

PERSEREC 

Technical Report 04-1
January 2004

Preferences and Priorities for Professional Development in the Security Workforce: A Report of the Professional Development Survey

Alissa J. Kramen

Northrop Grumman Mission Systems

Lynn F. Fischer

Defense Personnel Security Research Center

Research Supported by
Joint Security Training Consortium

Research Conducted by
Defense Personnel Security Research Center

Approved for Public Distribution:
Distribution Unlimited.

**Preferences and Priorities for Professional Development in the Security
Workforce: A Report of the Professional Development Survey**

Alissa J. Kramen
Northrop Grumman Mission Systems

Lynn F. Fischer
Defense Personnel Security Research Center

Released by
James A. Riedel

Defense Personnel Security Research Center
99 Pacific Street, Suite 455-E
Monterey, CA 93940-2497

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				FORM APPROVED OMB No. 0704-0188	
The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 26-January-2004		2. REPORT TYPE Technical		3. DATES COVERED (From - To) April 2003-December 2003	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Preferences and Priorities for Professional Development in the Security Workforce: A Report of the Professional Development Survey				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) Alissa J. Kramen Lynn F. Fischer				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER TR 04-1	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Joint Security Training Consortium 1755 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 901 Arlington, VA 22202				10. SPONSORING/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S) JSTC	
				11. SPONSORING/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT The Defense Personnel Security Research Center (PERSEREC) developed and implemented the Professional Development Survey on behalf the Joint Security Training Consortium (JSTC). The purpose of this research was to assess the views of the general security workforce concerning the state of the profession and the need for training and professional development programs. Previous PERSEREC research examined the opinions of high-level security managers from five sectors of the federal security workforce (military departments, Defense agencies, intelligence community agencies, and non-DoD agencies). The present report summarizes the results of general survey data from security practitioners at all grade levels in the Department but believe there is currently little uniformity among training programs. Contrary to manager expectations, practitioners support the use of certification as a requirement for advancement. Results of this study will be useful in evaluating and improving security training and development programs.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS Professional Development Survey Certification JSTC Training					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF: Unlimited Distribution			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 38	19a. NAME OF REPOSIBLE PERSON James A. Riedel, Director
a. REPORT Unclassified	b. ABSTRACT Unclassified	c. THIS PAGE Unclassified			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include area code) 831-657-3000

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 8/98)
Prescribed by ANSI Std. Z39.18

Preface

This report presents the findings of a study undertaken for the Joint Security Training Consortium (JSTC). The purpose of this research was to assess the views of the general security workforce concerning the state of the profession and the need for training and professional development programs. Previous Defense Personnel Security Research Center (PERSEREC) research examined the opinions of high-level security managers from five sectors of the federal security workforce (military departments, Defense agencies, intelligence community agencies, and non-DoD agencies). The present report summarizes the results of general survey data from security practitioners at all grade levels in the Department of Defense. Results of this study will be useful in evaluating and improving security training and development programs.

James A. Riedel
Director

Executive Summary

The Professional Development Survey was designed by the Defense Personnel Security Research Center (PERSEREC) to assess the state of the security profession and to learn about practitioner views of the adequacy of professional training and need for professional development programs. This report is a follow-up to previous reports by the PERSEREC research team containing the views of headquarters-level security managers, policymakers, and human resource specialists. Information from previous reports was collected via interviews and focus groups from five sectors of the federal security workforce: military departments, Defense agencies, intelligence community agencies, and non-DoD agencies. The Professional Development Survey reflects the views of DoD civilian employees of all levels, including individuals in the DoD intelligence community. Similar survey efforts in FY04 will focus on the non-DoD intelligence agencies and other federal departments that employ significant numbers of security professionals.

Information obtained in previously conducted focus groups was used to assist the research team in selecting items for inclusion in the survey. Letters were sent to 9,000 security practitioners holding security-relevant Office of Personnel Management (OPM) occupational codes for civilian government employees (e.g., code 1810, general investigator) requesting their participation in this research project. Participants completed and submitted the survey on the Joint Security Training Consortium (JSTC) Web site. Reminder letters were later sent to all those who did not initially complete the survey, resulting in the eventual participation of over 3,000 individuals.

