

The Interagency Service Club:

(Almost) Free Interagency Training and Education

by Thomas P. Moore

Introduction

You've seen them in every town you've ever visited—the signs on the outskirts of town listing the Rotary Club, Kiwanis Club, and Lions Club. In some cases, these clubs have been in existence for more than 100 years, and they have proliferated around the world. Rotary International claims to have nearly 33,000 local clubs and 1.22 million members worldwide, while Lions International claims 1.36 million members and 46,000 clubs in 206 countries. The goal of these clubs is to provide service to the community. One of goals of Rotary International is, “the advancement of international understanding, goodwill, and peace through a world fellowship of business and professional persons united in the ideal of service.”¹ The mission of the Lions Club is, “to empower volunteers to serve their communities, meet humanitarian needs, encourage peace, and promote international understanding.”²

Besides the altruistic motivations for joining such a club, members also benefit from the professional and social networks they develop as a result of club membership. This article explores how the highly successful concept of the service club might be used to help employees of government agencies, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and international organizations (IOs) further develop their personal, interagency, and professional network and gain knowledge of other agencies.

Interagency Challenge

Over the past several decades, the U.S. government (USG), especially the Departments of Defense and State, and state and local governments have encountered significant difficulties in working together to plan for and respond to national security crises and natural and manmade disasters. For example, the planning for Operation Blind Logic, the post-conflict plan associated

Thomas P. Moore, Ph.D., a retired U.S. Army Reserve Colonel, is a professor of Joint Military Operations at the U.S. Naval War College Monterey.

with Operation Just Cause (the U.S. invasion of Panama to depose Manuel Noriega) conducted at U.S. Southern Command, “dealt only with those issues that the military could address unilaterally, without the coordination of the [other] government departments.”³ And according to the 2008 Project on National Security Reform, “the ongoing operations in Afghanistan and Iraq have generated numerous studies, many of which conclude that the U.S. government is not able to get its various national security organizations to work together well enough.”⁴

Former U.S. Secretaries of State James Baker and Lawrence Eagleburger and former Chair of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs Lee Hamilton also addressed this issue in the 2006 Iraq Study Group Report:

For the longer term, the United States government needs to improve how its constituent agencies—Defense, State, Agency for International Development, Treasury, Justice, the intelligence community, and others— respond to a complex stability operation like that represented by this decade’s Iraq and Afghanistan wars and the previous decade’s operations in the Balkans. They need to train for, and conduct, joint operations across agency boundaries, following the Goldwater-Nichols model that has proved so successful in the U.S. armed services.⁵

Government agencies are encountering more and more circumstances that demand interagency collaboration, coordination, integration, and networking. According to Frederick M. Kaiser of the Congressional Research Service:

In sum, these collaborative efforts extend beyond national security or homeland security—albeit, the most visible issue areas—to other varied policies and programs. Among these are protecting the

environment; conserving natural resources; preparing for and responding to natural disasters and pandemics; restructuring the domestic financial sector; determining the safety and effectiveness of medications; regulating various consumer goods; implementing medical and social welfare programs; and granting security clearances.⁶

According to Kaiser the following four reasons account for the increased need for interagency collaboration:

1. Public demand has increased or changed the responsibilities of some government agencies (for example, after the terrorist attacks of 9/11, dealing with terrorist organizations became a new responsibility of the Department of Defense (DoD), while the responsibility of law enforcement agencies regarding terrorism changed).
2. In certain areas, the public has pressured some government agencies (for example, the Environmental Protection Agency) to reduce the size, scope, and cost of their operations.
3. The scope, number, variety, and complexity of programs that assign responsibilities across multiple government agencies have increased (for example, Project Sea Hawk in Charleston, SC).⁷
4. Several significant crises have suffered from inadequate interagency collaboration and coordination (for example Hurricane Katrina, the 9/11 terrorist attacks, and much of the immediate post-conflict period in Iraq).⁸

The “interagency challenge” has even been recognized beyond the bounds of governmental organizations.⁹ It is really an “interorganizational challenge” that involves not only the USG, state/provincial governments, local governments, and informal government-

like organizations, but also NGOs, IOs, coalition partners, allies, and even government contractors.¹⁰

Unfortunately, the “interorganizational challenge” is hard to solve, and at the federal level, the structure of the executive branch often hinders interagency collaboration.

