This class will provide an in-depth look at the United States Intelligence Community (IC) – the different agencies of which the IC is comprised, and their varying missions, priorities and resources - and how intelligence informs national security decision-making. It is a course designed for students who are interested in understanding and/or becoming part of our nation’s national security apparatus. Students will write strategic analytical products and simulate inter-agency coordination. They will analyze long-term national security issues on which the government would like to focus, and the short-term crisis issues on which the government must focus.

The very nature of this online course will simulate the robust yet virtual nature of communication and collaboration within the IC. Systems and infrastructure designed around security make virtual interaction the preferred means of communication for analysts with shared problem sets who operate around the world and around the clock. We will operate under the same physical and time constraints that bound the Intelligence Community. It will be realistic, challenging and fun.

**Course Goals**

By the end of this course, you will achieve the following:
- Foster an in-depth understanding of the US Intelligence Community – of whom it is comprised, how it is organized, how it has changed, and its many functions and limitations.
- Hone your professional communication and writing skills.
- Become a savvy strategic-level analyst, with an appreciation for collaboration within an intricate organization, whose mission is to understand and predict a complex, unpredictable world.
- Become an effective collaborator, anticipating and appreciating other perspectives, succinctly and thoughtfully expressing opinions and disagreement and offering solutions, in a virtual and time-sensitive environment.

**How Will We Meet These Goals Online?**

You must be committed to both working hard and engaging your peers if we are to achieve these goals. The course is set up much like a traditional course, with different topics each week and a significant amount of reading and research required to understand each topic. The difference in the online course is that we won’t meet in person once a week to discuss these topics. Instead, our dialogue will occur virtually and over time – which, if we are all committed to the process, will make the discussion even more robust, thoughtful and inclusive than one that would occur in the classroom. Your assignments will also be more collaborative than in a traditional class – partly because we are trying to emulate the work of the Intelligence Community, and that is how its work is done. But it is also a great way to forge the bonds that we would through face-to-face interaction.
Your Professor

I spent 7 years in the Intelligence Community – as a counterproliferation analyst with the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA), a China analyst with the US Army, a Red Team Leader at US Pacific Command in Hawaii, and most recently, as the DIA’s Devil’s Advocate, where it was my job to help analysts across the entire agency challenge assumptions and think differently. Having worked in a number of different specialties, agencies, and locations, I have rare insight into a very diverse, complex and secretive organization. (That said, there is still much that I don’t know…one person has only so much “need to know!”)

I got my undergraduate degree from Carroll University in Wisconsin (where I am from), a Masters in Political Management from George Washington University, and a Masters in Public Affairs from Harvard University’s Kennedy School of Government.

I am not an official St. Louisan. My family and I have been settled here for 6 years after lots of moving with the US Army, from which my husband recently retired. I loved Hawaii and DC, but this is a great place to raise my two little baseball fans – Cole (9) and John (6). In addition to this course, I teach several other courses for University College – *Alternative Analytic Techniques for International Affairs, National Security Decision-Making* and *Presidential Campaigning*. I am also a career consultant at the Career Center, and am happy to advise any of you on your internship or professional pursuits!

My Contact Information

There are a number of ways you can contact me; please do not hesitate to do so if you have a question or concern. I will work very hard to be responsive – you can expect a response from me within 24 hours - but do not assume I am *always* online and available. We can communicate via any of the means you prefer below, but please email me to set up an appointment if you would like to talk on the phone or meet in person.

- If you have a question or concern that you think others might also have, please post your question in the “Watercooler Chat.” This allows me to only have to answer a question once, and may save others from having to ask the same question.
- You can email me at scraig@wustl.edu
- You can call me at (314) 594-7442. I will answer if we have a scheduled appointment; if not, please leave a voicemail and I will get back to you as soon as possible.
- We can chat online using Blackboard Chat. Please email me to make an appointment.
- We can also set up a time to meet *in person!* This is an online course, but it does not mean we can’t have real meetings. I am on campus on Tuesdays and Fridays, if that fits your schedule. My office is located in the Danforth University Center, Room 203.

Required Texts


**Grades**

There are 1000 points possible in this course. They are distributed as follows:

50 pts. Agency Perspective Powerpoint Brief
100 pts. Drone Debate
100 pts. Crisis PDB
100 pts. Concept Paper for Final Project
150 pts. NIE
200 pts. Final Project
75 pts. Final Project Oral Brief
225 pts. Collaboration and Engagement

The grading scale is as follows:

92.5-100 A
89.5-92 A-
86.5-89 B+
81.5-86 B
78.5-81 B-
76.5-78 C+
71.5-76 C
69.5-71 C-
66.5-69 D+
60-66 D
0-59 F

**Turning In Assignments**

Much of your work will take place collaboratively, on our discussion board or other collaborative tools. The individual assignments that you have will be submitted to me electronically, through the Grade Center on Blackboard.