Survey results showed a clear consensus regarding the following issues:

- Working as a security professional is rewarding and most professionals are committed to a long-term career in security.
- Cross-disciplinary experience is desirable for training and development.
- Security practitioners believe they need a professional development program, which should include certification.
- Certification should include a grandfathering provision to give credit for relevant past work experience.

There were mixed findings concerning several other areas. Additional research would be required to understand the reasons for differences of opinion concerning:

- The current state of morale and mobility within the security profession. There were no systematic differences by organization or discipline. However, those in occupational code 1810 (general investigator) did have somewhat lower levels of morale than persons with other occupational codes.
- The current level of access to training and the level of funding and staff replacement available for training.
- The role that experience and standardized testing should play in certification.

Results of this study will provide a basis for planning training and professional development programs. Many of the results were consistent with findings from earlier interviews with security managers, including positive outlooks on professional development and cross-disciplinary experience. Although practitioners were enthusiastic regarding certification as a requirement for advancement, managers seemed to have reservations.

A number of the areas seemed to lack consensus, such as the current level of morale, mobility, and access to training. Such inconsistency reinforces the need for uniformity in training and development programs. In addition, respondents disagreed about the role of experience and standardized testing in certification. The reasons behind practitioner preferences are unknown and require additional questioning of security professionals.

The Professional Development Survey identified many of the needs for training and development programs. These findings can now be used to further develop, plan and implement programs that answer the needs and interests of security practitioners. Such programs can be uniformly implemented in order to secure fair and effective training and development for the security workforce.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Purpose	1
Methodology	2
Results	3
Characteristics of Respondents	3
The Security Profession	7
Training and Experience	9
Professional Development Programs	9
Conclusions	12
Implications	12
Next Steps	12
References	14
Appendix A: Professional Development Survey	A-1
Appendix B: Invitation Letter	B-1

List of Tables

1. Characteristics of Respondents	4
2. Responses to Survey Items Addressing the Security Profession	8
3. Responses to the Item “Morale is good within the security profession” by Occupational Code	8
4. Responses to Survey Items Addressing Training and Experience	10
5. Responses to Survey Items Addressing Professional Development Programs	11

Introduction

The Joint Security Training Consortium (JSTC) was formed to develop programs and policies for the training and development of individuals in the security profession. This includes improving skill and career development for security professionals from all organizations and disciplines.

The current state and future requirements of training and development in the security profession are unclear and need to be better understood in order to create improvement. The current perception of morale, mobility, and access to training among security practitioners varies from organization to organization. It appears as though there is little uniformity in access and types of training available. Given the importance of the security occupation, it is necessary that adequate and uniform training and development systems be in place. In addition, it is not known whether such initiatives would be well received by security practitioners and met with voluntary participation. The necessary specific requirements of such programs need to be determined based on the informed opinions of security practitioners.

Two previous studies (Fischer, 2002; Marshall-Mies & Fischer, 2003) provided preliminary information prior to the current study. The first study was based on interviews with headquarters-level officials, including top security and human resource management personnel. The second provided the basis for items in the Professional Development Survey. This study consisted of focus groups of security practitioners at all levels, with a particular emphasis on nonmanagerial practitioners. The current survey serves to compare the views of practitioners with those of managers previously studied.

The previous studies showed that security managers felt there is a clear need for professional development programs. Although their opinions varied, managers were generally skeptical about the low resources available to institute such programs and about workforce willingness to participate in such programs as certification. Most managers in intelligence agencies acknowledged recognizing the existence a need for training programs, as well as a problem with retention of security professionals.

Purpose

The Defense Personnel Security Research Center (PERSEREC) developed and administered the Professional Development Survey for JSTC. This survey was designed to investigate the state of the security profession and to provide guidance for improvement. This study (1) investigates how security practitioners view the security profession, (2) explores security practitioners' attitudes concerning options for training and professional development, and (3) gathers views about certification and how a certification program might be implemented.