Unfortunately, the “interorganizational challenge” is hard to solve, and at the federal level, the structure of the executive branch often hinders interagency collaboration. For example, the concept of unity of command is a well-accepted principle in the DoD and local law enforcement and fire protection agencies. When a crisis arises, this concept says that one person, with no other duties, should be fully responsible for controlling all organizations responding to that crisis in order to ensure the highest likelihood of a successful outcome. However, the current structure of the executive branch makes it extremely difficult for a civilian employee or political appointee working for a department outside DoD to command military units. It is similarly difficult to put a section of personnel from, for example, the Federal Emergency Management Agency under the command of an officer from the DoD.

Basic Barriers to Interagency and Interorganizational Collaboration

Interagency and interorganizational challenges result from a number of causes including the following:

- Collective unfamiliarity with each other’s capabilities and limitations.
- Differences in the use of technical language.¹¹

- Lack of knowledge of organizational cultures in other agencies.
- Lack of personal relationships with personnel from other agencies.
- Significant differences in organizational resources and capabilities.
- Differences in authorized responsibilities and missions.
- Differences in funding and legal authorities to expend government funds and engage in various activities.

Education, Training, and Experience as a Barrier Breaker

According to a study by William J. Davis, Jr., “...education and experience may mitigate any predisposed tendency to be insular and think of ‘other communities’ [interagency] as less able or less important.”¹² Education and experience might mitigate the first four items on the list above. If this is so, then three questions arise: How should this education and experience be made available? Who should be exposed to it? What is its appropriate content?

Federal Programs for Interagency Education, Training, and Experience

In May 2007, President George W. Bush issued Executive Order 13434, which established the National Security Professional Development (NSPD) program. Shortly thereafter, the “National Strategy for the Development of Security Professionals” was released by the White House. Both the Executive Order and the “National Strategy for the Development of Security Professionals” included homeland security as part of its definition of national security.

According to the national strategy, “The national security professional will need access to education, training, and opportunities

to work in coordination with other Federal departments and agencies, State, local, territorial and tribal governments, the private sector, non-governmental organizations, foreign governments, and international organizations.”¹³ Thus one goal of the NSPD program is to improve interagency collaboration by cultivating a community of national security professionals.¹⁴ In her 2011 analysis of the NSPD program, Catherine Dale concluded that, “While the initial intent of the NSPD program ... appeared to be to include all levels of government, the focus subsequently narrowed to the federal level.”¹⁵ This is probably at least partly because most of the educational products developed in response to the NSPD program have been established at educational institutions operated by the federal government. It is, therefore, not surprising that these programs have a federal perspective on interagency problems. These educational programs include the following:

- The National Defense University (NDU) pilot program for national security professionals, which was taught in the 2007–2008 academic year at three NDU campuses: the National War College, the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, and the Joint Forces Staff College. Students came from all military services plus six non-DoD agencies of the USG.¹⁶
- Six one-week courses currently offered by NDU’s Information Resources Management College for federal employees in the NSPD program.¹⁷
- Three courses offered by NDU’s College of International Security Affairs for federal employees in the NSPD program.¹⁸
- The Department of State Foreign Service Institute National Security Executive Leadership Seminar, in which approximately half of the students come from outside the

Department of State and are at the GS-15 level or equivalent.¹⁹

- The Department of Defense Executive Leadership Development Program for DoD civilian employees (GS-12 to GS-14). While the students come from multiple services, the student body does not have significant interagency or interorganizational representation.²⁰
- The Federal Emergency Management Agency on-line, three-hour course entitled “National Response Framework: An Introduction,” which is open to employees of government agencies, NGOs, and the public.²¹

“While the initial intent of the NSPD program ... appeared to be to include all levels of government, the focus subsequently narrowed to the federal level.”

