follow established curriculum or demonstrate quality instruction. The CCs could mitigate this shortcoming as CC operated police academies must submit their courses for approval by the colleges' curriculum committees according to the California Code of Regulations, Title 5 (California Department of Education, 2009). These committees are comprised of faculty members from all disciplines within the colleges (California Department of Education, 2009). Besides this academic vetting of curriculum, instructors must also be certificated or approved

for instruction along community college guidelines (CCCCO, 2008). This additional review and approval might add to the quality of instruction over an academy that selects instructors or develops curriculum without the benefit of higher education's curriculum process or instructor certification (CCCCO, 2008).

Looking Forward

Though a decade has passed since 9/11 and Hurricane Katrina the law enforcement community is still on the threshold of improving homeland security through quality and diverse training programs. Homeland security has continued from its inception to be the driving force in dictating new and emerging roles for the law enforcement community. The changing face of the law enforcement community also changed how law enforcement practitioners were trained. As researchers explored the gap between performance and training the impact of the CCs on law enforcement training received very little consideration. The law enforcement community is in need of examining all sources of law enforcement training and education to improve the preparedness and response capabilities of the nation's homeland security posture. Leveraging knowledge from existing programs prevents law enforcement leaders from reinventing the proverbial wheel of training.

The footprint left by CCs on law enforcement training cannot be ignored. The unique role the CCs have enjoyed in the delivery of law enforcement training should not be lightly discarded. CCs can enhance the law enforcement community by participating in future development of professional guidelines and standards involving law enforcement training and education. CC faculty and instructors can also work with their law enforcement partners to develop professional guidelines and educational standards that match with actual and expected professional practices. Likewise the accreditation standards of higher education and law enforcement programs should be complimentary in purpose and design. If law enforcement agencies are to continue protecting the public within the ever growing framework of homeland security, law enforcement practitioners need to enhance their capabilities through quality and meaningful training and education. The training required for today's law enforcement community can be found on the campuses of CCs, especially those that have a long history of delivering training in vocational and career technical educational programs.

Last but not least, law enforcement agencies and compliance agencies like POST, should explore expanding their partnerships with CCs to leverage limited resources, enhance capabilities and initiate matching of funding sources to maximize training programs and training capacity. Reinvigorating the law enforcement training agenda, especially in a crippled economy, is as important as moving towards the development of sound homeland security measures. In actuality the experience of CCs has not so much been that they were unnoticed as that the CCs have always been there paving the way for a comprehensive training experience.

REFERENCES

9/11 Commission, National Commission on Terrorist Attacks. (2004). *The 9/11
   commission report: Final report to the national commission on terrorist
   attacks upon the United States(Authorized Edition).* New York: W.W. Horton.

Altizer, A., Bradshaw, N., Courtney, P., Hill, R., & Jilani, E. (2006). A Duty to
   Educate. *Journal of Homeland Security.* Retrieved August 13, 2006 from
   http://www.homelandsecurity.org.

American Association of Community Colleges (2006). *Community Colleges on
   the Front Line of Security.*

Asia Pacific Center for Security Studies [APCSS] (2008). APCSS *Homepage
   information.* Retrieved August 17, 2008 from http://www.apcss.org. .

Birnbaum, R. (1988). *How colleges work.* San Francisco: Jossey- Bass Publishers.

Bradford, D. & Pynes, J. (1999). Police academy training: Why hasn't it kept up
   with practice? *Police Quarterly*, 2(283), pp. 283-301. Retrieved August 13,
   2006 from http://pqx.sagepub.com.

Bush, G. W. (2001). *National security presidential directives - 9: Combating
   terrorism.* Retrieved April 8, 2009 from http://www.fas.org.

Bush, G. W. (2001a). *(HSPD) Homeland security presidential directive -
   1:Organization and operation of the homeland security council.* Retrieved
   April 8, 2009 from http://www.fas.org.

Bush, G. W. (2003). *(HSPD)Homeland security presidential directive - 8:
   National preparedness.* Retrieved April 8, 2009 from http://www.fas.org.

Bush, G. W. (2003a). *(HSPD)Homeland security presidential directive - 5:
   Management of Domestic Incidents.* Retrieved April 8, 2009 from
   http://www.fas.org.

