

## STANDARDIZATION OF THE INTELLIGENCE ANALYST WORKFORCE AND EDUCATION: ARE WE THERE YET?

OBRADOVIC, L., University of Nebraska  
lobradovic@unomaha.edu

BLACK, M., University of Nebraska  
michelleblack@unomomaha.edu

---

### ABSTRACT

This article examines intelligence analyst education and training standardization efforts at higher education institutions and in the U.S. Intelligence Community (IC). By identifying core competencies outlined in IC guidance documents, the study evaluated the alignment and compatibility between the competencies taught in academic programs and the needs of intelligence agencies. Standardization across academic programs has occurred; however, these programs prioritize specialized skills over foundational core competencies. Significant gaps remain in how the IC agencies define, prioritize, and categorize core competencies, highlighting the ongoing challenges in achieving a unified intelligence education and training framework.

*Keywords: intelligence analyst's core competencies, Intelligence Community workforce development*

---

Since the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks and the implementation of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, the U.S. Intelligence Community (IC) has sought to improve its analytic capabilities. It supported IC analysts' education, training, and professional development via guidance papers, reports, and partnerships with academic institutions to create more effective intelligence-related programs (Burch, 2008). This led to a concerted effort to produce dozens of IC documents regarding intelligence analysts' core competencies and to professionalize and standardize intelligence education and training programs across academic institutions, known as the *academization of intelligence*. Consequently, there was a dramatic growth in university programs, curricula, and research aimed at improving analytical approaches and preparing students to join the intelligence workforce (Michael & Kornbluth, 2019).

The effectiveness of these standardization efforts remains uncertain (Reinhold et al., 2020). This article seeks to bridge the gap between IC-driven core competencies and academic program offerings by identifying shared priorities and areas of divergence. By building on two seminal research studies, Spracher (2009) and Ramsay and MacPherson (2022), we evaluate how well academic intelligence programs align with the competencies outlined in IC guidance documents. While the two studies provided valuable insights, they applied different measurement standards. Spracher used the Office of the Director of National Security (ODNI)'s 2008 core competency standards (Landon-Murray, 2013), whereas Ramsay and

MacPherson relied on the International Association for Intelligence Education (IAFIE) competency standards, resulting in inconsistent findings. These discrepancies prompted us to examine how IC intelligence guidance papers define and prioritize core competencies, and how academic programs align with these standards.

Our research broadens the scope beyond traditional IC agencies by including the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), a largely forgotten intelligence component, and incorporating Black and Obradovic's (2022) study, which identified six core intelligence competencies and produced a conceptual framework for homeland security intelligence training and education. DHS is frequently overlooked as an intelligence entity due to its domestic security and disaster response focus, integration challenges, perceived lack of traditional intelligence expertise, and overly complex jurisdictions that overlap with other agencies. There is an urgent need to define and agree on basic core competencies in the IC to ensure they can be provided at higher education institutions and strengthened in specialized in-house programs.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. First, we provide an overview of the scholarly debates regarding the conceptualization of intelligence education and training, including who is responsible for developing and teaching the curriculum. Second, we examine the current trends in collaborative efforts to provide intelligence education and training, highlighting the successes and challenges of existing university-government partnerships. Third, we delineate our qualitative multi-method research approach, analyzing 42 government guidance documents and coursework taught at 48 existing and legacy IC Centers of Academic Excellence and DHS Centers of Excellence, using Black and Obradovic's (2022) core competency standards: analytical writing, communication, critical thinking and reasoning methods, collaboration, project management, and basic technology. Finally, we present our findings on the most frequently taught core competencies and discuss how they correspond to and are in line with those outlined in IC guidance documents. The article aims to advance the discussion on standardizing intelligence education and training across all IC elements. It proposes measures to enhance collaborative intelligence analysis education and training through standardized core competencies.

## **DEFINING INTELLIGENCE ANALYSIS EDUCATION AND TRAINING**

The National Security Act of 1947 established a post-World War II national security framework that drew on the expertise of military and diplomatic intelligence analysts. These analysts had experience in compiling analytic briefs and often possessed strong educational backgrounds in the liberal arts and social sciences (Lowenthal, 2014). While some called for the inclusion of an intelligence-related course in university degree programs in the social sciences (Platt, 1957), such as international relations (Dorondo, 2006), a dedicated standalone intelligence program development was largely nonexistent throughout most of the Cold War (Coulthart & Crosston, 2015). In 2004, Mercyhurst University established the first intelligence degree program to produce analytic generalists rather than traditional specialists with expertise in area studies, languages, and social sciences. However, post-Cold War personnel and budgetary reductions led to a decline in interest and investment in intelligence education and training in the IC and academia.

Traditionally, universities provided broad foundational knowledge and theoretical education, while agencies conducted job-specific intelligence training in-house, providing practical skills in analytical writing, covert operations, and counterintelligence (Johnson, 2019). Former CIA analyst Stephen Marrin (2009) described universities as crucial for offering continuing education, providing expertise from academic specialists, advising students on IC management from a political science or historical perspective, and recruiting graduates with substantive knowledge. Marrin argued that after the 9/11 attacks, the lines between education and training began to blur. Universities were increasingly expected to deliver practical generalist analytical training alongside theoretical intelligence studies. This shift led to a dramatic rise in demand for and development of intelligence-focused courses, degrees, and certification programs across the United States (Campbell, 2011). Debate continues regarding the value of this approach (Landon-Murray, 2013), and scholars, including Arthur Hulnick, Mark Lowenthal, and Carmen Medina, have advocated for keeping intelligence education part of broader social sciences or liberal arts frameworks (Spracher, 2009). Others favor smaller, hands-on intelligence programs taught by former practitioners that emphasize procedural knowledge, analytical competencies, and specific methods such as structured analytical techniques (Landon-Murray, 2013).

Critics argue that this vocational approach sacrifices more theoretically oriented, social science-based preparation and subject matter education (Collier, 2005; Landon-Murray, 2011; Corvaja et al., 2016). Some are also concerned with the sustainability of such practice-focused intelligence programs, noting that most faculty members are non-tenure-track or adjunct/part-time instructors with limited influence over program direction or the allocation of resources to teaching intelligence in higher education institutions (Smith, 2013). Integrating intelligence analysis training into higher education is becoming increasingly common, yet debate remains over the optimal balance of students' foundational, theoretical, and practical training. In the following section, we discuss IC standardization efforts through the development of university-government partnerships designed to address 21<sup>st</sup> century security threats and create more efficient and effective talent pipelines using federal funds.

