EMHEN POST-CONFERENCE REPORT

Prepared by Jessica Jensen

NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY

Contents

Executive Summary

Emergency Management Degree Program leaders met March 26 and 27 to discuss issues of collective concern. There were several outcomes of the conference:

1. Degree program leaders want to meet quarterly regarding issues of common interest.
2. Degree program leaders want to set up and participate in both a listserv and a Google Business Drive for information and resource sharing.
3. Degree program leaders agreed to a) endorse the 2015 accreditation standards, b) engage in a self-study against those standards, and c) bring self-study evidence to a series of 3 separate meetings to discuss evidence and the extent to which the standards may require revision.
4. Degree program leaders agreed to organize under the name, Emergency Management Higher Education Network (EMHEN). For now, this organization will be a loose, flat network as opposed to a professional association and remain open to any emergency management degree program leader to join.

Introduction and Background

In 2017, a small group of leaders of emergency management degree programs met to consider whether there might be value in creating a space for us to dialogue about issues of mutual concern. The FEMA Higher Education Program had been a huge source of support for a long time, a source which we all valued. Still, we decided that we would love to interact around topics of mutual interest more than once a year. We dubbed our effort to convene and discuss issues of mutual concern the "Emergency Management Higher Education Network (EMHEN)" to capture the idea that we were a group, without formal hierarchy, agenda, or dogma that desired connection to one another. And…then…despite the best of intentions…nothing came of it…until late 2020!

Late 2020, the same group of leaders came together out of an interest in exploring the very topics of focus in the conference agenda. We did not want to hold these conversations just amongst ourselves. We wanted to open the opportunity to any program leaders out there who are as hungry for dialogue as we are—so we worked together to coordinate this first conference.

We reached out to every single degree program leader identified on one of the FEMA Higher Education College List, lists of emergency management degree programs (i.e., associates, bachelors, masters, doctoral, and international) and invited participation. We sent three pre-read documents to all who registered and a link to a survey to gather their opinions related to the ideas in those documents with the promise of sharing the data report leading up to the conference. See Appendix A for the full list of those who registered and completed a pre-conference survey, those registered but did not complete a pre-conference survey, and those who registered but had to cancel (and did not complete a pre-conference survey).

This document presents the format, discussion and findings from the conference March 26 and 27. The report is structured around conference day and breakout session to facilitate review.

Day One: Break Out Session 1

The first conference session was devoted to exploration of how we might meet our emergency management degree program leadership and faculty professional development needs. Between the breakout session and full group discussion that followed, we sought a brainstormed list of ways we might best meet our common needs.

Pre-conference survey results

In preparation for this discussion, the pre-conference survey asked two open-ended questions to gauge existing leadership and faculty professional development needs. All of the open-ended responses to these prompts (included in Appendix B and C) were shared with attendees before the conference.

The survey results had revealed that six program leaders had no unmet professional development needs, and an additional two indicated that while opportunities are available to them, they lack the time to take advantage of them. Data analysis of the remaining responses regarding the professional development needs of program leadership revealed a strong interest among respondents in networking for the purposes of collaboration (peer relationships, cross-institution student learning opportunities, teaching) and information sharing as well as learning about various topics through what will be termed, for the sake of this report, training. Topics that such training might cover include grant writing/opportunities, emergency management theory, and alumni relations. Each of these topics was mentioned multiple times.

Eight individuals indicated that there faculty had no professional development needs and an additional two indicated that accessing professional development was a matter of a lack of funds, as opposed to opportunity. Data analysis of the remaining responses regarding the professional development needs of

faculty suggests more diversity than observed in the data related to program leadership needs. Networking, collaboration, information exchange, and training on various topics were each mentioned multiple times as faculty professional development needs.

Outcome of break out session 1 and following full group discussion
During the first session, attendees reiterated many of the professional development needs that they had identified on the survey. Additional needs identified through discussion included the need for a guidebook for EM program leaders and a repository of emergency management curriculum/syllabi.

Very little discussion actually centered on the ways we might meet our common needs in the breakout sessions or full group discussion to follow. Ultimately, this session ended without clear answers to the questions posed for consideration or any other clear outcome.

Day One: Break Out Session 2
The second conference session was focused on exploring the extent to which degree program leadership agree on key aspects of offering bachelors level degree programs in emergency management—both in terms of identity and curriculum content—and what, if anything, we wanted to do about it.

Discussion in the years leading up to and during the 15th Annual FEMA Higher Education Symposium resulted in a widespread call for a focus group to explore whether accreditation for emergency management higher education programs was warranted and, if so, to what standard(s). Representatives of a mixture of Emergency Management higher education programs along with representatives of bodies actively engaged in the accreditation of emergency management programs were convened for an initial two-day meeting at the Emergency Management Institute by the FEMA Higher Education Program in September 2012.

Three years and four focus group meetings later, in September 2015 a recommended set of Emergency Management Accreditation Standards was produced. Significant effort was committed during the three-year period to represent the voice of the community served in the focus group composition; the focus group also gathered input from degree programs throughout the nation via surveys and breakout sessions at the Higher Education Symposium. The standards include a) general standards and b) curriculum standards.

The standards were provided to the two bodies engaged in emergency management degree program accreditation—the International Fire Service Accreditation Congress (https://ifsac.org/) and the Council for the Accreditation of Emergency Management and Homeland Security Education (https://www.caemhse.education/).

The next year, 2016, the FEMA Higher Education Program sponsored a focus group to consider competencies for next generation emergency management professionals. This group engaged a panel, using a modified Delphi method, to develop a set of competencies. The group presented at the FEMA Higher Education Symposium on the competencies more than once. The group recommended the competencies for inclusion in bachelor's level curriculum. A document was promulgated in 2017 outlining how each competency might be met at each degree level.

Prior to these accreditation and competency efforts, the FEMA Higher Education Program-staff convened a number of focus groups to discuss associates and bachelors level curriculum and a number of individuals had written white papers on the topic.