In October 2008, Congress authorized the creation of the Civilian Response Corps (CRC), led by the Department of State’s Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization (S/CRS). The purpose of the CRC is to have trained personnel from nine agencies of the USG (not including the DoD) ready to go on short notice to apply “whole of U.S. government” capabilities to reconstruction and stabilization problems in other nations. Training includes courses such as “Foundations of Interagency Reconstruction and Stabilization Operations” and “Whole-of-Government Planning for Reconstruction and Stabilization.”²²

Unfortunately, Congress never fully funded the CRC concept, which was to include 250

active members, a 2,000 member standby team, and a 2,000 member reserve component. By the end of 2010, the CRC had approximately 130 active members, 967 standby members, and no reserve members.²³ Furthermore, the S/CRS has recently been abolished and replaced by the Assistant Secretary for Conflict and Stabilization Operations (CSO). It is yet to be seen what impact this change may have on interagency training and education and on the CRC.

Perhaps the broadest program for interorganizational education began in 2004 with the creation of the Center for Stabilization and Reconstruction Studies (CSRS) at the U.S. Naval Postgraduate School.

The U.S. Naval Postgraduate School (NPS) has reached out to multiple levels of government to offer interagency education and training. Much of the focus of this effort has been on homeland security. For example, the Center for Homeland Defense and Security at NPS offers the following programs:

- The Master of Arts degree in Homeland Security enrolls homeland security officials from all levels of government, including tribal, local, county, state, and federal.²⁴
- The Fusion Center Leaders Program trains personnel from law enforcement and intelligence fusion centers at the local, state, and federal levels.²⁵
- The Homeland Security Executive Leaders Program enrolls homeland security leaders and managers from all levels of government, including tribal, local, county, state, and federal.²⁶

- Executive Education Seminars inform senior state officials and senior officials in large metropolitan areas about homeland security issues, such as federal, state, and local responsibilities and coordination.²⁷

Perhaps the broadest program for interorganizational education began in 2004 with the creation of the Center for Stabilization and Reconstruction Studies (CSRS) at NPS. Each CSRS seminar ensures a broad mix of attendees from:

- U.S. uniformed services.
- DoD civilian employees.
- Appropriate foreign Ministries of Defense.
- NGOs.
- IOs.
- U.S. non-DoD federal government agencies.
- Faculty in academia and think-tanks.²⁸

To date CSRS has offered 32 seminars with a variety of themes, including interorganizational coordination, security sector reform, demobilization and disarmament activities, post-conflict and stability operations, and humanitarian assistance and disaster relief activities. However, due to recent funding issues, the number of CSRS seminars has been reduced to 2–3 per year.

Recent Changes to the NSPD Program Affecting Interagency Education and Training

In early 2011, the Obama administration made changes to the NSPD program. Called NSPD 2.0, it has a revised structure for managing the program and identifying government personnel to participate in the program. The scope of the overall effort was reduced to a single pilot program that would focus exclusively on the area of domestic

emergency management. In addition, the pilot program was limited to federal employees in the National Capitol Region and holding a grade in the GS-13 to GS-15 range. The Department of Homeland Security was tasked with developing the core requirements for education, training, and rotational assignments across cabinet-level agency boundaries.²⁹

NSPD 2.0 has been somewhat controversial among officials with current or past responsibilities for the program. On the one hand, the selection of domestic emergency management as the focus area allows the NSPD program to take advantage of fairly robust "...existing collaboration mechanisms, and training and educational programs (in particular through FEMA's Emergency Management Institute)..."³⁰ On the other hand, some have expressed concern that the narrowing of the program's substantive focus might make it difficult to broaden that scope again in the future to include a wider array of national security-related concerns.³¹