### **SPECIALIZED IN-HOUSE PROGRAMS**

The Dulles and Jackson (1949) report, *The Central Intelligence Agency and National Organization for Intelligence: A Report to the National Security Council*, identified significant issues in intelligence activity coordination and evaluation, forcing a restructuring of the IC and setting a tone for education and training programs for years. In the following decades, agencies organized in-house and agency-specific programs, such as the CIA's Sherman Kent School for Intelligence Analysis. Although the details of most in-house training programs remain classified, we assume that they vary across agencies depending on their specific missions. Since the 9/11 attacks, these programs have adapted to address the evolving threats and have updated core intelligence education and training requirements. The National Intelligence University program is the only fully accredited federal institution offering intelligence degrees, with a curriculum focused on analytical skills and competencies such as critical thinking, communications, engagement, and leadership (National Intelligence University, 2024).

The DHS has developed in-house training programs for intelligence analysts. Since 2007, the DHS Intelligence Training Academy (2018) has been accredited by the Federal Law

Enforcement Training Accreditation Board. In addition to its eight-week Basic Intelligence Threat Analysis course, the Academy offers courses in areas including critical thinking and analytic methods, introduction to risk analysis, intermediate risk analysis, and intelligence writing principles. Some regional fusion centers have organized Intermediate Fusion Center Analyst Training programs, while others offer mentoring programs due to limited staff and resources.

The Association of Law Enforcement Intelligence Units and the International Association of Law Enforcement Intelligence Analysts (IALEIA) offer a five-day Foundations in Intelligence Analysis Training (FIAT) for law enforcement intelligence analysts. The introductory course was developed with the National White Collar Crime Center and Regional Information Sharing Systems project directors. The IALEIA recommends a comprehensive list of requirements for basic training, including analytical writing, critical thinking, ethics, and logic. In addition, the *National Criminal Intelligence Sharing Plan* and IALEIA recommend that analysts hold a four-year degree or have equivalent experience to reduce training costs and ensure core competencies. However, fusion centers and law enforcement still hire analysts with two-year degrees, which can complicate on-the-job training (New York State Intelligence Center, 2009). Also, some analysts only receive the five-day FIAT training and are expected to work alongside colleagues with more advanced graduate degrees, making collaboration, communication, and even project management difficult. Finally, while most research on intelligence training focuses on federal-level programs, there has been limited examination of state, local, and tribal law enforcement intelligence training programs, which remain mostly basic, fragmented, and lack standardization (Dorn, 2019).

### **STANDARDIZING INTELLIGENCE EDUCATION AND TRAINING: UNIVERSITY–GOVERNMENT PARTNERSHIPS**

In the 1960s, partnerships between intelligence and academia began to take shape, and by the 1970s, intelligence courses taught by practitioners became more common (Rudner, 2009). The CIA's 1985 Officer-in-Residence program became a model for academic collaboration and recruitment of students directly from their classrooms (Hedley, 2005). This initiative expanded in 2016 with the CIA Signature School Program, where intelligence professionals work with students on skills such as critical thinking and briefing and collaborate with faculty on course development (Ortiz, 2016). The *Homeland Security Act of 2002* prompted DHS to launch Centers of Excellence. Today, ten centers nationwide partner with DHS to solve security challenges such as counterterrorism, immigration, and maritime security while preparing students for homeland security careers by engaging them in meaningful hands-on learning experiences (DHS, 2022). Although valuable, these Centers of Excellence programs have limited focus on standardizing student preparation and establishing common core competencies in coursework (Black & Obradovic, 2022). Similarly, the IC's Centers for Academic Excellence (IC CAE) Program has awarded five rounds of grants to universities for developing intelligence curricula (Office of the Director of National Security, 2020). Universities were given seed funding to build sustainable intelligence education programs focused on providing critical core competencies such as intelligence analysis, writing and briefing, cultural and language expertise, and STEM skills. As a result, the IC now benefits

from a readily accessible, diverse, capable, and competitive talent pool to support its mission. By 2019, IC CAE institutions developed 49 intelligence degrees, certificates, and minors, including 33 at the undergraduate level (Landon-Murray & Coulthart, 2020). The IC CAE curriculum is primarily concerned with broader national security education for federal careers rather than intelligence training focused on law enforcement (Green, 2008).

Meanwhile, interdisciplinary academic homeland security programs have expanded, often in collaboration with local, state, and tribal governments. These programs cover topics beyond intelligence education, including terrorism, emergency management, immigration, and cybersecurity, but often lack focus and standardization (Bellavita, 2008). While some undergraduate homeland security programs have been validated in terms of process and efficacy through focus groups or advisory councils (Comiskey, 2015), others offer little support, with some arguing that the educational goals of such programs are too vague (Pelfrey & Kelly, 2013). Consequently, students with homeland security degrees seeking intelligence analysis careers in DHS might struggle due to a lack of a standardized framework of core competencies, complicating collaboration with their federal counterparts.

Additionally, professional organizations like the IAFIE developed guidelines for intelligence curricula to establish minimum standards. While some advocate for an external authoritative accrediting body to maintain standard consistency (Marrin & Clemente, 2006), only some academic programs have been certified by IAFIE's educational standards (International Association for Intelligence Education, 2022). Despite the existence of IC guidance, the alignment between academic programs and IC standards remains to be seen. The following sections detail the methodology used to analyze academic programs and examine their alignment with the core competencies outlined in IC guidance documents.