Concurrent to these efforts, the FEMA Higher Education Program sponsored a number of focus groups to consider the disciplinary purview and research standards for emergency management. Feedback via surveys and breakout sessions was sought throughout the period in which these focus groups were held. The final points of consensus from all of these groups is reflected in the Doctoral Points of Consensus v.2 document, and, at the time, reflected some aspects of a shared identify for emergency management education, educators, and researchers.

The questions remain after all these years and all of these efforts: 1) To what extent do we have a shared identity? And 2) To what extent do we agree on what an emergency management bachelor's degree curriculum should cover?

Pre-conference survey results
Degree program leaders were asked in the pre-conference survey to evaluate statements from the Doctoral Points of Consensus v.2 document. See Appendix D for the descriptive statistics related to all statement evaluations—the statements with the lowest means highlighted in yellow for ease of reference.

The mean response to ALL statements was above 4 on a scale of 1-5 (1=Strongly disagree, 5=Strongly agree) and evidenced standard deviations well below 1 and skew and kurtosis suggesting very few outliers. The statements with the lowest associated means seem to reflect a view of emergency management education as broad and serving a wide variety of career paths (i.e., not just local level government). It may be the case that those few who rated these statements less positively view emergency management education and exclusive to government and preparation for such positions.

Prior to 2016, there had been considerable consensus about these statements within the emergency management community. Data analysis reveals that there still is consensus, and, hence, there is some sense of identity among the degree program leaders who answered the survey. This finding was something to be celebrated, and, going into the conference, it was suggested that the attendees might consider doing something more formal as degree program leaders to reflect the consensus around these identity points (e.g., sign on to a document similar to the doctoral example, put the statements on individual website with a link to them, etc.).

Unfortunately, the data revealed far less consensus with respect to the content a bachelor's degree program ought to reflect. The pre-conference survey prompted evaluation of the most recent two initiatives related to this topic—the bachelor's content standards from the 2015 Accreditation Standards and the NGCC competencies. See the statements and related data in Table 1.

Statements	The Accreditation Focus Group Report p. 10	The Next Generation Competencies Document	DK/ NA
Our curriculum covers the majority of the content outlined in	15 (38.4%)	11 (28.2%)	12 (30.8%)
I believe the most appropriate approach to undergraduate curriculum is outlined in	10 (25.6%)	15 (38.5%)	13 (33.3%)
Our undergraduate program learning objectives are more aligned with	12 (30.8%)	15 (38.5%)	11 (28.2%)

Respondents were provided an open-ended comment box and asked to describe any alternative document(s) that guide the design of your WHOLE or OVERALL curriculum content and/or program

learning objectives if not one of the two documents above (See Appendix E for the complete list of responses). No theme emerged in analysis of the responses.

Given the distribution of opinions with respect to bachelor's degree program content, our conference discussion will focus discussion on the following questions in Session 2:
- What are the core aspects of a bachelor's curriculum that make the degree "emergency management"?
- Do the accreditation content requirements and/or the NGCCs provide emergency management bachelor's degrees a clear curricular identity?
- Given the differences of opinion on the accreditation content requirements and the NGCCs is there: A way to reconcile the two approaches? Common ground? Compromise to be had?

Outcome of break out session 2 and following full group discussion
Breakout groups engaged in significant discussion on the topic of accreditation, curriculum and identity. Discussion of these topics continued in the full group session to follow. Ultimately, this session ended without clear answers to the questions posed for consideration or any other clear outcome.

Day Two: Breakout Session 1
The first session of day two focused on 1) determining what the community of degree program leaders attending the conference want to do about accreditation given that we HAD CONSENSUS regarding the 2015 Accreditation Standards and 2) why we had not done more to date.

Pre-conference survey results
With one exception, the mean response to ALL statements was above 4 on a scale of 1-5 (1=Do not support at all, 3=Can live with it, 5=Strongly support) and evidenced standard deviations well below 1 and skew and kurtosis suggesting very few outliers. The statements with the lowest associated means concern human resources primarily. The one statement with a mean lower than 4 (i.e., 3.95) was "These standards are voluntary for degree program accreditation. These standards are intended for degree programs that are face-to-face, blended/hybrid, and wholly online. While the standard language was drafted primarily for application to bachelor's degree programs, the standards language is written broadly in terms of curriculum content to allow for application in associate, bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degree programs assuming appropriately advanced learning objectives and expected levels of expertise at each higher level of degree".

Respondents were invited to share their reasons for ratings of "Do not support at all" and "Do not support" in three open-ended comment boxes—1 with respect to Scope, 1 with respect to Institutional and Administrative, and 1 with respect to Program Structure and Curriculum. The lowest rated statement noted above fell in the Scope section of the Standards. Unfortunately, the open-ended comments reveal no theme explaining the less positive ratings of this item (See all responses in Appendix H).

Comments left with respect to the Institutional and Administrative Standards were diverse reflecting concerns such as whether the same standards are appropriate for online and face-to-face programs, questioning the degree requirement for faculty, and opposing the requirement that programs have one fulltime dedicated faculty member (See all responses in Appendix H).

Comments left with respect to the Program Structure and Curriculum were largely positive—indicating support of accreditation and the Standards—however some questioned whether secondary, or program specific accreditation was necessary/appropriate among other concerns (See all responses in Appendix H).

Data analysis reveals that conference attendees are largely united behind the Standards. Now, it is up to us to consider, in our time together in the first session of day two, why we have not pursued accreditation and how we want to move forward based on the extent of consensus we have currently. Specific questions we will consider in this session include:

- Why has your program not pursued program specific-accreditation as of now?
- What needs to happen for accreditation to move forward?

Outcome of break out session 1
Prior to entering breakout groups, attendees participated in the following poll question: xxx. All but two individuals indicated they would pursue program-specific accreditation with available resources and institutional support.

Breakout groups identified a variety of reasons why their institution had not pursued program-specific accreditation as of now. The main reasons included

- Lack of awareness of the institutions intending to accredit emergency management programs,
- Not able to meet standards currently (too new or just cannot for other reasons),
- Cost,
- Available time to commit to the process,
- Differences in curriculum across programs/institutions, and
- Lack of institutional support/pressure to pursue.