So while there are a number of individual efforts and scope-limited, collective efforts to provide interagency education and training, these efforts are scattered, often oriented to one particular problem set, and sometimes rather entrepreneurial. When compared to centrally and tightly controlling interagency education and training, the current situation produces a wide variety of approaches to education and training opportunities, content, and delivery methods, which has several disadvantages:

1. It makes it very difficult for federal, state, and local governments to determine if the right people are actually being exposed to the right interagency education and training.
2. It makes it difficult to determine how much is spent overall on interagency education and training.
3. Most of these programs and events provide

no or weak on-going means to develop professional networks that cross agency boundaries.

4. NGOs, IOs, and some quasi-governmental organizations do not have much access to this interagency education and training.³² Nor do they often have much access to means to develop professional networks across governmental boundaries.

The Interagency Service Club (IASC) Concept

The IASC concept provides opportunities for a broad range of people to have access to interagency education, training, and on-going professional network development across agency boundaries. Patterned after the successful Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions club models, it provides a forum to develop and maintain friendships across agency boundaries. It is also intended to greatly broaden access to interagency education and training for managers from governmental,

...while there are a number of individual efforts and scope-limited, collective efforts to provide interagency education and training, these efforts are scattered, often oriented to one particular problem set, and sometimes rather entrepreneurial.

non-governmental, international, and quasi-governmental organizations. The concept is not intended to focus on one particular functional area (such as domestic emergency management or post-conflict operations); however, individual clubs may initially form around a functional area of particular interest to the members.

The primary goal of the IASC is to educate its members regarding capabilities, limitations, organizational cultures, missions, funding issues, and legal authorities of governmental, international, and nongovernmental organizations. It does so by providing a regular, local forum where members can learn about each other's organizations.

The second most important goal of the IASC is to afford its members the opportunity

The primary goal of the IASC is to educate its members...

to develop their personal interagency and interorganizational social networks. The knowledge and professional contacts gained by club members are likely to increase the ability of governmental organizations and NGOs to respond to future crises.

The third goal of the IASC is to take on one or more service projects that meet unfilled needs related to the interagency and interorganizational communities.

Interagency service clubs can most easily be formed in areas that have a sufficient concentration of governmental, non-governmental, international, and/or quasi-governmental organizations. The following locations could sustain one or more IASCs:

- Washington, D.C.
- Tampa, FL (United States Special Operations Command and United States Central Command).
- Miami, FL (United States Southern Command)
- Colorado Springs, CO (United States Northern Command).

- Monterey, CA (Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center and United States Naval Postgraduate School).
- St. Louis, MO (United States Transportation Command).
- Charleston, SC (Project Seahawk).
- Honolulu, HI (United States Pacific Command).
- Stuttgart, Germany (United States European Command and United States Africa Command).

Three or four people can start a local club. Startup tasks include recruiting appropriate people to an initial organizational meeting; establishing a meeting place, date, and time; developing a set of club bylaws;³³ choosing club officers;³⁴ and applying for non-profit status with the Internal Revenue Service and the appropriate state authorities (optional).

The ideal membership mix would include high-level, mid-level, and entry-level managers/leaders in their respective organizations. IASCs might attempt to recruit leaders and managers from some of the organizations listed in Figure 1.

It is also critically important to achieve a mix of people from a variety of agencies from across all levels of governmental, international, and non-governmental organizations. The most beneficial mix would be agencies that are likely to work together in crises such as Hurricane Katrina, the Haiti earthquake, the Indonesian Tsunami, the Loma Prieta earthquake, and wars such as in Iraq or Afghanistan.