Bush, G. W. (2005). *(HSPD) Homeland security presidential directive - 7:
   Critical infrastructure identification, prioritization, and protection.* Retrieved
   April 8, 2009 from http://www.fas.org.

Bush, G. W. (2007). *(HSPD) Homeland security presidential directive - 19:
   Combating terrorist use of explosives in the United States.* Retrieved April 8,
   2009 from http://www.fas.org.

Bush, G. H. (1992). *National security directive 66: Civil defense.* Retrieved April
   8, 2009 from http://www.fas.org.

California Community College Chancellor's Office [CCCCO] (2008). *CCCCO
   Homepage.* Retrieved August 17, 2008 from http://www.cccco.edu.

California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training [POST] (1998).
   The commission on peace officer standards and training: An overview.
   Sacramento: POST.

California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training [POST] (2001).
   *The Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training: POST Basic
   Management Course Guide*: POST.

California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training [POST]   (2006).
   *The commission on peace officer standards and training: Recruitment &
   retention: Best practices update.* Sacramento: POST.

California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training [POST] (2006a). *The commission on peace officer standards and training: Program administration manual*: POST.

California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training [POST] (2008). *POST Homepage: Training division information*. Retrieved August 17, 2008 from http://www.post.ca.gov.

California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training [POST] (2010). *POST commission meeting minutes of October 28, 2010.* Retrieved January 21, 2010 from http://www.post.ca.gov.

California Department of Education (2009). *California education code*. St. Paul: West's Publishing Company.

Center for Homeland Defense and Security [CHDS] (2008). Master's degree program homepage. Retrieved August 17, 2008 from http://www.chds.us.

Chappell, A. (2008). Police academy training: comparing across curricula. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management,* 31(1).

Clinton, B. (2000). *Presidential decision directive PDD 71: Strengthening criminal justice systems in support of peace operations*. Retrieved April 8, 2009 from http://www.fas.org.

Dowd, A., (2003). From Access to Outcome Equality: Revitalizing the Democratic Mission of the Community College, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* 586.

Federal Bureau of Investigation (2009) *A centennial history, 1908-2008*. Washington DC: GPO.

Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA] (2008). *Emergency management institute homepage*. Retrieved August 17, 2008 from http://training.fema.gov/IS/crslist.asp.

Frederick Community College [FCC]. (2009). *EmergencyManagementStudy.com homepage.* Retrieved August 1, 2009 from http://www.emergencymanagementstudy.com/content/default.asp.

Glenn, R., Panitch, B., Barnes-Proby, D., Williams, E., Christian, J., Lewis, M. Gerwehr, S., & Brannan, D. (2008). *Training the 21st century police officer: Redefining police professionalism for the Los Angeles police department*. Santa Monica: RAND Corporation.

Gordon, M. (2004). *Police recruiting in the 21st century*. Paper presented to the E.M.U. School of Police Staff and Command, August 19, 2004.

Gose, B. (2005). The front line in training for disasters. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, October 28, 2005. Retrieved August 17, 2008 from http://www.chronical.com.

Government Accounting Office (2000). *Police corps: Some problems resolved, but most positions remain unfilled*. Retrieved August 17, 2006 from http://www.gpo.org.

Government Accounting Office (2003). *Defense budget: Tracking of emergency response funds for the war on terrorism*. Retrieved January 15, 2009 from http://www.gpo.org.

Government Accounting Office (2004). *Homeland security: Selected recommendations from congressionally chartered commissions and GAO*. Retrieved January 15, 2009 from http://www.gpo.org.

Government Accounting Office (2005). *Homeland security: DHS' efforts to enhance first-responders' all-hazards capabilities continue to evolve*. Retrieved August 17, 2006 from http://www.gpo.org.

Government Accounting Office (2007). *Combating terrorism: Law enforcement agencies lack directives to assist foreign nations to identify, disrupt, and prosecute terrorists*. Retrieved December 18, 2008 from http://www.gpo.org.

Hickman, M. (2005). *Department of Justice: State and local law enforcement training academies 2002*. Washington: Department of Justice.

Hickman, M., & Reaves, B. (2006). *Department of Justice: Law enforcement management and administrative statistics: Local police departments*. Washington: Department of Justice.

National Center for Women & Policing (NCWP). (n.d.) *Recruiting & retaining women: A self-assessment guide for law enforcement.* Retrieved July 7, 2006 from www.womanandpolicing.org.