### **METHODOLOGY: QUALITATIVE MULTI-METHOD APPROACH**

We used a qualitative multi-method research approach, combining document and content analysis, to collect, organize, and analyze our data. Our first method, document analysis, allowed us to extract intelligence competencies from various intelligence agency guidance documents. We collected and reviewed 42 ODNI and agency-specific documents across the IC to establish core competencies essential for intelligence analysts to perform their jobs (Appendix A). We examined IC directives, agency strategic plans, evaluation and review reports, and recommendation manuals. Analyzing such a wide range of sources allowed us to identify specific standardization policies and understand the historical and institutional contexts in which they were established. While the term *standard* can be ambiguous, especially since agencies often use different terms for the same or similar competencies, this article focuses on a qualitative analysis to capture the descriptions of these competencies. Specifically, we looked for core intelligence analyst competencies that represent the knowledge, skills, abilities, and attributes deemed essential by IC agencies for hiring and promoting their analytical personnel (Moore et al., 2005; Spracher, 2009).

The IC guidance documents allowed us to classify core competency definitions across IC agencies (Appendix B). This comprehensive classification was compared with the six core

competencies identified in Black and Obradovic's (2022) study that sought to understand what IC analysts and supervisors consider to be the minimum knowledge, skill, and abilities required of entry-level analysts regardless of their placement in the IC. Based on ethnographic and domain analyses, we identified six core competencies: analytical writing, critical thinking, communication, collaboration, project management, and basic technology.

Moreover, we identified a seventh category of *specialized skills* as certain IC elements often seek candidates with more specialized subject matter knowledge and skills to fill their intelligence analyst positions. The seven competencies provided a benchmark for comparison between what the IC expects from its analysts (as outlined in IC guidance documents) and what is being taught in academic programs. Using our document review and triangulation process, we used these seven competencies to develop a comprehensive classification to guide the content analysis of academic and training programs during the second phase of our research. This research phase assessed whether the academic and training programs provided the competencies outlined above. We collected program and course descriptions from 48 current and legacy IC CAE programs, including DHS current and emeritus Centers of Excellence (Appendix C).

Our data were limited to 48 institutions as some institutional information was not available. To understand whether academic and agency-specific education and training programs adequately prepare future intelligence analysts for their careers, we conducted a content analysis of their course and degree offerings against our predefined set of categories of core competencies from the IC-wide guidance document analysis. We added specialized skills as a seventh core competency as most CAEs receive funding based on their specialized expertise and coursework, such as STEM, cybersecurity, technology, and innovation. We then coded and analyzed the texts using these seven core competencies. Below, we present the findings and observations from our analysis.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

### **Guidance Document Analysis Findings: Integrating DHS Competencies**

Our analysis shows that, despite a longstanding goal within the IC to standardize core competencies across agencies over the last two decades, implementation has been slow and fraught with problems. Similar goals, objectives, and recommendations repeatedly appear in various documents without reference to previously achieved benchmarks or milestones. Although initiatives such as the Intelligence Fundamentals Professional Certification have been introduced, limited interagency collaboration persists, with the agencies struggling to align on defining intelligence analyst competencies and job descriptions. DHS' (2020) strategic goal to establish foundational intelligence training to create an agile workforce echoes earlier efforts such as the Department of Justice, Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative's (2010) competencies: critical thinking, communication, collaboration, fusing intelligence and law enforcement tradecraft, and intelligence principles. The competencies serve as baseline skills.

Recent DHS documents recognize and underscore the ongoing difficulty in synchronizing

analyst core competencies across IC agencies. The DHS' (2019) *Strategic Plan* highlighted significant inconsistencies in defining and implementing core competencies across agencies. Throughout our extensive review of these documents, we could not identify a single set of intelligence analysts' core competencies that was valid across the Community. The DHS Office of Intelligence and Analysis's (2020) *FY 2020–2024 Strategic Plan* confirms the problem, noting persistent misalignment among IC elements despite frameworks such as the *National Criminal Intelligence Sharing Plan* and *Law Enforcement Analytic Standards*.

The Department of Justice's Global Advisory Committee's (2015) *Analyst Professional Development Road Map* introduced a structured career pathway for analysts in various government organizations, focusing on six common competencies for basic-level intelligence analysts: "legal issues surrounding the analytic process, thinking critically in the analytic cycle, sharing information and collaborating, fusing analytic tradecraft in a law enforcement environment, communicating analytic observations and judgments and generating analytic products to decision-makers [and] turning concepts and principles into action." (p. 4) Despite revisions in 2019, the roadmap maintains the same six competencies, with recommendations for training at basic, intermediate, and advanced proficiency levels.

Nearly two decades after the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, significant progress remains elusive. It is unclear why many organizations, including DHS and their components, struggle to set these standards despite several reports providing recommendations and implementation manuals. Moreover, we found that agency-specific guidelines often do not reflect ODNI guidance or provide clarification and guidance regarding different proficiency levels (Appendix B).

### **Content Analysis Findings: IC CAE and DHS COEs Program Evaluation**

We found evidence that some standardization across academic programs has occurred when comparing IC CAE and DHS COEs academic programs against the seven competencies identified in our document analysis. Academic programs provide a combination of analytic generalist competencies, such as analytical writing, critical thinking, communication, and basic technology, along with more hands-on specialized skills, such as intelligence analysis, collection and gathering, and cyber and AI-related skills (Table 1). Instead of identifying specific courses offering competencies, we summarized the frequency or number of times each competency was taught in these academic programs.

We did not anticipate that most schools would emphasize teaching more specialized skills rather than the six core competencies highlighted by guidance documents and Black and Obradovic (2020). When we separated the IC CAE and DHS COE datasets, we found that most DHS CEAs tended to offer more specialized programs in areas such as homeland security and cyber and emergency planning. When we compared our findings with Spracher's (2009) findings, they were unexpectedly complementary. Specifically, when calculating the number of technical expertise courses offered by representative academic institutions found in Spracher's Crosswalk with Core Competencies data (Appendix C) showed that 87% of the total classes offered were classified as technical expertise coursework, closely matching our specialized skills percentage (See Table 1). This finding demonstrates that for over 13 years,

academic institutions have concentrated on providing specialized skills rather than core competencies despite IC guidance regarding academic programs. In addition, this misalignment suggests a fundamental disconnect between academic offerings and the IC's competency requirements, raising several questions: *Why are so many agencies defining standardization differently? Why are academic institutions focused on specialized skills rather than broader core competencies?* And, as previously argued by the authors, *Should the responsibility for core competencies be left solely to intelligence agencies?*

Table 1. Frequency of Core Competencies: Academic Programs Coursework

Core Competencies	% of Schools Providing Coursework
Analytical Writing	47%
Critical Thinking	59%
Communications	51%
Project Management	13%
Collaboration	17%
Technology	49%
Specialized Skills	83%

However, we found that IC CAE programs tended to offer more graduate and undergraduate certificate programs, often granted by traditional political science or international relations departments. These programs focus more on providing broader national security skills, including courses on institutional, policy, and legal frameworks, structured analytic techniques, data analysis, and visualization. One significant finding is that most university CAE programs do not integrate specific courses that provide core project management and collaboration competencies. These courses are taught within colleges of business administration and are often unrelated to CAE programs. In addition, unlike academic programs with much greater standardization of intelligence programs and courses, there are significant inconsistencies in how different IC elements prioritize and think of the standardization of intelligence education and training and the IC's engagement with academia. We found no agreement among IC agencies on defining core competencies, nor did they consistently provide clarification or guidance regarding different proficiency levels.