The most challenging aspect of starting an IASC is recruiting the appropriate mix of members. When trying to recruit members, sometimes just obtaining contact information for personnel inside agencies other than your own is a difficult task. A specific IASC would not be very interagency in nature if 90 percent

| Federal Government | State Government | County Government | City Government | Special District Government | IOs | NGOs |
|--|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
| Dept. of Homeland Security | Dept. of Public Health | Emergency Management Dept. | Public Safety Dept. | Water Agencies | World Health Organization | American Red Cross and International Committee of the Red Cross |
| U.S. Coast Guard | Army and Air National Guards | Public Health Dept. | Police Dept. | Wastewater Agencies | UN Office of the Coordinator for Humanitarian Assistance | Salvation Army |
| U.S. Army, Navy, and Marine Corps Civil Affairs | Dept. of Food and Agriculture | Public Works Dept. | Emergency Services Dept. | Community Services Districts | UN High Commissioner for Refugees | Mercy Corps |
| FBI; Drug Enforcement Administration; Customs and Border Protection; Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives; Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and Central Intelligence Agency | Emergency Management Agency | Sheriff's Dept. | Fire Dept. | Hospital Districts | UN Children's Fund | Oxford Committee for Famine Relief |
| | Dept. of Public Safety | Planning Dept. | Public Health Dept. | Airport Districts | UN Dept. of Peacekeeping Operations | International Medical Corps |
| | Dept. of Transportation | Board of Supervisors | Public Works Dept. | Harbor and Port Districts | UN Population Fund | Save the Children |
| | Dept. of Forestry and Fire Protection | Information Technology Dept. | Planning Dept. | Electric Utility Districts | UN Development Program | International Crisis Group |
| Dept. of State | State Hospitals Dept. | | City Council | Fire Districts | World Bank | Relief International |
| U.S. Agency for International Development and Office of Foreign Disaster Relief | | | | Transit Districts | | Catholic Relief Services |
| Dept. of Agriculture | | | | | | International Organization for Migration |
| Dept. of Transportation | | | | | | Habitat for Humanity |
| Army Corps of Engineers | | | | | | |
| Dept. of Health and Human Services | | | | | | |

Figure 1.

of its members were, for example, employees of the DoD.

One interesting aspect of the IASC concept is that it can be implemented without seeking funding or formal approval from anyone in the government. And although obtaining tax exempt status does require governmental approvals, it is important only if you raise significant amounts of money for service projects. Otherwise, the club is simply a group of people who get together periodically to share a meal and hear a talk.

Due to the availability, interests, and affiliation of potential members in a given local area, the specific composition of each club will vary substantially. If the IASC concept were to spread beyond areas having a heavy concentration of federal employees and military personnel, the local clubs would be heavily dominated by state, county, and local officials. Regardless, for any given club, the main membership goal is to achieve a broad interagency membership, one that is

representative of all the locally-available levels of government with personnel in the area.

It should also be noted that some states have a form of government that is considered local but is not considered county, city, town, or village government. In California this form of government is called a special district, and these districts include fire districts, water districts, community services districts, cemetery districts, and about 85 other types of districts. This form of local government should not be neglected—some of these organizations can play a significant role in a disaster or other crisis due to their mission, personnel, communications gear, capital equipment, and/or training. There is also a good reason for having two members of the club who do not work for and may have never worked for any of the types of organizations mentioned so far. These members serve as direct connections between the club and the broad civilian population those government agencies and other organizations serve. These members could bring a particular perspective to the club and a point of view that might be valuable to government employees. Four additional categories of possible members include NGOs, IOs, government-regulated private utility companies, and government contractors.

In the New York and Washington, D.C., areas, an IASC should try to include a significant number of members from IOs and NGOs. In U.S. government operations overseas, these NGOs and IOs provide significant services, interact with U.S. government agencies, and sometimes make demands on U.S. government resources. Many of these NGOs and IOs have headquarters and a significant number of employees in New York and/or Washington, D.C., making it possible for some of them to join the local IASC.

Representatives from regulated utilities should be considered for membership because of the role they would likely play in a natural

or manmade disaster. Finally, given the extent to which some government functions have been contracted out to private companies in recent years, it may be appropriate for some clubs to include in their membership a limited number of appropriately-selected government contractors.