Methodology

Survey items were intended to capture the views of security professionals and to identify areas of concern. Items were developed based on interviews with security managers (Fischer, 2002) and results of focus groups sessions (Fischer, 2002; Marshall-Mies & Fischer, 2000). Draft survey items were then reviewed by security professionals and PERSEREC staff. Input from reviewers was used to fine-tune questionnaire items for the final draft of the survey. The final survey instrument was posted on the JSTC Web site so that respondents would be able to easily access and complete the survey. An electronic file was automatically created as respondents submitted their input, facilitating easy data retrieval and analysis by the research team.

The survey instrument consisted of four sections. Section I gathered demographic data from respondents (e.g., gender, age, organization, Office of Personnel Management (OPM) occupational code, primary security role, time spent performing security functions, grade level, years of experience, and expected years remaining in the security profession). Section II consisted of 10 statements designed to gather views about the security profession (e.g., commitment to the field, current state of morale, and perceived opportunity for mobility). Section III examined subjects' attitudes concerning current access to training, the need for cross-disciplinary experience, and the role of training in competence evaluation. Section IV assessed subjects' opinions concerning the need for professional development programs, their willingness to participate in certification, and the role that experience should play in certification. Items in Sections II, III, and IV of the questionnaire were phrased as positive statements to which the respondent was asked to respond in terms of agreement or disagreement (see Appendix A).

PERSEREC sent invitation letters to 9,000 civilian employees of the DoD who held one of several OPM occupational codes (e.g., 1810, security investigator) thought to represent the professional security workforce. Names and addresses of potential respondents were provided by the Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC). The invitation letter, shown in Appendix B, solicited participation in the study by stressing the importance of obtaining the views of as many security practitioners as possible. Potential respondents were informed that their responses could be used to improve training and professional development within the security profession. In addition, endorsement letters from participants' organizations were included to encourage participation. For example, individuals in the Army received a letter informing them of the Army's support of this survey and requesting participation. Such letters were intended to add credibility and increase motivation to complete the survey. In order to increase the response rate, reminder letters were later sent to those who had not completed the survey.

Results were examined for frequency of responses in order to determine the rate of agreement with each statement in the survey. Differences among groups, e.g., agency, discipline, occupational code, etc., were assessed by completing cross-tabulations. The

identification numbers of respondents were examined to ensure that no one completed the survey more than once.

Results

The initial mailing resulted in a response rate of 27% ($n = 2,337$). After a reminder letter, the response rate increased to 34% ($n = 3,091$). These response rates were within the normal rate of response, given the voluntary nature of participation in this survey. While care must always be taken when generalizing the results of a study, PERSEREC researchers feel a sufficient number of individuals participated in order to be confident that the findings represent the views of the entire DoD security workforce, as defined by five occupational codes used for selecting respondents. There was not a difference in the pattern of responses from those who responded after the initial invitation letter and those who responded after the reminder letter.

But do these occupational codes adequately constitute the security paradigm? An adequate definition of the security profession has yet to be fully articulated so it is difficult to determine whether the population has been adequately represented. It is also possible that some of those who were sent the survey and did not respond, do not actually fit within, or consider themselves to be part of, the security profession. This was found to be true in the 1811 occupational code series in which several recipients of our letter called to say that their investigative work was not related to security.

Characteristics of Respondents

Table 1 shows the demographic characteristics of respondents. Seventy-five percent of respondents declined to disclose their grade level, suggesting some level of sensitivity to this question. However, all other questions were answered by at least 98% of participants.

All ages were represented, although there were few participants in the younger age ranges (under 33). The majority of participants were male. However, a substantial number of females did participate (35%), allowing generalizations to both genders. Defense agencies were the most common organization represented at 33%, while the Army, Navy, and Air Force were all adequately represented at 16-20% each. The intelligence community was tapped at a smaller level (10%). Letters were only sent to the intelligence community members who work for organizations within the DoD, e.g., security officers within the Army intelligence command. Letters of invitation were sent out to similar percentages in each organization (Defense Agencies 31%; Army 22%; Navy 28%; Air Force 19%), suggesting that response bias was not an issue for respondents of various agencies. Organization was the only demographic characteristic for which the distribution of individuals who were sent invitation letters is known. Most respondents (61%) were in OPM occupational code 0080, security administration series, with codes 0086, 1810, 1811, and 0334 also being represented.