Breakout groups discussed what would move accreditation forward in this context. They identified a range of things:

- National licensure for emergency managers
- People to labor in support of making it happen
- A professional association or governing body through which to pursue it that is independent of FEMA but perhaps associated with a preexisting organization and/or move toward formation of a group for the purpose of information and resource sharing (and, perhaps, one day accreditation)
- A clear identity
- Clarity about process, costs
- Voluntary, widespread endorsement of the standards
- Voluntary self-study engagement from programs
- Collaboration and networking with smaller programs

It seemed clear from the breakout groups that the institutions of conference attendees (as a whole) were not prepared to pursue accreditation currently even while conference attendees believed in program-specific accreditation themselves. A number of ideas regarding what might move accreditation forward were discussed and polls developed to assess where the group was at relative to these ideas:

- Attendees were asked if they support the 2015 accreditation standards as written—100% responded yes
- Attendees were asked if they would endorse the standards by adding their name to them—all but 1 responded yes
- Attendees were asked if they would undertake a voluntary self-study against the 2015 standards—all but 1 responded yes

Day Two: Breakout Session 2

Attendees spent the first half of day one in consideration of professional development, and they spent the latter half of day one and the first of day two in discussion of what if anything we wanted to do about defining and owning a collective identity for emergency management education, bachelor's curriculum content and accreditation. While there was no clear outcomes of day one discussions, the first session of day two resulted in agreement on a number of fronts. Session two was devoted to identifying what initiatives we wanted to pursue as a group and how.

Outcome of breakout session 2

Back to breakout sessions to discuss how to move ideas discussed across the conference to fruition. Breakout group discussion centered largely on the formation of some form of group for the purposes of pursuing collective interests further, like the topic of accreditation. Significant discussion in groups centered around aligning or embedding within a preexisting professional organization/association and/or maintaining close connection with practice if forming a group of degree program leaders. Other ideas discussed in breakout groups included creation of a repository for information and resource exchange and creation of a listserv and/or social media site to facilitate communication among degree program leaders.

Further discussion regarding the formation of an association through which to pursue these initiatives ensued in full group discussion. It was determined that there was sufficient interest within the group of attendees to meet as a flat network of degree program leaders using the title of Emergency Management Higher Education Network (EMHEN) but not, at this point, for forming a professional association.

A poll was presented to attendees asking if they would bring evidence of their self-study to a series of meetings of degree program leadership to discuss a) the appropriateness of individual evidence and b) the extent to which any standards need to be revised—all but 1 responded yes.

The group decided that it would value meeting to quarterly to discuss issues of common interest, beyond the meetings to discuss the results of the accreditation self-studies. The first meeting to follow the Conference will be devoted to discussion of institutional challenges and barriers and exchange of ideas regarding solutions.

The full group was in favor of creation of a listserv and Google Business Drive account for sharing information and resources, and Jessica Jensen of North Dakota State University agreed to set up these two platforms and share information regarding how to access and leverage each with conference attendees. She also promised to share the conference report and information regarding how to be a part of the information sharing and other activities of EMHEN with the leadership of all programs who did not attend the conference.

The conference-coordinating group agreed to identify dates for the initial quarterly meeting and initial self-study meeting. It is the coordinating group's hope that more individuals that are interested join the coordinating group to share in EMHEN decision making and planning.

Appendix A. Registered Institutions and Survey Completions

Registered Institutions: *Completed Survey List* (n=40)

Adelphi University
American Public University System
Anderson University (SC) School of Public Service & Administration
Arkansas Tech University
Barton Community College
Bellevue University
Brandon University
Caldwell Community College & Technical Institute
California State University Long Beach
Clackamas Community College
CQUniversity
Drury University
Durham Technical Community College
Elizabeth City State University
Frederick Community College, Maryland
George Washington University
Indian River State College
Ivy Tech Community College
Joint Centre for Disaster Research, Massey University, NZ
Kansas Wesleyan University
Lenoir Community College
Mercer University
Millersville University
Montgomery College (Maryland)
Northern Alberta Institute of Technology (NAIT)
North Dakota State University
Notre Dame College of Ohio
Pacific Union College
Purdue University Global
Savannah State University
SUNY Erie
Texas Southern University
Thomas Jefferson University
Truckee Meadows Community College
University at Albany
University of Alaska Fairbanks
University of Central Missouri
Utah Valley University
West Texas A&M University
Western Carolina University

Registered Institutions: *Did Not Participate in Survey* (n=8)

Clemson University
Everglades University
Forsyth Technical Community College
Lander University
Post University

Royal Roads University
Ryerson University
York University

Institutions: *Did Not Participate in Survey + Regrets due to Conflict/Registered and Had to Cancel* (n=6)

Barry University
Crown College
Northwest Missouri State
Pennsylvania Technology
University of Central Florida
Upper Iowa University

Appendix B. Program Leader Professional Development Needs
Open-ended Responses "As program administrator, describe your professional development needs that are not met currently. Examples of professional development needs could include: training sessions focused on teaching, training regarding emergency management theory, networking f