Interagency Service Club Template

The following IASC organizational template facilitates creating individual mission statements, club structures, bylaws, and agendas:

- Regular meetings about 75 minutes in length. Each club decides on the date, time, and frequency of these meetings.
- Each meeting should feature a speaker whose topic is intended to expand the membership's knowledge of governmental and non-governmental organizations' activities, capabilities, limitations, and challenges.
- Each meeting should have an agenda. Bylaws should include the club mission and purpose statements, duties and responsibilities of club officers and committees, and club membership composition guidelines and rules.
- Some suggested traditions to establish might include seating rules that ensure each table contains members from multiple agencies; formal, annual business card exchanges; an annual report on the interagency training and education; and annual awards.

Interagency Service Projects

Besides sharing a meal, one of the ways to develop fellowship across interagency boundaries is to work together toward some common goal. Club members should propose specific projects that have an interagency flavor. Three examples of possible "interagency

service projects” include the following:

- The Wounded Peacemaker Project: In the past decade in places such as Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere, many non-military U.S. personnel have deployed to do important work. These people have come from federal, state, and local governments, NGOs, IOs, and quasi-governmental organizations. Their work has been intended to deter further warfare in these countries and to help the local populations achieve peace and improved living conditions. In the course of this work, some of these people have been killed or injured. Some of the injured cannot return to their jobs, and they must undergo months of rehabilitation before they try to find a job that accommodates their disability. The support systems for these individuals are significantly weaker than the support systems for military casualties. This project would help develop better support systems for these individuals.³⁵
- Interagency Speakers Bureau Project: This project would support civics education in the local area. The club would put together and offer to local high schools and colleges a directory of speakers and topics from the interagency domain.
- Developing a directory of local organizations involved in crisis response.

Interagency Challenge Revisited

Effective, well-funded, interagency training and education will not by itself dispose of the interagency challenge, but it will help. Unfortunately, at least for the near term, it appears that Congress does not have the will to pass legislation to comprehensively address the interagency challenge. Absent such a “Goldwater-Nichols Act” for interagency processes, interagency training, education, and network building that can be accomplished with little or no Congressional support becomes a lot more important. Although very flexible, the IASC concept is but one approach to interagency education, training, and professional network building. **I AJ**

NOTES

1 Rotary International, <<http://www.rotary.org/en/AboutUs/RotaryInternational/GuidingPrinciples/Pages/ridefault.aspx>>, accessed on October 14, 2011.

2 Lions Clubs International, <<http://www.lionsclubs.org/EN/about-lions/mission-and-history/our-mission.php>>, accessed October 14, 2011.

3 Richard H. Shultz, Jr., *In the Aftermath of War: U.S. Support for Reconstruction and Nation-Building in Panama Following Just Cause*, Air University Press, Maxwell Air Force Base, AL, 1993, p. 18.

4 “Project on National Security Reform: Forging a New Shield,” Center for the Study of the Presidency, Arlington, VA, 2008, p. 17.

5 James A. Baker, III, et al., *The Iraq Study Group Report: The Way Forward—A New Approach*, Vintage Books, New York, 2006, p. 61.

6 Frederick M. Kaiser, “Interagency Collaborative Arrangements and Activities: Types, Rationales, Considerations,” *Inter Agency Paper No. 5*, Colonel Arthur D. Simons Center for the Study of Interagency Coordination, June 2011, p. 13.

7 U. S. Department of Homeland Security, “Secretary Napolitano Tours Project Seahawk,” online press release, Washington, July 6, 2009, <http://www.dhs.gov/ynews/releases/pr_1246911374161.shtm>, accessed on October 19, 2011. Project SeaHawk was established by Congress in 2003 as a collaborative initiative designed to bring multiple agencies together to protect the port. Located at Port Charleston in South Carolina, Project SeaHawk enables federal agencies to work together with South Carolina authorities to share information and coordinate maritime response efforts.