The intent of this survey was to represent practitioners in as many different security roles as possible. Results show this was accomplished by finding substantial numbers in many different security roles. However, it is apparent that many respondents (35%) found it difficult to select a primary role from those listed in the item. Various security disciplines were represented, with personnel security the most heavily, at 40%. Most respondents report that they spend all of their time performing security duties (60%), while 18% spend three quarters of their time, 7% spend one half of their time, and 14% spend one quarter of their time performing security-related duties. The percentage of respondents increases by experience level, while the number of years they plan on staying in the security profession is fairly evenly spread from less than 2 years to 18 or more.

Table 1
Characteristics of Respondents

	n	%
Age		
18-25	30	1.0
26-33	173	5.6
34-41	541	17.5
42-49	973	31.5
50-57	950	30.7
58 or older	403	13.0
Gender		
Male	1962	63.5
Female	1103	35.7
Organization		
Intelligence Community organizations	308	10.0
Army	632	20.4
Navy	587	19.0
Air Force	502	16.2
Defense Agencies	1032	33.4
Non-Defense Federal agencies	4	.1

	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
Occupational Code		
GS-0080 Security Administration Series	1889	61.1
GS-0086 Security Clerical and Assistance Series	281	9.1
GS-1810 General Investigating Series	488	15.8
GS-1811 Criminal Investigating Series	273	8.8
GS-0334 Computer Specialist	127	4.1
Grade Level		
GS-7	47	1.5
GS-8	3	.1
GS-9	71	2.3
GS-10	2	.1
GS-11	77	2.5
GS-12	384	12.4
GS-13	151	4.9
GS-14	33	1.1
GS-15	10	.3
Primary Security Role		
Security manager of an organization unity (multi-disciplinary position)	657	21.3
Special agent (personnel security investigations)	558	18.1
Adjudicator (personnel security)	149	4.8
Security educator (training and awareness)	63	2.0
Program security manager	259	8.4
Security policymaker	79	2.6
Director of security	133	4.3
Information systems security Manager	82	2.7
Other	1085	35.1

	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
Primary Security Discipline		
Personnel security	1243	40.2
Information system security	205	6.6
Information security	367	11.9
Physical security	519	16.8
Industrial security	210	6.8
Other	517	16.7
Time currently spent performing security duties		
One-quarter of my work time	432	14.0
Half of my work time	210	6.8
Three-quarters of my work time	549	17.8
All of my work time	1856	60.0
Years spent working as a security practitioner		
Less than 2 years	280	9.1
2-5 years	454	14.7
6-9 years	284	9.2
10-13 years	352	11.4
14-17 years	506	16.4
18 years or more	1157	37.4
Approximately how much longer do you intend to work in the security profession		
Less than 2 years	155	5.0
2-5 years	553	17.9
6-9 years	467	15.1
10-13 years	593	19.2
14-17 years	345	11.2
18 years or more	476	15.4
I don't know	472	15.3

The Security Profession

Table 2 shows responses to items in the Security Profession portion of the survey. Results indicate that security practitioners find their work rewarding and plan on staying in this profession for the long term. In addition, most agree they have been placed in the correct occupational code.

Respondents differ with respect to their views of the current state of the security profession. Statements concerning level of morale and opportunities for mobility lack consistency in their objective or perceived experiences. There also does not seem to be consensus on the designation of a career path for their profession, and a large portion of respondents disagreed that such a path is well-defined. These results do not differ substantially by organization, discipline, or experience level. The only recognizable distinction is by occupational code. Individuals in code 1810 show a visibly lower level of morale than those holding other occupational codes. Several emails and phone calls from investigative agents at the time of the survey explained that, due to their anticipated transfer to OPM in FY04 and their uncertain future as government employees after that date, background investigators' morale has fallen considerably. Table 3 shows the relationship between occupational code and level of morale.

Disagreement in whether or not participants hold the correct grade appears to be associated with actual grade level. That is, those holding a higher grade level were more likely to agree they were placed in the correct grade. However, since most did not disclose their grade level, it is difficult to support this finding with the data available.