- Most of my PD needs are being met. I have a travel budget that allows me to attend our state Emergency Management association meetings to network with practitioners to ensure our program stays current and relevant.
- Professional development opportunities abound. The time to take advantage of those is not as available although the shift to distance meeting with the pandemic response promises to help with that.
- Technical Delivery Support for recently installed Audio Visual systems for online delivery is somewhat lacking.
- There are some areas that more information sharing would be greatly beneficial including grant opportunities, collaborative educational and training opportunities, networking across different disciplines involved in emergency management
- I feel that there are many professional development options available, time is often an issue. I would like to see more user friendly options for teaching third party credentialed trade courses as well as options for certification in task book areas while teaching still
- Information exchange.
- Training for remote learners Networking for collaboration
- Resource sharing/information exchange grant opportunities
- Aligning PSI education across Canada relevant to this field. Right now it is a "free for all" with little guidance and oversight, impacting its credibility as a unique, standalone profession.
- I am interested in training regarding emergency management theory, curriculum building, networking for the purposes of collaboration and resource sharing. Also grant opportunities.
- Learning about grant opportunities; cooperative learning between students at multiple institutions
- none
- Learning about grant opportunities and collaboration
- Networking for collaboration; Cooperative learning between students at multiple institutions; Wish for more opportunities to connect my faculty with other EM faculty
- The professional development gaps I experienced were more important when I began chairing the department 15 years ago. Combined with a lack of institutional planning in general it has made developing the program a very ad hoc affair.
- Networking with peers to share research interests, teaching successes, and cooperative research and teaching.
- learning about grant opportunities, alumni relationship building, program marketing for students recruitment
- resource sharing; grants and funding; Cooperative learning between students at multiple institutions   keeping a balance between research and practice
- No issues
- Needs are being met
- At this time our needs are met. In the future we may need assistance in connecting FEMA guidance and current practices into our current curriculum.
- I would say our biggest downfall being able to provide training for our instructors that will enhance their courses. Topics like academic integrity, open educational resources and course assessment are hot button topics for our department. We could always use more PD in networking for collaboration/resource sharing as well.

- networking for the purposes of collaboration, resource sharing, and information exchange, learning about grant opportunities, alumni relationship building,
- Alumni relationship building, maintaining concept consistency across courses and faculty.
- How to create micro-credentials and certification programs that link academic and practitioner communities.
- Networking Curriculum development Grant writing Alumni relationship development
- My primary need is a repository of emergency management theory in order to keep up to date on new developments/theories. It would be good to have something like that for best practices in emergency management, as well, possibly through an information exchange SharePoint.
- Networking for the purpose of collaboration, resource sharing, cooperative learning between students at multiple institutions, learning about grant opportunities
- Time Mgn.   I direct 3 programs and it is hard to have the time to even fill our surveys. Grant Writing
- Teacher training sessions for both in-person and virtual classes; Information about grant information;
- N/A
- Teaching (focused on today's student); grant opportunities
- training regarding emergency management theory, networking for the purposes of collaboration -- in the area of teaching, not research
- In my opinion, we lack training in grant opportunities that would be available for our program. Being a hands-on program for several of our degrees, I find that we are overrun with education-only-minded people that do not understand the needs of the public safety students and employers.
- Networking/Collaboration, Grant Opportunities, Technology in Emergency Management, Computer Softwares for Chemicals and Nuclear release projections and exposures/Vulnerabilities and Hazards training.
- resource sharing
- All of the above examples are not met
- N/A

Appendix C. Faculty Professional Development Needs
Open-ended Responses to "Describe the professional development needs of your faculty that are not met currently."

- I would love to attend national level conferences but our program's size/budget doesn't allow for that yet.
- FCC offers considerable professional development for full time and adjunct faculty. Access to faculty at other institutions would be most welcome.
- Training for Audio Visual support. Our eCampus is currently stretched due to COVID to support one on one time with adjuncts and those who are new to teaching.
- networking for grant and collaborative opportunities, student faculty research and exchange opportunities
- see above
- Cast Studies that can be used in the classes.
- Training for remote learners Networking for collaboration
- All of our faculty are part time and most are still employed in the EM field and obtain professional development through other avenues. The college provides many opportunities in regard to online course development, Quality Matters, student engagement, so we do not have immediate needs.
- Our Faculty is completely supported. No concerns.
- Understanding emergency management theory.
- Unless a professor is still in the field, continual degree specific training is lacking.
- none
- Funding opportunities are limited
- Opportunities for connecting with other EM faculty   Opportunities for presenting
- Our ability to take sabbaticals is hampered by our small department size which is insufficient on a regular basis to meet our teaching demands. Plus our comparatively small enrollment makes accessing term contracts difficult though filling them with qualified academics is even harder
- The majority of faculty do not attend professional conferences because of cost of travel and time obligations. Need closer or cheaper conference opportunities.
- Training regarding emergency management theory, networking for the purposes of collaboration, resource sharing, and information exchange.
- We have a lot of teaching and educational training support right now but not enough bandwidth to build a great research agenda. Constricted budgets lead to limited full-time faculty positions so teaching is the priority especially during covid.
- None
- Just in time training for certificate programs
- At this time our needs are met. In the future we may need assistance in connecting FEMA guidance and current practices into our current curriculum.
- Same as above, and I'd say there is training on all of the topics but we could definitely do better.
- networking for the purposes of collaboration, resource sharing, and information exchange, learning about grant opportunities, alumni relationship building,
- Increasing student engagement with hybrid and online formats while maintaining transfer of the same level of knowledge as on-site format.
- More interaction with field operatives in order to focus research potential on critical issues
- EM Currency Networking with EM professionals
- The foremost need is a conduit for sharing information on best practices and theories pertaining to emergency management.
- networking for the purpose of collaboration, resource sharing, and information sharing

- Conference attendance and paper presentations.
- N/A
- Teaching today's student; EM topics I think they do a good job staying current.
- new technologies
- We have a hard time funding memberships in various professional organizations. We also find that there is minimal funding for staff to attend new training because it does not "fit" the college thinking on what training are needed now.
- Technology: computer softwares and applied games for exercises.
- training sessions focused on teaching
- Nothing is currently provided them. All the adjunct faculty are on their own for any conference or professional development they would like.
- N/A