More specifically, our findings suggest a lack of conversation and coordination between academic and practitioner communities to delineate responsibilities and agree on a common conceptual framework of core competencies. Yet, the only way to establish standard core competencies that represent the minimum knowledge, skills, and abilities required of entry-level analysts, regardless of their job placement, is through the synchronization of intelligence analyst education and training across academic institutions, the IC, and different government levels. Therefore, it is no wonder that scholars such as Lowenthal (2014) argued that despite efforts and years of investments, intelligence education and training remain uneven, episodic, and stovepiped.

There is an urgent need to understand which basic core competencies are valued within the entire IC to ensure that they can be provided at higher education institutions and further strengthened within in-house specialized programs. IC agencies could focus on more



specialized training if every prospective intelligence analyst had these essential competencies before being hired. Therefore, we have made the following recommendations for the IC.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

### 1. **Develop an Intelligence Fundamentals Professional Certificate**

Require and build an Intelligence Fundamentals Professional Certification for all analysts across the IC, including DHS. A comprehensive certification will establish a common understanding of the standards the entire IC requires. It is important to involve academic programs and professional organizations, such as IAFIE, in developing this certification in order to align educational programs with these standards. If in-house programs prefer to retain their existing courses, then an agreement on minimum intelligence standards could be considered.

### 2. **Separate Core and Specialized Training**

Ensure the distinction between standardized core intelligence analyst competency educational programs and specialized in-house training programs that provide skills unique to individual components or government levels. For example, IC CAE and DHS COEs should reach out to the IC for investment in specializations to ensure that the intelligence agencies resolve their gaps. Guidance documents should specify that academia is responsible for providing specialized skills.

### 3. **Enhance Engagement with Academic Programs**

Actively engage with the IC CAE and DHS COE programs to integrate competencies into coursework. This approach will enable the IC to create, attract, and support a professionally competitive and knowledgeable talent pool across multidisciplinary areas. To achieve this, it is necessary to increase networking and engagement opportunities with the IC CAE and DHS CAE faculty, directing and supervising research and teaching activities to provide feedback, guidance, advice, and suggestions on modifying coursework.

### 4. **Establish a Hiring Pipeline**

Develop an intelligence analyst hiring pipeline and encourage IC CAE and DHS CAE programs to refer to top candidates who have already acquired the necessary core competencies and demonstrated academic, professional, and research strengths.

### 5. **Update the Intelligence Community's *Road Map***

Revise the Department of Justice, Global Advisory Committee's *Road Map*, initially created in 2015 and updated in 2019, to incorporate advancements in technology, such as AI, and address evolving security threats. Updating the *Road Map* would ensure it remains relevant and actionable and allow for the creation of a standard scoring checklist to uniformly evaluate candidate proficiency, design recruitment pipelines and interview guides, map career paths, and update educational programs.

## CONCLUSIONS

Since the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, the IC has sought to enhance its analytic capabilities by promoting intelligence education in academic settings.

This effort aimed to standardize and professionalize intelligence training across universities, leading to the creation of specialized degree programs across the country. However, the impact of these academic standardization efforts on preparing intelligence professionals remains uncertain. Several research studies reveal inconsistent findings due to differing evaluation standards, prompting a call for more defined core competencies for intelligence analysts. In this paper, we sought to build on these studies by incorporating guidance documents across IC, including from the DHS, which often are overlooked in traditional intelligence education due to its domestic security focus and complex jurisdictional roles.

We used document and content analysis to assess core intelligence competencies across various IC guidance documents and academic intelligence studies programs. While document analysis allowed us to examine and interpret 42 guidance documents regarding core competencies, content analysis of academic and training programs enabled us to evaluate how effectively these competencies are currently incorporated into academic programming across 48 IC Centers of Academic Excellence and DHS Centers of Excellence programs. More specifically, by cross-referencing the seven core competencies—analytical writing, critical thinking, communication, collaboration, project management, basic technology, and specialized skills—we were able to assess the emphasis on generalist versus specialized competencies within these academic programs.

Our findings revealed significant disparities between the standardized competencies outlined in IC guidance documents and those prioritized in academic programs. Although DHS and IC agencies have sought to articulate competencies crucial for intelligence work, academic programs emphasize specialized skills over foundational competencies. This gap highlights the need for greater alignment between the IC's educational expectations and the actual coursework provided in academic programs. Moreover, we found that IC agencies frequently lack uniformity in defining and prioritizing core competencies, underscoring a broader issue of inconsistent communication and collaboration within the Community. By following the suggested recommendations, IC agencies could build a talent pipeline and develop a proactive and procedural approach to identify, qualify, and nurture potential candidates toward eventual hiring. Agencies can also ensure that candidates have mastered the core competencies before their hiring date and that there are easily identifiable educational opportunities for existing employees who need additional professional development and certification programs to acquire them. IC's goals for a more agile and proficient workforce may not be met without addressing the critical need for greater synchronization of standards across academic and practitioner domains to ensure that future intelligence analysts are equipped with a cohesive and comprehensive set of competencies.

**Acknowledgments.** The authors are deeply grateful to the undergraduate and graduate students who assisted us in this research project, part of a larger project funded by DHS for the National Counterterrorism, Technology, and Education Center of Excellence.