While most of the results displayed in Table 2 indicate a generally positive view of the profession, members of the workforce indicated two areas of concern. First, over half of the respondents indicated no well-defined career path to allow them to plan their careers. Second, a large proportion of the group feels there is little opportunity for upward mobility within the security profession. An equal percentage of respondents (approximately 38%) agreed and disagreed with this item. These two items suggest that agencies need to address the issue of long-term career planning for the security workforce.

Table 2
Responses to Survey Items Addressing the Security Profession

	<i>Strongly Disagree %</i>	<i>Disagree %</i>	<i>Neutral %</i>	<i>Agree %</i>	<i>Strongly Agree %</i>
Working as a security professional is personally rewarding	1.4	3.8	10.1	48.7	35.4
I am, or have been, committed to a long-term career in the security profession	1.1	2.6	9.6	37.9	48.1
Generally speaking, the security profession attracts highly competent employees	2.2	12.9	27.4	46.8	9.8
The image of the security professional, as held by non-security personnel, needs to be improved	1.1	6.6	14.5	41.0	36.1
I would like to receive a temporary assignment to work in another organization to broaden my professional experience	7.1	15.4	20.4	30.4	25.8
Morale is good within the security profession	10.1	24.5	25.5	34.0	4.9
Considering the work that I perform, I hold the correct occupational code or MOS within my organization	3.6	7.2	8.9	46.7	32.4
Considering the work that I perform, I hold the correct grade/rank within my organization	16.4	24.2	10.1	34.3	12.7
There is a well-defined career path for security practitioners that allows them to plan their careers	16.8	36.3	23.1	20.1	2.8
There is opportunity for upward mobility within the security profession	13.4	25.0	21.9	32.0	6.5

Table 3
**Responses to the Item “Morale is good within the security profession”
by Occupational Code**

<i>Occupational Code</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree %</i>	<i>Disagree %</i>	<i>Neutral %</i>	<i>Agree %</i>	<i>Strongly Agree %</i>
0080	7.3	24.8	24.9	37.5	4.9
0086	10.3	20.3	23.5	39.9	5.7
0334	2.4	11.8	44.9	32.3	6.3
1810	27.3	35.7	18.0	14.3	4.1
1811	3.3	14.3	35.9	41.4	4.8
Total	10.1	24.5	25.5	34.0	4.9

Training and Experience

Subjects' attitudes concerning training and experience are shown in Table 4. There seems to be little agreement concerning access to training among various security personnel. Opinions regarding access to training, available funds for training, and replacement staff varied across respondents. Nevertheless, more than a third of respondents indicated that they cannot get the training they need either due of lack of funding or to staff shortages. Cross-tabulations failed to reveal any pattern to the perception of access to training, meaning that the variation of these results cannot be explained by agency, discipline, or any other demographic variable measured in the survey.

In contrast, while broader and cross-disciplinary experience in training may be necessary, many respondents doubt their agencies' willingness to provide such broadening career experiences. Respondents' interest in cross-disciplinary experience is seen in every context in which it is addressed. Consequently, it appears that practitioners in the field, as well as many higher-level policy leaders, support the concept of the generalist security professional.

Professional Development Programs

Table 5 shows that respondents indicated a need for a professional development program, and many feel that such programs would provide incentive to stay in the profession. Additionally, 90% of respondents indicated that a professional development program should recognize different levels of skills and require the development of competence in more than one discipline.

Specifically, certification as a measure or verification of professional development was highly supported by security practitioners. Approximately 56% of the respondents felt that it should be a requirement for advancement and that, if offered, they would participate. Most respondents would also be willing to commit their own personal time to getting certified, although most would not want to bear the financial responsibility. The addition of a grandfathering clause, which would give credit for past work experience to senior-level personnel, was supported by approximately 75% of survey participants.

No clear consensus exists among respondents about the role of standardized tests, training, and experience as a basis for certification. There seemed to be little agreement on these subjects. Differences could not be traced to any demographic characteristic.