National Center for Women & Policing (NCWP). (1998) *Equality denied: The status of women in policing, 1997.* Retrieved July 7, 2006 from www.womanandpolicing.org.

National Center for Women & Policing (NCWP). (2002) *Equality denied: The status of women in policing, 2001.* Retrieved July 7, 2006 from www.womanandpolicing.org.

National Center for Women & Policing (NCWP). (2002a) *Men, women, and police excessive force: A tale of two genders. A content analysis of civil liability cases, sustained allegations & citizen complaints*. Retrieved July 7, 2006 from www.womanandpolicing.org.

National Center for Women & Policing (NCWP). (2003) *Under scrutiny: The effect of consent degrees on the representation of women in sworn law enforcement.* Retrieved July 7, 2006 from www.womanandpolicing.org.

National Center for Women & Policing (NCWP). (2003a) *Hiring & retaining more women: The advantages to law enforcement agencies.* Retrieved July 7, 2006 from www.womanandpolicing.org.

National Institute of Justice (NIJ) (2005). *Enhancing police integrity*. Retrieved December 18, 2008 from www.ojp.usdoj.gov/nij.

National University, (2008) *National University distinguished alumnus, 2007.* San Diego: National University.

Obama, B. (2009). *(PDD) Presidential policy directive - 1: Organization of the national security council system.* Retrieved April 8, 2009 from http://www.fas.org.

Raymond, B., Hickman, L., Miller, L. & Wong, J. (2005). *Police personnel challenges after September 11: Anticipating expanded duties and a changing labor pool.* Retrieved May 17, 2007 from http://rand.org.

Ridgeway, G., Lim, N., Gifford, B., Koper, C., Matthies, C., Hajiamiri, S., & Huynh, A. (2008). *Strategies for improving officer recruitment in the San Diego police department*. Santa Monica: RAND Corporation.

Rohrabacher, D. (2006). *The Oklahoma City bombing: Was there a foreign connection. Chairman's report, oversight and investigations subcommittee of the house international relations committee.* Retrieved on April 4, 2008 from http://rorabacher.house.gov.

Rostker, B. D., Hix, W. M., & Wilson, J. M. (2007). *Improving recruitment and retention in the New Orleans police department*. Retrieved April 5, 2007 from www.rand.org.

Roth, J., Greenburgh, D., Willie, S. (2004). *Staff report to the commission: Monograph on terrorist financing, national commission on terrorist attacks upon the United States*. Retrieved May 17, 2009 from http://proquest.umi.com.

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2009). *Homepage: law enforcement data*. Retrieved August 17, 2008 from http://www.data.bls.gov.

U.S. Congress, (1994). *H.R. 3355*: *Violent crime control and law enforcement of 1994*. Retrieved from http://www.govtrack.us on August 17, 2006.

U.S. Congress, (1999). (Gilmore Commission) *U.S. congressional advisory panel to assess domestic response capabilities for terrorism involving weapons of mass destruction. Part 1*. Washington DC: GPO

U.S. Congress, (2000). (Gilmore Commission) *U.S. congressional advisory panel to assess domestic response capabilities for terrorism involving weapons of mass destruction. Part 2*. Washington DC: GPO

U.S. Congress, (2001a). (Gilmore Commission) *U.S. congressional advisory panel to assess domestic response capabilities for terrorism involving weapons of mass destruction. Part3*. Washington DC: GPO

U.S. Congress, (2002). (Gilmore Commission) *U.S. congressional advisory panel to assess domestic response capabilities for terrorism involving weapons of mass destruction. Part 4*. Washington DC: GPO

U.S. Congress, (2003). (Gilmore Commission) *U.S. congressional advisory panel to assess domestic response capabilities for terrorism involving weapons of mass destruction. Part 5*. Washington DC: GPO

U.S. Congress, (2006). *Carl D. Perkins career and technical education improvement act of 2006*. Retrieved from http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/ on August 17, 2008.

U.S. Department of Homeland Security. (2007). *National strategy for homeland security, 2007*. Washington, DC: GPO.