Appendix D. Data analysis related to Doctoral Points of Consensus v.2 Statements

Statements	Valid N	Missing N	Mean	SD	Skew	Kurtosis	Min	Max
Avoid monolithic representations of emergency management as practiced only by government which may limit the ways in which students understand the field and view their career options	39	0	4.56	0.55	-0.76	-0.49	3	5
Educate future emergency management professionals in a manner that will benefit them wherever they enter the broad profession	39	0	4.90	0.31	-2.73	5.72	4	5
Educate those throughout society who perform tasks and activities related to emergency management outside of the profession	39	0	4.49	0.51	0.05	-2.10	4	5
Educate students based on the integration and synthesis of hazards and disaster scholarship and research	39	0	4.56	0.68	-1.30	0.46	3	5
Collect, analyze, integrate, synthesize literature related to hazards, vulnerabilities, and resulting events	39	0	4.67	0.53	-1.29	0.75	3	5
Generate new knowledge through original research and critical assessment of existing hazards and disaster literature	39	0	4.59	0.60	-1.16	0.43	3	5
Promote the dissemination, application, and utilization of the results of original research	38	1	4.47	0.65	-0.85	-0.27	3	5
Seek to foster the utilization of research findings and to the extent possible foster practical application of research findings	39	0	4.59	0.64	-1.32	0.69	3	5
Make the results of our research available and accessible in form, format, and forum to multiple audiences	39	0	4.64	0.54	-1.14	0.34	3	5
Collaborate with those working in the profession so that theory shapes practice and practice shapes theory	39	0	4.77	0.48	-2.03	3.64	3	5
Seek to influence policy	39	0	4.31	0.69	-0.50	-0.77	3	5
Advocate for a culture of shared responsibility	39	0	4.51	0.56	-0.54	-0.80	3	5
Foster the legitimacy and development of the academic discipline and profession of emergency management	39	0	4.72	0.46	-1.01	-1.04	4	5
Major areas where an emergency management career can be pursued include government, nonprofits, and the private sector in domestic and international contexts.	39	0	4.78	0.41	-1.52	0.32	4	5
Students must pursue professional development opportunities (e.g., training, certification) and opportunities to gain direct, hands-on management experience, beyond their degree, to be competitive in attaining emergency management jo	39	0	4.67	0.53	-1.29	0.75	3	5
The professional development and experience students would ideally pursue to complement their emergency management education varies depending on where the student desires a career.	39	0	4.23	0.71	-0.36	-0.88	3	5

Statement	N		Mean	SD			Min	Max
Emergency management programs would be wise to sensitize their students who desire an emergency management career to the importance of ongoing professional development and the opportunities for different career areas.	39	0	4.54	0.64	-1.09	0.16	3	5
Higher education programs are not alone responsible for the professional development of their emergency management students.	39	0	4.49	0.76	-1.49	1.95	2	5
Programs ought to inform students of the responsibility they bear for their professional development.	39	0	4.56	0.64	-1.20	0.41	3	5
Emergency management programs should not conceive of themselves solely as professional preparatory programs.	39	0	4.39	0.63	-0.52	-0.57	3	5
==It would not be possible for degree programs to address each of the professional development needs related to the range of emergency management careers within the auspices of a single higher education program at any level.==	==39==	==0==	==4.18==	==0.97==	==-1.11==	==0.38==	==2==	==5==
Professional development may be part of higher education program curricula to varying degrees and manifest in different ways, related to different career areas.	38	1	4.34	0.63	-0.40	-0.59	3	5
There is an opportunity and need for increased partnerships between higher education programs in emergency management and organizations offering emergency management training.	39	0	4.72	0.56	-1.91	2.87	3	5
Higher education programs owe students the opportunity to learn about the significant, substantive, and topically varied body of scholarship and research that would benefit them in all emergency management career paths.	38	1	4.47	0.65	-0.85	-0.27	3	5
Assisting students in building the following skills is obligatory on the part of higher education programs: verbal communications, written communications, interpersonal communication, group communication, network building and stakeholder engagement…	39	0	4.82	0.39	-1.74	1.07	4	5
Present and define emergency management as a profession and an academic discipline when setting the theoretical framework for our courses.	39	0	4.54	0.56	-0.65	-0.67	3	5
Ground the courses we teach in the integration and synthesis of scholarship stemming from multiple disciplines.	39	0	4.56	0.72	-1.36	0.41	3	5
==Build course content around scholarship and using doctrine and policy as complements or supplements.==	==39==	==0==	==4.18==	==0.76==	==-0.70==	==0.38==	==2==	==5==
Engage practitioners and key stakeholders in our courses.	38	1	4.76	0.43	-1.29	-0.36	4	5
Identify service learning opportunities that benefit both students and practice.	39	0	4.64	0.49	-0.61	-1.72	4	5
Promote internships that allow students to develop skills and additional knowledge related to the sector in which they desire a career	39	0	4.67	0.48	-0.74	-1.54	4	5

Item	N	Missing	Mean	Std. Dev.	Skewness	Kurtosis	Min	Max
Explore the pedagogical and curricular uniqueness of our discipline particularly as related to building verbal communications, written communications, interpersonal communication, group communication, network building and stakeholder engagement, analytical	39	0	4.67	0.48	-0.74	-1.54	4	5
Reflect on and exploring disciplinary implications derived from educating both students in, or seeking careers in, emergency management and students who do not intend a career in emergency management.	38	1	4.32	0.62	-0.32	-0.57	3	5
Introduce the students we teach to the role of training and education and differences between the two.	39	0	4.28	0.72	-0.49	-0.911	3	5
Sensitize the students we teach to their personal role in their own ongoing professional development.	39	0	4.59	0.64	-1.32	0.69	3	5
Conduct research in accordance with the October 2015 Draft Research Standards for the Academic Discipline of Emergency Management.	37	2	4.11	0.61	-.06	-0.21	3	5
Explore research questions that are important to emergency management practice, broadly defined.	38	1	4.47	0.56	-0.39	-0.92	3	5
Include practitioners and key stakeholders in our research processes where appropriate.	38	1	4.50	0.56	-0.49	-0.83	3	5
Attend practitioner conferences and pursuing offers to present at those conferences where appropriate and possible.	38	1	4.42	0.68	-1.31	2.74	2	5
Increase the depth and breadth of our understanding of emergency management research.	38	1	4.55	0.56	-0.72	-0.55	3	5
Being active in shaping the body of knowledge and how it is understood.	38	1	4.55	0.60	-0.10	0.08	3	5
Incorporate students into our research processes and promoting their involvement in research within our departments.	38	1	4.47	0.73	-1.02	-0.29	3	5
Apply research in our practice to the extent possible given the context in which we work.	38	1	4.42	0.60	-0.48	-0.60	3	5
Invite emergency management scholars to support the development and delivery of training.	39	0	4.44	0.72	-0.89	-0.48	3	5
Promote the value of an emergency management education as a complement to relevant training and experience.	39	0	4.67	0.478	-0.74	-1.54	4	5
Support mutually beneficial relationships between the organizations in which we work and schools (e.g., research opportunities, internships, training opportunities for students, suggest opportunities for service learning projects, present in classes).	39	0	4.69	0.47	-0.87	-1.32	4	5
Invite students and faculty to participate in exercises, planning efforts, hazard, risk, and vulnerability assessments, and after action reviews.	39	0	4.74	0.50	-1.81	2.66	3	5