All assignments are due before midnight (11:59 pm) on the date indicated. Late assignments are not accepted, just like they wouldn’t be accepted in a work environment. Your analysis is not helpful if it isn’t timely. If technical problems occur, be sure to seek help immediately in addition to contacting me.
I will review all assignments within one week and provide detailed feedback. You can keep up-to-date on your progress in class by checking the “My Grades” link in Blackboard. I will embed comments in your assignments, so be sure to find and open the attachments in your Grade Center.

**The Key to This Course: Engagement and Collaboration**

Participation is even more important in the virtual classroom than it is in the face-to-face classroom. Contributing to discussions is the only way to interact and demonstrate an ability to apply the concepts and defend your own thinking. Your participation will be graded on the same tenets that define analytic quality in the Intelligence Community: **clarity, relevance, brevity** and **timeliness**. This means your contributions must be clear, cogent, advance the discussion, and perhaps most importantly, are posted in time for others to read and respond. (Postings at the deadline fulfill an assignment requirement, but do not contribute to your peers’ discussion and understanding of the issue.) Another advantage to the online format is that you will get weekly feedback on how you are doing.

Further, the topics we are covering are very complex, and there is no way to master them on our own in such a short time period. Just as in the Intelligence Community, we will depend on each other to develop expertise in specific aspects of an issue. Then, through active and ongoing collaboration, we will be able to achieve a sophisticated, in-depth understanding of the issue as a whole. Your classmates will be depending on you, which should motivate you to do your part, even more than a good grade!

Note the class schedule (see pg. 9) for a week-by-week breakdown of how collaboration and engagement will be graded throughout the semester.

**Netiquette**

When participating in online dialogue, it is important to remember a few things. First, a good rule of thumb: if you wouldn’t say it to someone in person, you shouldn’t say it virtually! Use courtesy and common sense. It is ok to convey emotion – your comments may be humorous or passionate – but they must remain respectful. (And please no ALL CAPS – I wouldn’t allow shouting in the classroom, so don’t do it here!)

Second, we are trying to emulate a professional work environment – one where your communications could be reviewed by superiors or even worse, leaked to the press! So, to achieve our standards of clarity and brevity, you should at a minimum double check your grammar and spelling, write in complete sentences and be meticulous with your words.

**Discussion Forum Tips**

It will take some time to become comfortable with Blackboard and with the Discussion Boards, which will be our primary means of communication. Here are a few helpful hints to make navigation of it easier for all of us.

1. **Be thoughtful.** Don’t just type whatever comes to your mind after reading the discussion question. First, do the assigned readings. Second, reflect on the questions posed. Third, read
through the discussion so far. (If you post without doing this, you will probably not add much, besides confusion for the rest of us!) Then, think about what unique insight you might offer to advance the discussion. Then:

2. **Use Word to compose your thoughts.** This is a good way to remind yourself that it’s a formal, thoughtful reply. It also helps catch grammar and spelling mistakes. And, it will provide you a record of your contributions, in case you want to reference something again, or just look back on the quality and quantity of your participation.

3. **Change the SUBJECT.** When creating a post, use the SUBJECT line to give everyone a very clear idea of what your post is about. If you’re introducing a new concept, tell us about it in the title. New titles help when browsing through a discussion and referring back to it.

4. **Sign your name.** It is not clear who wrote the post, so be sure to sign your name at the bottom of all contributions. It also helps if you are responding specifically to someone else’s point to copy and paste the sentence you are referring to into your reply.

5. **Engage early and often.** The key to a vibrant online discussion is time. If we all waited until the last minute to contribute, we wouldn’t get the opportunity to respond to one another or build upon ideas. Successful participation does not mean one reply to the professor. It means a series of replies, over the course of the week, to my initial post, as well as one another.

**What to Expect Each Week**

Each week will bring a new topic of study. **Our sessions will begin on Wednesdays and end on Tuesday evenings at 8pm.** Each week will begin with an email from me on Wednesday mornings, where I will provide step-by-step instructions and expectations for the week. You should plan to do the assigned readings in the first few days of the week, so you can begin contributing to the online activities no later than Saturday. On occasion I will also post some mini-lectures for you to view. Collaborative assignments will often be due mid-week, to allow others to review and discuss your input. On Tuesday evenings (after 8pm), I will post some concluding thoughts and take-aways from the week.

As this schedule demonstrates, **work will be required both during the week and on weekends.** The course is asynchronous, meaning we will never have a set time where we are all online together. This offers flexibility **within** the week, but it is not a course in which you can do all your work in one or two sittings.