**Funding Details.** The material in this article is based on work supported by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security under Grant Award Number 20STTPC00001-02-01. The views and conclusions included here are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as necessarily representing the DHS' official policies, either expressed or implied.

## REFERENCES

- Bellavita, C. (2008). Changing homeland security: What is homeland security? *Homeland Security Affairs*, 4(2). <https://www.hsaj.org/articles/118>
- Black, M., & Obradovic, L. (2022). Strengthening DHS intelligence analysis education: Core competencies, gaps, and challenges. *Journal of Policing, Intelligence and Counter Terrorism*, 1(18). <https://doi.org/10.1080/18335330.2022.2069475>
- Burch, J. (2008). The domestic intelligence gap: Progress since 9/11? *Proceedings of the 2008 Centre for Homeland Defense and Security Annual Conference*. <https://www.hsaj.org/articles/129>
- Campbell, S. H. (2011). A survey of the U.S. market for intelligence education. *International Journal of Intelligence and CounterIntelligence*, 24(2), 307–337.
- Collier, M. W. (2005). A pragmatic approach to developing intelligence analysts. *Defense Intelligence Journal*, 14(2), 17–35.
- Comiskey, J. (2015). How do college homeland security curricula prepare students for the field? *Journal of Homeland Security Education*, 4(20), 20–40. <https://jsire.org/how-do-college-homeland-security-curricula-prepare-students-for-the-field/>
- Corvaja, A. S., Brigita, J., & Uwe, M. B. (2016). The rise of intelligence studies: A model for Germany? *Connections: The Quarterly Journal*, 15(1), 79–106.
- Coulthart, S., & Crosston, M. (2015). Terra incognita: Mapping American intelligence education curriculum. *Journal of Strategic Security*, 8(3), 46–68. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282437336\\_Terra\\_Incognita\\_Mapping\\_American\\_Intelligence\\_Education\\_Curriculum](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282437336_Terra_Incognita_Mapping_American_Intelligence_Education_Curriculum)
- Department of Homeland Security, Intelligence Training Academy. (2018, April). *Department of Homeland Security Intelligence Training Academy newsletter*. <https://www.colochiefs.org/assets/DHS%20ITA%20Newsletter%20April%202018.pdf>
- Department of Homeland Security, Office of Intelligence and Analysis. (2020). *FY 2020–2024 strategic plan*. <https://www.dhs.gov/publication/office-intelligence-and-analysis-fy-2020-2024-strategic-plan>
- Department of Homeland Security. (2019). *The DHS strategic plan: Fiscal years 2020–2024*. [https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/19\\_0702\\_plcy\\_dhs-strategic-plan-fy20-24.pdf](https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/19_0702_plcy_dhs-strategic-plan-fy20-24.pdf)
- Department of Justice, Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative. (2010). *Common competencies for state, local, and tribal intelligence analysts*. [https://bja.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh186/files/media/document/common\\_competencies\\_state\\_local\\_and\\_tribal\\_intelligence\\_analysts-2.pdf](https://bja.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh186/files/media/document/common_competencies_state_local_and_tribal_intelligence_analysts-2.pdf)

- Department of Justice, Global Advisory Committee. (2015). *Analyst professional development road map*. [https://bja.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh186/files/media/document/analyst\\_professional\\_development\\_road\\_map1.pdf](https://bja.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh186/files/media/document/analyst_professional_development_road_map1.pdf)
- Department of Justice, Global Advisory Committee. (2019). *Analyst professional development road map*. [https://bja.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh186/files/media/document/analyst\\_professional\\_development\\_road\\_map\\_2-00.pdf](https://bja.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh186/files/media/document/analyst_professional_development_road_map_2-00.pdf)
- Dorn, D. (2019). Teaching intelligence analysis writing skills: A program evaluation. *Journal of Intelligence and Analysis*, 24(2), 73–94.
- Dorondo, P. J. (1960). For college courses in intelligence. *Studies in Intelligence*, 4(3), 15–19.
- Dulles, A., & Jackson, M. (1949, January 1). *The Central Intelligence Agency and National Organization for Intelligence: A report to the National Security Council*. <https://www.cia.gov/readingroom/docs/CIA-RDP86B00269R000500040001-1.pdf>
- Green, P. (2008). *An analysis of the requirements and potential opportunities for the future education of law enforcement intelligence analysts* [Master's thesis, Naval Postgraduate School]. NPS archive: Calhoun. <http://hdl.handle.net/10945/4235>
- Hedley, J. H. (2005). Twenty years of officers in residence. *Studies in Intelligence*, 49(4), 31–39.
- International Association for Intelligence Education. (2022). *Educational standards*. [https://www.iafie.org/academic\\_programs\\_standards.php](https://www.iafie.org/academic_programs_standards.php)
- Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, Pub. L. No. 108-458, 118 Stat. 3638 (2004).
- Johnson, L. K. (2019). Spies and scholars in the United States: Winds of ambivalence in the groves of academe. *Intelligence and National Security*, 34(1), 1–21.
- Landon-Murray, M. (2011). Social science and intelligence analysis: The role of intelligence education. *Journal of Applied Security Research*, 6(4), 491–528.
- Landon-Murray, M. (2013). Moving U.S. academic intelligence education forward: A literature inventory and agenda. *International Journal of Intelligence and CounterIntelligence*, 26(4), 744–776.
- Landon-Murray, M., & Coulthart, S. (2020). Intelligence studies programs as U.S. public policy: A survey of IC CAE grant recipients. *Intelligence and National Security*, 35(2), 269–282.
- Lowenthal, M. M. (2014). The education and training of intelligence analysts. In R. Z. George & J. B. Bruce (Eds.), *Analyzing intelligence: National security practitioners' perspectives*. Georgetown University Press.