Table 4
Responses to Survey Items Addressing Training and Experience

	<i>Strongly Disagree %</i>	<i>Disagree %</i>	<i>Neutral %</i>	<i>Agree %</i>	<i>Strongly Agree %</i>
I have access to security training when I need it	9.4	25.3	18.4	38.9	7.2
I have not been able to take advantage of training opportunities due to a lack of funding	5.6	28.6	22.2	28.5	14.3
I have not been able to take advantage of training opportunities because other staff are not available to perform my duties while I am away	5.3	36.7	20.5	25.0	11.7
I would like to receive training in security functions other than those that I currently perform	1.1	6.0	13.3	48.4	30.2
Cross-disciplinary experience is important for security professionals who wish to advance within the profession	.9	1.3	6.2	42.6	48.0
My organization would support the temporary assignment of security professionals to other agencies for the purpose of broadening their experience	16.1	29.1	32.9	16.4	4.6
The amount of training that a security professional receives should be a primary factor in evaluating his or her competence	7.5	28.4	24.0	29.6	9.3
Electronic media such as web-sites, CD-ROMs, and tele-training are effective ways to provide training to security professionals	3.9	15.0	22.7	46.6	10.9
Security professionals should develop skills in a variety of security disciplines to advance within the profession	.7	1.3	6.3	48.7	41.7

Table 5
Responses to Survey Items Addressing Professional Development Programs

	<i>Strongly Disagree %</i>	<i>Disagree %</i>	<i>Neutral %</i>	<i>Agree %</i>	<i>Strongly Agree %</i>
Security professionals need a professional development program that outlines requirements for advancement within the profession	.6	2.0	7.3	52.0	37.3
I would be more likely to continue working as a security professional if a professional development program were available	1.3	8.5	27.8	39.1	22.4
A professional development program should recognize different levels of skill for security professionals	.5	1.0	7.4	60.5	29.7
A professional development program should require the development of competence in several security disciplines for security professionals to receive advanced recognition	1.1	4.8	11.7	53.8	27.5
If a professional certification program were offered to security personnel, personal certification should then become a requirement for promotion to a higher grade	2.9	10.2	19.2	43.7	22.6
If the requirements for certification were clear and reasonable, I would participate in a professional certification program for security professionals	1.0	2.5	10.8	51.8	32.8
Becoming certified as a security professional should be based on years of experience within the security profession	4.0	25.8	27.1	32.8	9.2
Becoming certified as a security professional should be based on the amount of security training that an individual has received	2.9	19.5	26.7	42.0	7.6
The amount of cross-disciplinary experience a security professional has received should be an important factor in certification	2.0	10.8	24.7	50.9	10.1
Becoming certified as a security professional should be based on performance on a standardized test	9.1	25.3	29.9	29.1	5.6
Any certification program that is developed should include a “grandfathering” provision where senior security personnel are given credit for past work experience	2.9	6.4	14.1	43.6	31.9
The professional development of the security workforce should be the sole responsibility of the employing agency or company	10.6	34.1	21.7	24.8	7.7
I would be willing to bear the financial cost of my own professional development	19.5	30.7	32.2	14.4	2.2
I would be willing to commit personal time to carry out the requirements of a professional development program	6.5	9.3	19.0	49.0	15.0

Conclusions

Implications

It is clear that security practitioners and managers advocate the implementation of training and professional development programs. The Professional Development Survey indicates that retention might be less of a problem, given a clear development program.

The Professional Development Survey also demonstrates strong support for the establishment of a certification program, while in our earlier study we found that managers' support was mixed with some skepticism. Managers were concerned about possible inequities concerning access to certification programs and felt any such initiatives should be voluntary. In contrast, a large portion of practitioners believe that certification should be a requirement for advancement to a higher grade. Only 13% of survey participants disagreed or strongly disagreed with certification as a requirement for advancement. Clearly, even if certification were voluntary, the majority would participate. It is unknown whether or not participants in this survey considered the possibility of inequity as managers did. There is little consensus among practitioners as to the role of experience, training, and standardized testing in the certification process.

A number of issues remain ambiguous and require additional study before firm conclusions can be made. The views of security professionals are not clear on morale in the profession, upward mobility, and access to training. An effort was made to identify patterns associated with these results. However, very few could be found, meaning that the lack of consensus cannot be easily explained by discipline, agency, etc. This leads to the conclusion that substantial differences of opinion exist even within agencies and disciplines.