Mentor students interested in emergency management careers.	39	0	4.69	0.52	-1.44	1.25	3	5
Promote student involvement in every setting in which we work.	39	0	4.41	0.68	-1.26	2.68	2	5
Allow emergency management researchers to conduct research on your jurisdiction's emergency management activities.	38	1	4.47	0.65	-0.85	-0.27	3	5

Appendix E. Alternative Documents Guiding Design of Curriculum Content
Open-ended Responses "Please describe any alternative document(s) that guide the design of your
WHOLE or OVERALL curriculum content and/or program learning objectives if not one of the two
documents above."

- These two documents are great and I will likely use them to evaluate our program moving forward. I didn't have these when I built our program and I went solely off of experience and knowledge of NC specific needs in EM.
- None come to mind.
- we incorporate industry credentials as well as the next generation competencies
- N/a
- Our EDMG and Fire Science programs are guided by our specialty accreditation, International Fire Service Assembly Congress (IFSAC) as well as following FEMA's suggested curriculum.
- Various literature and other EM programs
- NA
- Canada has a National Framework for Emergency Management that has been agreed to by all levels of government. We incorporate its principles into our teaching within the Canadian context. I imagine those teaching in other countries would do the same.
- NFPA 1600
- None
- Collaborating with other institutions of higher ed. and key stakeholders in our community.
- Advisory Committees drive the design of our curriculum and overall content.
- Comprehensive Emergency Management: A Governor's Guide (1979); a range of foundational emergency management documents and general management theory and conceptual research.
- None
- N/A
- NA
- Program was developed with input from North Carolina Emergency Management and local EMs.
- We rely on several sources.
- Just a comment: Emergency Management programs are lacking a strong basis on Vulnerability and Hazards Analysis. How can you be an EM professional without the most basic tool to develop a Comprehensive Emergency Management Program? Too much history and social sciences and vey little on the V/Hazards/Risk Assessments. Need to expand on the sciences and technology.
- N/A

Appendix F. Data Analysis related to 2015 Emergency Management Accreditation Standards

Statement	Valid N	Missing N	Mean	SD	Skew	Kurtosis	Min	Max
These standards are voluntary for degree program accreditation. These standards are intended for degree programs that are face-to-face, blended/hybrid, and wholly online. While the standard language was drafted primarily for application to bachelor's degree…	38	1	3.95	0.80	-0.23	-0.61	2	5
1.1 Institution: In the United States, the institution must be accredited by a regional or national accrediting body approved by the US Department of Education. In the case of foreign universities, the institution is accredited by a generally accepted…	36	3	4.39	0.73	-0.77	-0.68	3	5
1.2 Facilities and Other Resources: The institution provides program specific services to support the programs mission where needed (e.g., if the program has an EOC, then support for maintaining and equipping the EOC is provided by the institution).	37	2	4.32	0.67	-0.48	-0.67	3	5
1.3 Office Space: Office space shall be provided for program faculty and the program coordinator. An area for private and group meetings is provided. Instructional space, technology, and materials are provided, maintained, and updated consistent…	37	2	4.41	0.76	-1.25	1.40	2	5
1.4 Equipment and Supplies: Equipment and supplies to support office operations is provided as appropriate to support faculty responsibilities and effectively accomplish program objectives and goals given program delivery model.	38	1	4.42	0.64	-0.66	-0.48	2	5
1.5 Technical Support: Technical support for instructional technologies is provided as appropriate to help faculty meet their responsibilities and effectively accomplish program objectives and goals given program delivery models.	38	1	4.50	0.60	-0.78	-0.31	3	5
1.6 Library: The program will work with the library to make available emergency management scholarly journals and books to students and faculty. The library shall make these journals and books easily accessible to students and faculty given the delivery…	38	1	4.61	0.55	-0.97	-0.08	3	5
1.7 Program: The program provides clear, consistent, and reliable information to the public regarding: a. A statement of purpose that conveys the focus of the degree being offered as emergency management for standards to apply. b. Orientation of program…	38	1	4.40	0.64	-0.57	-0.55	3	5
1.8 Organization: The institution clearly identifies the program and its organizational structure including its location and relationship within the broader institution. The program faculty shall determine the program's design and development, implement…	38	1	4.29	0.87	-0.88	-0.34	2	5