- Marrin, S. (2009). Training and educating U.S. intelligence analysts. *International Journal of Intelligence and CounterIntelligence*, 22(1), 131–146.
- Marrin, S., & Clemente, J. D. (2006). Modeling an intelligence analysis profession on medicine. *International Journal of Intelligence and CounterIntelligence*, 19(4), 642–665.
- Michael, K., & Kornbluth, A. (2019). The academization of intelligence: A comparative overview of intelligence studies in the West. *Cyber, Intelligence, and Security*, 3(1), 117–140.
- Moore, D. T., Krizan, L., & Moore, E. J. (2005). Evaluating intelligence: A competency-based model. *International Journal of Intelligence and Counterintelligence*, 18(2), 204–220.
- National Intelligence University. (2024). *About NIU*. <https://ni-u.edu/wp/about-niu/>
- New York State Intelligence Center. (2009). *Fusion Center training strategy development: guidelines and recommendations for fusion center intelligence analysts and personnel*. [https://www.ialeia.org/docs/Fusion\\_Center\\_Training\\_Strategy\\_and\\_Development.pdf](https://www.ialeia.org/docs/Fusion_Center_Training_Strategy_and_Development.pdf)
- Office of the Director of National Security. (2020). *Intelligence Community Centers for Academic Excellence: Strategy 2020–2023*. [https://www.odni.gov/files/CHCO/documents/CAE/IC\\_CAE\\_Strategy.pdf](https://www.odni.gov/files/CHCO/documents/CAE/IC_CAE_Strategy.pdf)
- Ortiz, C. (2016). CIA launches signature school program at UNM. *Albuquerque Business First*. <https://www.bizjournals.com/albuquerque/news/2016/11/11/cia-launches-signature-school-program-at-unm.html>
- Pelfrey, W. V., & Kelley, W. D. (2013). Homeland security education: A way forward. *Homeland Security Affairs*, 9(3). <http://hdl.handle.net/10945/27490>
- Platt, W. (1957). *Strategic intelligence production: Basic principles*. F. A. Praeger.
- Ramsay, J., & MacPherson, A. (2022). The integration of statistical learning in intelligence education: Is the academy equipping tomorrow’s intelligence professionals to analyze data-centric threats? *Journal of Policing, Intelligence and Counter Terrorism*, 19(1), 3–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/18335330.2022.2048965>
- Reinhold, D., Russo, C. M., & Eisenfeld, B. (2020). Analytical standards in the intelligence community: Are standards professionalized enough? *Journal of Strategic Security*, 14(1), 106–121.
- Rudner, M. (2009). Intelligence studies in higher education: Capacity-building to meet societal demand. *International Journal of Intelligence and CounterIntelligence*, 22(1), 110–130.
- Smith, J. (2013). Amateur hour? Experience and faculty qualifications in U.S. intelligence courses. *Journal of Strategic Security*, 6(3), 25–39.

Spracher, W. C. (2009). *National security intelligence professional education: A map of US civilian university programs and competencies* [Doctoral dissertation, George Washington University].

## Appendix A

## Guidance Documents

Central Intelligence Agency [CIA]	Strategic Investment Plan for Intelligence Community Analysis	2000
Central Intelligence Agency [CIA]	Tradecraft Primer: Structured Analytic Techniques for Improving Intelligence Analysis	2009
Central Intelligence Agency [CIA]	Director's Advisory Group Implementation Year Two Report to the Workforce	2015
Customs and Border Patrol [CBP]	Vision and Strategy 2020: U.S. Customs and Border Protection Strategic Plan	2020
Defense Counterintelligence and Security Agency	National Industrial Security Program (NISP)	2021
Defense Intelligence Agency [DIA]	DIA Analyst Training Requirements and Competencies	2008
Defense Intelligence Agency [DIA]	Counterterrorism Analysis Training	1985
Department of the Army	Military Intelligence: Counterintelligence Investigative Procedures	2020
Department of the Army	Security Education, Training, and Awareness. Training Academics	2020
Department of Defense	Antiterrorism Level I Awareness Training: DoD Civilian and Contractor Training	2000
Department of Defense	National Industrial Security Program Operating Manual	2006
Department of Defense	DoD General Intelligence Training and Certification	2015
Department of Defense Office of Inspector General	Evaluation of DoD Intelligence Training and Education Programs for the Fundamental Competencies of the DoD Intelligence Workforce	2014
Department of Homeland Security [DHS].	Performance Management: Number 3181	2006
Department of Homeland Security [DHS].	National Prevention Framework	2016
Department of Homeland Security Committee [DHS Security Committee].	Reviewing the Department of Homeland Security's Intelligence Enterprise.	2016
Department of Homeland Security [DHS]	DHS Lexicon Terms and Definitions	2017
Department of Homeland Security [DHS]	The DHS Strategic Plan 2020–2024	2019
Department of Homeland Security [DHS]	Office of Intelligence and Analysis Strategic Plan: FY 2020-2024	2020

Department of Homeland Security [DHS]	Homeland Security Information Network (HSIN) 2019 Annual Report	2021
Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance [DOJ]	Minimum Criminal Intelligence Training Standards for Law Enforcement and Other Criminal Justice Agencies in the United States and the Baseline Capabilities for State and Major Urban Area Fusion Centers	2008
Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance [DOJ]	Common Competencies for State, Local, and Tribal Intelligence Analysts	2010
Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance [DOJ]	Analyst Professional Development Road Map	2015
Federal Bureau of Investigation [FBI]	The Federal Bureau of Investigation’s Effort to Hire, Train, and Retain Intelligence Analysts	2005
Federal Bureau of Investigation [FBI]	FBI Core Competencies	2020
Federal Law Enforcement Training Centre [FLETC]	Federal Law Enforcement Training Center Strategic Plan 2018–2022	2017
Joint Publication Department of the Army, Department of the Navy U.S. Marine Corps, Department of the Navy, Department of the Air Force, and U.S. Coast Guard.	Joint Publication 3-27	2018
National Intelligence Council	U.S. National Intelligence: An Overview 2011	2011
National Security Agency [NSA]	Intelligence Analysis: Does NSA Have What It Takes?	1998
New York State Intelligence Center	New York State Intelligence Center Fusion Center Training Strategy Development Guidelines and Recommendations for Fusion Centre Intelligence Analysts and Personnel	2009
Office of the Director of National Security [ODNI]	Intelligence Community Directive Number 610: Competency Directories for the Intelligence Community Workforce	2010
Office of the Director of National Security [ODNI]	Intelligence Community Standard Number 610-3: Core Competencies for Nonsupervisory Intelligence Community Employees at GS-15 and Below	2010
Office of the Director of National Security [ODNI]	Intelligence Community Standard Number 610-4: Core Competencies for Supervisory and Managerial Intelligence Community Employees at GS-15 and Below	2010
Office of the Director of National Security [ODNI]	Intelligence Community Standard Number 610-7: Competency Directory for Analysis and Production	2010
Office of the Director of National Security [ODNI]	Intelligence Community Directive Number 656: Performance Management System Requirements for Intelligence Community Senior Civilian Officers	2012
Office of the Director of National Security [ODNI]	Intelligence Community Directive Number 651: Performance Management for the Intelligence Community Civilian Workforce	2014
Office of the Director of National Security [ODNI]	Intelligence Community Directive Number 203: Analytic Standards	2007 and 2015