Next Steps

As stated earlier, the present report is based on the analysis of data only from Department of Defense civilian employees. While this population comprised the larger part of the federal-wide security workforce, additional surveys should be conducted of security practitioners in other larger agencies to determine consistency of views. In FY04, proposals will be made to survey the workforce in intelligence community agencies. Participation in these surveys is voluntary so the possibility of response bias does exist, and it is possible that some of those sent the invitation letter do not consider themselves to be part of the security profession.

As mentioned in the results section, there are limitations to the Professional Development Survey. Additional studies are already in progress to better identify the size and definition of the security workforce in order to assure the accurate assessment of needs and the correct population to which we should apply such programs.

Once all the relevant views of the security community are assessed, this information may be used to plan possible training and development programs. Additional

research may be necessary to further identify necessary specifics and costs of the programs. Based on the findings from the Professional Development Survey and future research to be conducted by PERSEREC researchers, policies will be established to ensure the uniformity of training, certification, and development across agencies and disciplines.

References

- Fischer, L.F. (2002). *Preferences and priorities for professional development programs: Management and executive perspectives on the security workforce*. Unpublished report.
- Marshall-Mies, J.C., & Fischer, L.F. (2003). *Preferences and priorities for professional development programs: Focus groups perspectives on the security workforce*. Unpublished report.
- Tippit, J.D. (2002). *Study of professional development programs*. Unpublished report.

Appendix A
Professional Development Survey

Professional Development Survey

DD-P&R(OT)2158
Expires January 13, 2004

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SURVEY

This questionnaire begins with a few demographic items and then asks you to indicate the extent to which you AGREE or DISAGREE with a series of statements.

Please enter the ID number shown on the letter that you received

SECTION I - BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Please indicate your gender

☐

Male

☐

Female

Please indicate your age

☐

18 - 25 years old

☐

26 - 33 years old

☐

34 - 41 years old

☐

42 - 49 years old

☐

50 - 57 years old

☐

58 years or older

Which organization do you work for?

☐

Intelligence Community organizations

☐

Army (except intelligence community)

☐

Navy (except intelligence community)

☐

Air Force (except intelligence community)

☐

Defense agencies

☐

Non-Defense Federal agencies (except intelligence community)

Occupational code

- ☐ GS-0080 Security Administration Series
 - ☐ GS-0086 Security Clerical and Assistance Series
 - ☐ GS-1810 General Investigating Series
 - ☐ GS-1811 Criminal Investigating Series
 - ☐ GS-0334 Computer Specialist (or GS-2210 Information Technology Management)
-

Primary security role (check one).

- ☐ security manager of an organization unit (multi-disciplinary position)
 - ☐ special agent (personnel security investigations)
 - ☐ adjudicator (personnel security)
 - ☐ security educator (training and awareness)
 - ☐ program security manager
 - ☐ security policymaker
 - ☐ director of security
 - ☐ information systems security manager
 - ☐ other
-

In my current position, I spend ____ performing security duties.

- ☐ one-quarter of my work time
 - ☐ half of my work time
 - ☐ three-quarters of my work time
 - ☐ all of my work time
-

Primary security discipline (check one).

- ☐ personnel security
 - ☐ information systems security
 - ☐ information security
 - ☐ physical security
 - ☐ industrial security
 - ☐ other
-

Grade level

- ☐ GS-7
☐ GS-8
☐ GS-9
☐ GS-10
☐ GS-11
☐ GS-12
☐ GS-13
☐ GS-14
☐ GS-15

Approximately how long have you worked as a security practitioner?

- ☐ less than 2 years
☐ 2 to 5 years
☐ 6 to 9 years
☐ 10 to 13 years
☐ 14 to 17 years
☐ 18 years or more

About how much longer do you intend to work in the security profession?