Standard	N	Missing	Mean	Std. Dev.	Skewness	Kurtosis	Min	Max
1.9 Budget: The program coordinator must have influence in the formal budget process relative to the degree program in accordance with the institution's policy and procedures. The program's budget should provide adequate funding to accomplish the…	37	2	4.43	0.77	-1.33	1.54	2	5
1.10 Human Resources: 1.10.1 Program Faculty The program shall have a sufficient number of faculty to implement program objectives. The program must have at least one full time faculty member teaching in the program. The program coordinator and…	38	1	4.13	0.99	-1.16	1.29	1	5
1.10: Human Resources: 1.10.2 Full-time Faculty Qualifications Full-time faculty shall have academic and/or professional experience appropriate to their areas of responsibility. Full-time faculty shall participate in relevant professional and/or…	38	1	4.29	0.73	-0.52	-0.93	3	5
1.10: Human Resources: 1.10.3 Adjunct Faculty Qualifications Adjunct faculty teaching degree courses have emergency management related education, training, and experience. In addition: For associate degree programs, adjunct or part-time instructors should…	38	1	4.16	1.03	-1.28	1.33	1	5
1.10 Human Resources: 1.10.4 Administrative Assistance Administrative support (including the preparation and processing of materials, correspondence, and records) is provided…	38	1	4.13	0.84	-0.55	-0.61	2	5
1.11 Program Assessment: The program maintains an ongoing process, documented in written procedures, for assessing achievement of program learning outcomes. The program uses input from various groups (for example, enrolled students, faculty members…	37	2	4.41	0.64	-0.62	-0.52	3	5
2.1 The program has defined program learning outcomes for the degree. Example: Demonstrate identification of learning outcomes (e.g., Emergency Management higher education outcomes or curriculum map).	38	1	4.58	0.55	-0.84	-0.34	3	5
2.2 The curriculum is reflected in a written degree plan. Example: Provide a copy of the most current degree plan or the degree audit checklist used in the past five years.	38	1	4.40	0.60	-0.38	-0.64	3	5
2.3 Course learning objectives, consistent across sections and offerings, have been established for each course reflected in the degree plan and support the program learning outcomes regardless of delivery mode. Example: Course learning objectives are…	38	1	4.55	0.56	-0.72	-0.55	3	5
2.4 Each course in the degree plan has a syllabus. Example: Provide current syllabi for both required and elective courses in the program.	38	1	4.71	0.52	-1.58	1.73	3	5
2.5 The curriculum follows a logical sequence that begins with foundational content and progresses to more complex and in-depth content. Example: Demonstrate the sequence of courses from	38	1	4.45	0.83	-1.63	2.35	2	5

introductory and prerequisite courses to more advanced courses…								
2.6 The program maintains an ongoing process, documented in written procedures, to assess achievement of course and program learning outcomes and to improve curriculum, course content, and instructional delivery. Example: Demonstrate existence of …	38	1	4.37	0.68	-0.61	-0.62	3	5
2.7 The program uses input from internal and external constituencies to develop and implement strategies to improve curriculum, course content, and instructional delivery. Example: Demonstrate the use of exit surveys, focus groups, advisory boards, or…	38	1	4.40	0.64	-0.57	-0.55	3	5
2.8 Program assessment data is available to the public upon request. Example: Demonstrate data results from institutional research (e.g., program assessment data findings, graduation rates, completion rates, job placements, or job market data).	38	1	4.24	0.71	-0.39	-0.92	3	5
2.9 Courses in the curriculum are grounded on the basis of significant, substantive research in both classical and current topic area(s).Example: Ensure syllabi include a list of recommended and required readings.	38	1	4.37	0.68	-0.61	-0.62	3	5
2.10 The curriculum addresses topics that benefit students pursuing a wide variety of career paths in emergency management. Example: Ensure public, private, non-governmental, and other sectors are covered within the curriculum (e.g., internships, readings,	38	1	4.58	0.55	-0.84	-0.34	3	5

Appendix G. Open-ended Data Related to Lack of Support for Scope, Institution and Administrative, and Program Objectives and Curriculum Standards

Open-ended Responses to "Should you have not supported or strongly disagreed with the content/standards outlined in SCOPE, please describe why and/or the changes that would need to be made for your opinion to change."

- NA
- I continue to question the validity of accreditation bodies based upon past experience.
- I think that we would want to make something such as this mandatory as opposed to voluntary especially as one of the readings showing how EDMG is now an accepted academic and professional discipline.
- Supported
- NA
- Two main concerns: Having just finished a year of online teaching I believe the assumption that face to face and on-line programs can be treated as the same does not reflect the significant pedagogical challenges of each. Secondly I do not believe it is appropriate to expect graduate and higher degrees to be as broad as an undergraduate degree. Both of these factors are currently confusing students, institutions and employers who don't see clear differences between the levels of EM higher education or the form of content delivery.
- None
- n/a
- Being that it's a guidance document for Associate's programs it is different for us.
- Too little requirement for management theory and practical application, with bachelor students unprepared for a wide range of professional opportunities
- Note: Our PhD program is far more theoretical than our other degrees. I am cautious about a blanket statement which lumps all together.
- NA
- N/A
- NA
- I have no opinion at this time
- Refer to Question 12.
- N/A
- N/A

Open-ended Responses to "Should you have not supported or strongly disagreed with the content/standards outlined in INSTITUTION AND ADMINISTRATIVE, please describe why and/or the changes that would need to be made for your opinion to change."

- While I support, I do have a comment. For small programs, the faculty may be required to wear multiple hats to make the program work. For example, I'm the dean of our entire public safety division but our EM program is so brand new that I'm the sole faculty member right now and it's been added to my duties. If we had to have a separate, designated faculty member our program would not be viable right now.
- It's a personal matter. As program manager I could not also be full time faculty. I am full time program manager and I teach but carrying 30 credits per year would leave little time for the program development.
- I think any time that an outside organization starts to dictate to much, especially in terms of funding it jeopardizes the creative abilities for school to start or maintain programs. These areas

have to be approached very carefully. i.e. totally online program does that faculty even come on campus to need an office space? I felt other statements had similar holes in them