Office of the Inspector General [OIG]	The Federal Bureau of Investigation’s Efforts to Hire, Train, and Retain Intelligence Analysts	2005
Office of the Inspector General [OIG]	Office of the Inspector General National Security Agency Semi-Annual Report to Congress 2017-2018	2018
Office of Personnel Management [USOPM]	Agency Management Report: Department of Homeland Security	2020

## Appendix B

## Agency Specific Intelligence Analyst Core Competencies Definitions

Agency	Core Competencies	Definitions
<b>Customs and Border Patrol (CBP)</b>	Collaboration	Improved collaboration throughout CBP and with our stakeholders provides shared sense of purpose.
	Innovation	CBP must remain vigilant through innovative initiatives to continually advance and transform the agency into an agile and adaptable organization.
	Integration	CBP must lead the development of a seamless global network to integrate border enforcement capabilities and meet the demands of a constantly evolving landscape.
	Resource management	This strategic resource management framework ensures the Commissioner's vision, goals, and objectives are clearly articulated programs and activities are aligned to the goals and objectives; resources are appropriately allocated to achieve the desired goals and objectives; and a performance measurement and program evaluation capability enables the assessment of progress made in executing the DHS and CBP mission and operational priorities.
	Risk management	Anticipation and proactive reaction to strategic risks that impact mission accomplishment
<b>Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA)</b>	Critical thinking	Uses logic, analysis, synthesis, creativity, judgment, and systemic approaches to gather, evaluate, and uses multiple sources of information to inform decisions and outcomes
	Communication	Effectively comprehends and conveys information with and from others in writing, reading, listening, and verbal and nonverbal action. Uses a variety of media in communication and making presentations appropriate to the audience
	Accountability for results	Takes responsibility for one's work, sets and/or meets priorities, organizes and utilizes resources efficiently and effectively to achieve desired results, consistent with organizational goals and objectives.
	Engagement and collaboration	Recognizes, values, builds, and leverages collaborative and constructive networks of diverse coworkers, peers, customers, stakeholders, and teams within an organization and/or accesses the IC to share knowledge and achieve results
	Personal leadership and integrity	Demonstrates personal initiative, honesty, openness, and respect in their dealings with coworkers, peers, customers, stakeholders, teams, and collaborative networks across the IC
<b>Defense Intelligence Agency: Specialty Competencies</b>	GMA regional analysis	Research, review, evaluate, interpret, and analyze all source intelligence data on a specific region, country and the immediate environment or transnational topic in order to assess and identify vulnerabilities, opportunities, threats and targets and to develop warning.

	GMA functional analysis	Research, review, evaluate, interpret, and analyze all source intelligence data on specific processes and technology for a country, region, or worldwide topic in order to assess and identify vulnerabilities opportunities, threats and targets and to develop warning
	SEA – S&TI analysis	Apply scientific or engineering skills as well as intelligence analysis skills to research, review, evaluate, interpret, and analyze all source intelligence data on a specific region, country and the immediate environment or transnational topic in order to assess and identify vulnerabilities, opportunities, threats, and to develop warning.
<b>Department of Homeland Security (DHS)</b>	Achieving results (performance goals)	
	Technical proficiency	
	Customer service (exceptions for positions (1811 and 1896)	
	Teamwork/cooperation	
	Communications	
	Representing the agency	
	Assigning, monitoring, and evaluating work (supervisors and managers)	
<b>Department of Defense (DoD)</b>	Leadership (supervisors and managers)	
	Interpersonal skills	Develops and maintains effective working relationships, especially in difficult situations. Engages and inspires others. Treats others with courtesy, sensitivity, and respect. Considers and responds appropriately to the needs and feelings of different audiences, situations, and/or cultures. Actively solicits feedback. Exemplifies professionalism, tact, and empathy. Builds trust and commitment.
	Integrity/honesty	Nurtures ethically minded organizations through personal discipline, values, self-control, and policies that reinforce ethical behavior. Demonstrates selflessness of action by doing the right thing regardless of personal and professional consequences. Behaves in an honest, fair, and ethical manner without regard to pressure from other authorities. Shows consistency in words and actions. Instills trust and confidence, models high standards of ethics.

	Written communication	Writes to convey information in a clear, concise, organized, and convincing manner for the intended audience using correct English grammar, punctuation, and spelling. Expresses thoughts persuasively and uses effective modes to reinforce message retention.
	Oral communication	Demonstrates ability to clearly and effectively articulate, present, and promote varied ideas and issues (to include sensitive or controversial topics) before a wide range of audiences. Makes clear and convincing oral presentations. Listens effectively; clarifies information as needed.
	Continual learning	Assesses and recognizes own strengths and weaknesses; pursues self-development. Uses challenges as opportunities to improve and become more effective. Pursues chances to stretch skills to further professional growth. Seeks ways to improve the capacity of others and the organization through knowledge sharing, mentoring, and coaching.
	Public service motivation	Shows a commitment to serve the public. Ensures that actions meet public needs; aligns organizational objectives and practices with public interests.
<b>Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)</b>	Collaboration	Establish contacts and interact effectively with external agencies, government officials, the community and internal Bureau contacts; display professionalism while working with others to achieve common goals; proactively share information with others when appropriate.
	Communication	Express thoughts and ideas clearly, concisely, persuasively and effectively both orally and in writing; interpret and understand verbal or written communications; tailor the communication to the experience, exposure or expertise of the recipient; and proactively share information with others when appropriate.
	Flexibility and adaptability	Change is inevitable. To succeed in an unpredictable law enforcement environment, you must be able to adapt to rapidly changing circumstances and quickly respond to urgent needs. Cultivating the quality of adaptability can make you more effective and help mitigate stress.
	Initiative	Willingness to begin projects/work or to address issues; be proactive and creatively respond to problems/issues/tasks.
	Interpersonal ability	Ability to deal effectively with others; establish and maintain rapport with management, colleagues and subordinates; recognize and show sensitivity to differences in the needs and concerns of others; and mediate concerns between individuals and groups, as well as settle disputes.
	Leadership	Motivate and inspire others; develop and mentor others; gain the respect, confidence and loyalty of others; and articulate a vision, give guidance and direct others in accomplishing goals.