- ☐ less than 2 years
☐ 2 to 5 years
☐ 6 to 9 years
☐ 10 to 13 years
☐ 14 to 17 years
☐ 18 years or more
☐ I don't know

SECTION II - THE SECURITY PROFESSION

**Please indicate the extent to which you
AGREE or DISAGREE with the following statements:**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Working as a security professional is personally rewarding.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I am, or have been, committed to a long-term career in the security profession.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Generally speaking, the security profession attracts highly competent employees.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

The image of the security professional, as held by non-security personnel, needs to be improved.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I would like to receive a temporary assignment to work in another organization to broaden my professional experience.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Morale is good within the security profession.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Considering the work that I perform, I hold the correct occupational code or MOS within my organization.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Considering the work that I perform, I hold the correct grade / rank within my organization.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
There is a well-defined career path for security practitioners that allows them to plan their careers.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
There is opportunity for upward mobility within the security profession.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

SECTION III - TRAINING & EXPERIENCE

Please indicate the extent to which you AGREE or DISAGREE with the following statements:	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
I have access to security training when I need it.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I have not been able to take advantage of training opportunities due to a lack of funding.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I have not been able to take advantage of training opportunities because other staff are not available to perform my duties while I am away.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I would like to receive training in security functions other than those that I currently perform.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Cross-disciplinary experience is important for security professionals who wish to advance within the profession.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
My organization would support the temporary assignment of security professionals to other agencies for the purpose of broadening their experience.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

The amount of training that a security professional receives should be a primary factor in evaluating his or her competence.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Electronic media such as web-sites, CD-ROMs, and tele-training are effective ways to provide training to security professionals.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Security professionals should develop skills in a variety of security disciplines to advance within the profession.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

SECTION IV - PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Please indicate the extent to which you AGREE or DISAGREE with the following statements:	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Security professionals need a professional development program that outlines requirements for advancement within the profession.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I would be more likely to continue working as a security professional if a professional development program were available.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
A professional development program should recognize different levels of skill for security professionals.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
A professional development program should require the development of competence in several security disciplines for security professionals to receive advanced recognition.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
If a professional certification program were offered to security personnel, personal certification should then become a requirement for promotion to a higher grade.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
If the requirements for certification were clear and reasonable, I would participate in a professional certification program for security professionals.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Becoming certified as a security professional should be based on years of experience within the security profession.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Becoming certified as a security professional should be based on the amount of security training that an individual has	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

received.					
The amount of cross-disciplinary experience a security professional has received should be an important factor in certification.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Becoming certified as a security professional should be based on performance on a standardized test.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Any certification program that is developed should include a "grandfathering" provision where senior security personnel are given credit for past work experience.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The professional development of the security workforce should be the sole responsibility of the employing agency or company.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I would be willing to bear the financial cost of my own professional development.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I would be willing to commit personal time to carry out the requirements of a professional development program.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Submit Clear					

Appendix B
Invitation Letter

Invitation Letter



DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
PERSONNEL SECURITY RESEARCH CENTER
99 PACIFIC STREET, SUITE 455-E
MONTEREY, CA 93940-2497

SUBJECT: Professional Development Survey for the Security Workforce

TO:

Do you like working as a security professional? Are you considering a long-term career in government? Are you getting the training you need to do your job and to advance in the security profession? Would you value the opportunity to become certified as a security professional? Here is your chance to express your views on these subjects and to help shape policies that may have a great impact on your future career.

The Joint Security Training Consortium (JSTC) and the Defense Personnel Security Research Center (PERSEREC) want to know what you think about the professional development needs of security personnel. By completing a very short, on-line questionnaire on the subject of professional development, you will provide important information to. Policy-makers who are seeking to improve the status of the security workforce.

This survey can be completed in as little as 12 minutes.

Go to the JSTC web site. <http://www.jstc.gov> and click on "*Professional Development Survey*."

Enter your password

JSTC2003

and when the questionnaire appears, enter your ID number:

(This number will *not* be stored with your responses, allowing your views to remain anonymous.)

Complete the questionnaire and click the "**Submit**" button on the last page, and your results will immediately be stored in a database for analysis—no papers, no mailing!

Thanks for your assistance,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "James A. Riedel", is positioned above the typed name.

James A. Riedel, Ph.D.
Director, PERSEREC

P. S. When you have finished the survey, take a moment to explore the new JSTC web site. We hope that you will look at the “Training Opportunities” menu item (click on “Master Catalog”). By using the search function you may find training that meets your special needs. Your future in the security profession is important to all of us. If you have questions about this study, please contact the Project Manager, Lynn Fischer at (831) 657-3005.