8 Kaiser, p. 14.

9 For example, Department of Defense Joint Publication 3-08, *Interorganizational Coordination During Joint Operations*, June 24, 2011, contains descriptions of 12 international organizations and four nongovernmental organizations with which military forces may have to interact during crisis action planning and during execution of such a plan.

10 Organizations that responded to Hurricane Katrina included the U.S. Navy, Louisiana Army National Guard, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Federal Emergency Management Agency, Louisiana Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Preparedness, New Orleans Police Department, American Red Cross, Salvation Army, USA Freedom Corps, Citizen’s Corps Council, Catholic Charities USA, Wal-Mart, AMTRAK, Jefferson Parish Sheriff’s Office, Gretna City Police Department, Crescent City Connection Police, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Department of Transportation, U.S. Department of Justice, U.S. Department of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Interior, U.S. Department of Treasury, U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Postal Inspection Service, U.S. Coast Guard, and many more.

11 To a military member on the staff of an operational or tactical military organization, planning is the process by which he/she examines a problem, considers alternative courses of action, selects the best course of action, and prepares the order needed to execute that course of action. To a member of the U.S. Agency for International Development and absent any additional context, planning is the process used to obtain money from Congress.

12 William J. Davis, “Is a Sense of Community Vital to Interagency Coordination?” *Inter Agency Paper No. 3*, Colonel Arthur D. Simons Center for the Study of Interagency Coordination, Fort Leavenworth, KS, January 2011, p. 10.

13 “National Strategy for the Development of Security Professionals,” Executive Office of the President, Washington, July 2007, p. 2, <<http://www.cpms.osd.mil/ASSETS/13DCDB52B7D7453A9F78343E46F11F99/National%20Strategy%20for%20Professional%20Development.pdf>>, accessed on October 19, 2011.

14 Catherine Dale, “National Security Professionals and Interagency Reform: Proposals, Recent Experience and Issues for Congress,” report for Congress, Congressional Research Service, Washington, September 26, 2011, p. 8.

15 *Ibid.*, p. 9.

16 *Ibid.*, p. 13.

17 Information Resources Management College course offerings list, <http://www.ndu.edu/icollege/admis/course_offerings_11_class.html>, accessed on November 1, 2011 and NSPD Training and Education Portal, <<http://www.cpms.osd.mil/forms/lpdd/nspd/training/index.aspx>>, accessed on October 31, 2011.

18 *Ibid.*

19 Dale, p. 14.

- 20 Ibid.
- 21 Ibid., p. 16.
- 22 Department of State, <<http://www.civilianresponsecorps.gov/join/faq/index.htm#14>>, accessed on July 19, 2012.
- 23 Samuel S. Farr, "From Idea to Implementation: Standing Up the Civilian Response Corps," *Prism* 2, No. 1, December 2010, p. 22.
- 24 Center for Homeland Defense and Security, <<http://www.chds.us/?masters/overview>>, accessed November 1, 2011.
- 25 Ibid., <<http://www.chds.us/?special/info&pgm=FCLP>>.
- 26 Ibid., <<http://www.chds.us/?special/info&pgm=Exec>>.
- 27 Ibid., <<http://www.chds.us/?met>>.
- 28 Center for Stabilization and Reconstruction Studies, <http://www.csrns-nps.org/logistica/public/docs/CSRS_Brochure_March_2011.pdf>, accessed November 1, 2011.
- 29 Dale, p. 20.
- 30 Ibid., p. 21.
- 31 Ibid.
- 32 Quasi-governmental organizations provide some sort of government service or services under contract to or under the regulation of some part of the local, county, state, or federal government.
- 33 You will find a template for this purpose at <<http://www.interagencyclubs.org>>.
- 34 A president, vice president, treasurer, secretary, venue coordinator, and speaker coordinator are the suggested club officers.
- 35 Medical coverage, long-term care, dependent care, rehabilitation training, disability income, and life insurance programs are examples of these support systems.