	Organizing and planning	Establish priorities, timetables and goals/objectives; structure a plan of action for self and others; and develop both strategic and tactical plans.
	Problem solving and judgment.	Critically evaluate conditions, events and alternatives; identify problems, causes and relationships; base decisions or recommendations on data or sound reasoning; and formulate objective opinions.

*Note.* The data for CBP are from *Customs and Border Patrol Vision and Strategy 2020* (pp. 32–42), by Customs and Border Patrol, 2015 (<https://www.cbp.gov/sites/default/files/documents/CBP-Vision-Strategy-2020.pdf>). The data for DIA and DIA: Specialty Training are from *DIA Analyst Training Requirements and Competencies* (pp. 7–8), by Defense Intelligence Agency, 2008, ([http://scripts.cac.psu.edu/users/t/s/tsb4/GEOINT/DIA\\_Analyst\\_Compencies.pdf](http://scripts.cac.psu.edu/users/t/s/tsb4/GEOINT/DIA_Analyst_Compencies.pdf)). The data for DHS are from *Performance Management MD #3181* (p. 11), by Department of Homeland Security, 2006, ([https://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/foia/mgmt\\_directive\\_3181\\_performance\\_management.pdf](https://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/foia/mgmt_directive_3181_performance_management.pdf)). The data from DoD is from *Growing Civilian Leaders*, (p. 24), by Department of Defense, 2009, (<https://www.esd.whs.mil/Portals/54/Documents/DD/issuances/dodi/143016p.pdf>).

## Appendix C

## IC CAE and DHS CAE list

University of Arizona	Tucson, AZ	ICCAE
Florida International University	Miami, FL	ICCAE
Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey	Newark, NJ	ICCAE
Syracuse University (Consortium of Grove School of Engineering, John Jay College of Criminal Justice, Norfolk State University, and Wells College)	Syracuse, NY	ICCAE
University of Alabama in Huntsville (Partners with Alabama A&M University, and Tuskegee University)	Huntsville, AL	ICCAE
University of North Carolina in Charlotte (Consortium with Duke University, North Carolina Central University, North Carolina State University, North Carolina Chapel Hill)	Charlotte, NC	ICCAE
University of Central Florida	Orlando, FL	ICCAE
University of Kansas	Lawrence, KS	ICCAE
University of New Mexico	Albuquerque, NM	ICCAE
University of Oklahoma-Norman	Norman, OK	ICCAE
University of Southern California (Consortium with Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University, San Jose State University, and Santa Monica College)	Los Angeles, CA	ICCAE
University of Texas at San Antonio	San Antonio, TX	ICCAE
Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University	Blacksburg, Virginia	ICCAE
California State University - Fullerton	Fullerton, CA	ICCAE Legacy
California State University - Long Beach	Long Beach, CA	ICCAE Legacy
California State University - San Bernardino	San Bernardino, CA	ICCAE Legacy
Chicago State University	Chicago, IL	ICCAE Legacy
Eastern Kentucky University (Consortium with Kentucky State University and Morehead State University)	Richmond, KY	ICCAE Legacy
Elizabeth City State University	Elizabeth City, KY	ICCAE Legacy
Morgan State University	Baltimore, MD	ICCAE Legacy NISS-CAE CAE-CDE (cyber defense education)
Miles College	Fairfield, AL	ICCAE Legacy
North Carolina State University	Raleigh, NC	ICCAE Legacy CAE-R

Penn State University	Centre County, PA	ICCAE Legacy
University of Mississippi	Oxford, MS	ICCAE Legacy
University of Nebraska - Lincoln	Lincoln, NE	ICCAE Legacy
University of Nebraska - Omaha	Omaha, NE	ICCAE Legacy, DHS COE
University of South Florida	Tampa, FL	ICCAE Legacy
Duke University	Raleigh, NC	ICCAE Legacy
Palo Alto Community College	Palo Alto, CA	ICCAE Legacy
Texas State University	San Marcos, TX	ICCAE Legacy
University of Texas Rio Grande Valley	Edinburg, TX	ICCAE Legacy
University of the Incarnate Word	San Antonio, TX	ICCAE Legacy
Arizona State University	Tempe, AZ	DHS COE
University of Houston	Houston, TX	DHS COE
Northeastern University	Boston, MA	DHS COE
George Mason University	Fairfax, VA	DHS COE
University of North Carolina- Chapel Hill	Chapel Hill, NC	DHS COE
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	Urbana, IL	DHS COE
University of Southern California	Los Angeles, CA	DHS Emeritus COE
Purdue University	West Lafayette, IN	DHS Emeritus COE
Rutgers University	New Brunswick, NJ	DHS Emeritus COE
University of Minnesota- Twin Cities	Minneapolis, MN	DHS Emeritus COE
University of Maryland	College Park, Maryland	DHS Emeritus COE
University of Texas A&M	College Station, TX	DHS COE
University of Alaska	Anchorage, AL	DHS COE
Steven's Institute of Technology	Hoboken, NJ	DHS COE
Jackson State University	Jackson, MS	DHS Emeritus COE

*Note.* The data for this chart was collected from the Intelligence Community Centers of Academic Excellence information sheet, 2022 ([https://www.dni.gov/files/CHCO/documents/CAE/2022ICCAE\\_Schools\\_Final\\_508\\_011022.pdf](https://www.dni.gov/files/CHCO/documents/CAE/2022ICCAE_Schools_Final_508_011022.pdf)) and the Department of Homeland Security Centers of Excellence website, 2022 (<https://www.dhs.gov/science-and-technology/centers-excellence>)