- Smaller institution will not have the resources, space or personnel to support many of the standards. Also, due the field being new as it relates to graduate degrees some faculty may not have the degrees but the lived experiences with other degrees outside of emergency management. This will close the door on many practitioners from the academy.
- There is no recognized accrediting body for this in Canada. IAEM Canada is weak and poorly understood here, and has no power or obvious desire to provide this oversight, and leaving it in the hands of the provinces and territories will keep it in its para-military, response focused (only) form
- I disagree with the educational requirements for full-time instructors. As we are in compliance with the HLC, all of our instructors have to have a master's degree in the discipline or a discipline that is related along with at least 5 years experience in the field. In our graduate programs, all full-time instructors must have a terminal degree in the discipline or related discipline with at least 5 years experience in the field. This also applies to adjunct faculty members.
- agreed
- NA
- I feel all of these expectations are valid if properly contextualized to the institution and the intent of the program.
- None
- n/a
- Do not hold adjuncts to a degree requirement, instead work with them to ensure acceptable learning goals and objectives and pedagogy. Adjuncts with exceptional skills and experience often do not have advanced degrees.
- NA
- N/A
- NA
- Our university has cut the library funding and access to peer -reviewed journals-e.g. not a good place to cut corners!
- At this time I'm rather non-committed until I see more development.
- n/a
- N/A

Open-ended Responses to "Should you have not supported or strongly disagreed with the content/standards outlined in PROGRAM OBJECTIVES AND CURRICULUM STRUCTURE, please describe why and/or the changes that would need to be made for your opinion to change."

- I agree with it. It seems to be a very straightforward process that aligns with processes used by other accreditors.
- Agree wholeheartedly with all of this.
- Again, not entirely on board with a formal accreditation process specific to HS or EM based on involvement to date on these topics.
- I am good with the overall idea just hesitant on some details that might suppress new ideas.
- I agree that we need oversight, so that we can create more consistent standards across education programs and also so we can make some progress towards recognition as a credible, standalone discipline. This will influence the development of appropriate job profiles and NOC codes, so

that the right people get access to the right jobs, with the right knowledge and skill sets to actually do the work

- I agree with the standards. They are actually aligned with the accreditation standards of IFSAC; however, IFSAC has a lot more standards.
- I agree with the programs needing to be accredited; I do not necessarily believe they need to be accredited in emergency management.
- Great extent
- Agree wholeheartedly
- As long as it can be aligned with the institution's or other accrediting body's process then this is fine.
- agree
- I agree.
- Clackamas Community College is proud to have achieved and maintained formal accreditation through the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU). Our community college is recognized as an institution with high standards for performance, integrity and quality to merit the confidence of the educational community and the public.   This accreditation, from an independent, nonprofit organization recognized by the U.S. Department of Education, represents our voluntary and conscientious commitment to quality assurance and institutional improvement.
- We are an accredited institution. I agree that all institutions of higher ed should be as well.
- Needs work on core content to assure students in Bachelor programs are qualified beyond entry level emergency management jobs (which are relatively scarce).
- Accreditation needs to be a painless but positive learning experience for an organization. It should not be a cash scheme and inspector general the way many accreditation process are currently.
- Overall, I agree and support. Our program was initially created as associate degree in Emergency Services over 10 years ago. Five years ago, the program added a bachelors degree in Emergency Services. We have shifted toward a BS in Emergency Management and are continuing to move our curriculum in that direction. None of our current faculty hold a doctorate. That will be our largest hurdle.
- I agree or can live with most of the recommended accreditation processes and procedures. The exception is 2.5, which will likely be very difficult for emerging (new) programs, and small to mid-sized programs to accomplish given the financial and staffing constraints, as well as the programs' students' financial and academic schedule constraints.
- NA
- Since we are accredited by SAC I personally do not see a need for a secondary accreditation process. I also complete CIR reports each year (continuous improvement reports) and we submit ourselves for program review. I am not pleased with the thoughts of additional reviews etc. I can't keep all the balls in the air as it is. Should a specific EDM accreditation occur, I would have to participate because I would not want to not appear to be non supportive-or our program not be accredited by any legitimate mechanism. I just see this as redundancy-again because our university is accredited. I hope I am not sounding negative here:).
- Support
- I agree that there should be some form of accreditation. My issue is insuring that accreditation is something feasible for a community college.
- Agree with reference to Q 12

- agree
- They need to also address teaching load for those faculty that are required to teach and research. In addition, it would make more sense for this accreditation process to be able to be incorporated within IFSAC so that duel mission/multiple ES/EM programs can have one according body that is well established and recognized. This would also allow for great crossover of certifications and training. Like it or not, the fire service is often the lead in EM, in many jurisdictions this is not nor will not change due to budgeting and resources. Merging the services more within the IFSAC umbrella seems to make sense.

Appendix H. Suggested Conference Agenda Additions

Open-ended Responses to "The conference coordinating group collaboratively designed this first conference agenda for the purposes of bringing us together as a community for discussion. We welcome additional thoughts as to what the conference might usefully cover that are not …"

- While I see the value of a professional consensus on what a course of study in EM would entail, I would not like to see all programs be identical. There is value in specializing and diversifying within the discipline. For example, not every program needs a drone certification option or a debris removal or haz mat exercise grounds but these should be available to students at several locations for transfer credit.
- We simply appreciate the opportunity to participate within this forum.   Sean and Cam
- thank you for the work
- I would like to see a North American initiative on this - not just a US based vs. Canada based. We use the same models and have the same goal and I look forward to working together.
- I am good with the agenda.
- Promotion of diversity and inclusion Understanding variations for MSIs and underrepresented student/faculty population
- Keep going!
- I welcome this opportunity to engage with my academic colleagues. I hope we can see a future where the distinction between emergency management practitioners and academics is just a matter of where they work and we, as academics, should be extending an open hand to the practitioner community to collaborate on eliminating any other perceived differences. Nobody wonders if an architecture prof is an architect and that doesn't limit their programs to being viewed as "solely as professional preparatory programs"
- None
- none at this time
- A more purposeful focus on establishing emergency management as a recognized, established profession.
- As one who helped develop the agenda, I am biased. I believe the coordinating group triaged the topics well and are providing beneficial opportunities for collaboration given the existing time constraints.
- Again, I direct three programs and am just killed on obligations/time/administrative work. This makes me nervous about what extra I can give. As our program grows I am sure things will settle a bit.   I even thought about pulling our of the conference because of all the administrative duties having to be addressed. ...Crossing fingers for more help from university. Thank you.
- N/A
- No
- n/a
- N/A