U.S. Department of Homeland Security. (2009). *Department of homeland security: Progress in implementing 9/11 commission recommendations*. Washington DC: GPO

U.S. Department of Homeland Security. (2010). *Department of homeland security: Quadrennial Homeland Security Review Report*. Washington DC: GPO U. S. Department of State (DOS) (2001). *Patterns of global terrorism 2000*. Washington, DC: GPO.

U. S. Department of State (DOS) (2004). *Patterns of global terrorism 2003*. Washington, DC: GPO.

Walker, S. (19991). *Police in America: An introduction,* (3rd ed.), Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Wimshurdt, K. & Ransley, J. (2007). Police education and the university sector: Contrasting models from the Australian experience. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 18(1), March 2007.

TABLE 1:

PRESIDENTIAL DIRECTIVES RELATING TO HOMELAND SECURITY

President	Directive	Date	Subject	Purpose
Prior to September 11, 2001				
G.H.W. Bush	National Security Directive (NSD 66)	3/16/1992	Civil Defense	Civil defense capability was to prepare for all hazard emergencies
B. Clinton	Presidential Decision Directive (PDD 71)	2/24/2000	Strengthening Criminal Justice Systems in Support of Peace Operations	Form cadre of civil police trainers for nation building operations
Post September 11, 2001				
G.W. Bush	National Security Presidential Directive (NSPD 9)	10/25/2001	Combating Terrorism	Eliminate Al' Qaeda network (actual NSPD was ready for signature on 9/4/2001. It was signed with minor modification)
G.W. Bush	Homeland Security Presidential Directive (HSPD 1)	10/29/2001	Organization and Operation of the Homeland Security Council	Coordinate across Federal, State, and local agencies to reduce the potential for terrorist attacks
G.W. Bush	Homeland Security Presidential Directive (HSPD 2)	10/29/2001	Combating Terrorism Through Immigration Policies	Enforce immigration policy with multiple agencies in law enforcement & education
G.W. Bush	Homeland Security Presidential Directive (HSPD 3)	3/11/2002	Homeland Security Advisory System	Establish a threat warning system
G.W. Bush	Homeland Security Presidential Directive (HSPD 5)	2/28/2003	Management of Domestic Incidents	Established the National Incident management System (NIMS)
G.W. Bush	Homeland Security Presidential Directive (HSPD 6)	9/16/2003	Integration & Use of Screening Information	Expanded use of screening & reporting requirements

Table 1: Continued

President	Directive	Date	Subject	Purpose
G.W. Bush	Homeland Security Presidential Directive (HSPD 7)	12/17/2003	Critical Infrastructure Identification, Prioritization, & Protection	Protect critical infrastructure from terrorist attacks
G.W. Bush	Homeland Security Presidential Directive (HSPD 8)	12/17/2003	National Preparedness	Prepare, prevent & respond to all hazards
G.W. Bush	Homeland Security Presidential Directive (HSPD 9)	2/3/2004	Defense of United States Agriculture & Food	Protect agriculture & food supplies
G.W. Bush	Homeland Security Presidential Directive (HSPD 10)	4/28/2004	Biodefense for the 21st Century	Prepare, prevent & respond to biological weapons attacks
G.W. Bush	Homeland Security Presidential Directive (HSPD 11)	8/27/2004	Comprehensive Terrorist-Related Screening Procedures	Detect & interdict suspected terrorists in U.S.
G.W. Bush	Homeland Security Presidential Directive (HSPD 14) & National Security Presidential Directive (NSPD 43)	4/15/2005	Domestic Nuclear Detection	Protect against importation & attack from nuclear materials
G.W. Bush	Homeland Security Presidential Directive (HSPD 18)	2/7/2007	Medical Countermeasures against WMD	Use private & public resources to respond to WMD attacks
G.W. Bush	Homeland Security Presidential Directive (HSPD 19)	2/12/2007	Combating Terrorist use of explosives in the U.S.	Policy to plan, prevent & respond to terrorist attacks using explosives

Table 1: Continued

President	Directive	Date	Subject	Purpose
G.W. Bush	Homeland Security Presidential Directive (HSPD 20) & National Security Presidential Directive (NSPD 51)	5/9/2007	National Continuity Policy	Maintain continuity of federal, state and local governments
B. Obama	Presidential Policy Directive (PDD 1)	2/13/2009	Organization of the National Security Council System	Coordinate across Federal, State, and local agencies to respond to terrorist attacks