Online activities will often be a discussion, which I will begin by asking questions. Other weeks it will be a wiki or blog, to which you will have to contribute. You will also work in a small group to prepare for and present one side of a debate, and in a larger group to collectively write an intelligence product. The activities will vary from week to week, but the flow of your week will always be the same – you’ll need to start reading early, and contribute repeatedly through the end of our week.
**Time Commitment**

In a typical graduate-level class, you would spend 3 hours per week in the classroom, engaging with your professor and peers, and another 8-10 hours preparing – reading and completing assignments. This class will take just as much of a time commitment – but more self-discipline, since we don’t have three hours blocked off on the calendar once a week. And, contrary to what you might think about an online course, the time spent engaging and interacting with one another might actually be greater than it would be in a traditional class.

I advise you to build yourself a schedule that blocks off about 10 hours per week for coursework. And be prepared to spend about half of that time engaging in online discussion or working collaboratively with your peers. This means you can’t cram in all your work on the weekend. You need to be reading and thinking early in the week, and contributing and responding throughout the rest of the week. While some of this can be done is short time increments, it is advisable to work in 60-120 minute blocks.

**Technical Support**

This is a fully online course, which relies on our computers and internet connections – neither of which are 100% reliable. So be prepared to have technical issues, try not to let them get you too frustrated (this is advice I need to heed), and have a back-up plan in place for when the inevitable issues arise.

There is support available to you, and to be honest, I am not your best resource. So please keep me informed of any difficulties you may be having, but do not rely on me to solve them for you.

Before you seek assistance, I recommend you do the following, as these are the sources of many issues:

1. **Use Mozilla Firefox or Safari as your browser.** Internet Explorer is not recommended for Blackboard. Google Chrome may also cause some problems.

2. **Download the most recent version of Java.** This is free software, and you can check which version you are currently using as well as update it by visiting [www.java.com](http://www.java.com). Java updates are frequent, so you may have to do this several times throughout the course.

If this does not resolve your issues, send an email to student.technology@wustl.edu or call 935-8200. This is technical support for problems you experience within the Blackboard classroom, not other external software. For additional Blackboard resources, visit the Blackboard Help Page ([https://en-us.help.blackboard.com/Learn/Student](https://en-us.help.blackboard.com/Learn/Student)).

**Tips for Being a Successful Online Learner**

Online teaching is still new to me, just as online learning is likely new to you. It is both an exciting and daunting prospect. In order for the class to be successful, we need to all commit to working hard to make it so. It means we have to be diligent in doing our share of the work, ask questions when we have them, and commit to overcoming the technical roadblocks we are sure to encounter.
If you are concerned about this commitment, ask yourself if you have the following traits. These are the factors most often associated with “persistence” – which is the ability to successfully complete an online course despite obstacles or adverse circumstances.

**Self-motivation.** An online learner can’t depend on the imposed timeline of a regularly scheduled class to motivate to complete his/her work. You need to take it upon yourself to read and understand the week’s instructions and complete the assignments on schedule.

**Time management and organizational skills.** An online learner needs to fulfill personal, professional and academic obligations and carve out time throughout the week for meeting the requirements of this course. In other words, you cannot be a procrastinator!

**Computer proficiency.** You don’t need to be a computer whiz, but you do need to be comfortable navigating your computer and the Web, and be willing to troubleshoot and ask questions when necessary.

**Written communication skills.** Your primary means of communicating, with me and your peers, will be via the written word. It is important that you feel comfortable expressing your opinions and observations in this way.

**Peer and family support.** Those who have peers, colleagues and family who are supportive of your efforts to juggle your multiple obligations contribute to a student’s persistence.

**Ability to develop virtual relationships.** Students who are comfortable establishing relationships in a virtual environment also tend to “persist” at higher rates. Those who can participate in online discussions and work together with others they have not met will have success in this course. A sense of camaraderie is also helpful.

**Willingness to engage with the professor.** Students who are willing to reach out to their professor, ask questions and feel as though they get prompt feedback also have greater success in online courses. This takes the two of us. I commit to you that I will be available and prompt in responding to your questions and concerns. But I can’t do so if you don’t engage with me first! So please don’t hesitate to reach out to me, and your peers. We are in this together.

Given this, here is my advice to you, so that you will succeed in this course:

1. **Get started.** Log in and get going! It is important to dive in early in every week, but especially in the first week. Get to know the course and your classmates right away. If you delay, you may feel overwhelmed and behind, before we’ve even begun.

2. **Get organized.** Bookmark our Blackboard site, get the Blackboard App, create a binder and print out readings and other necessary materials. I recommend printing out the announcement at the beginning of each week, which will provide step-by-step instructions for the week’s requirements. Printing out the wrap-up email will also be a handy resource.

3. **Interact with your classmates.** Just because this is an online course doesn’t mean you can’t get together to discuss the class or work on group projects!
4. **Interact with me.** There are so many ways to communicate with me. I am here for you – but you have to reach out if you have questions or concerns.

5. **Don’t procrastinate.** Waiting until the last minute really will ruin your class experience. You will be overwhelmed and frustrated and your engagement grade will suffer. Keep up with the work, and when obstacles arise, refer to #4. (In other words, talk to me! I understand that life sometimes gets in the way.)

6. **HANG IN THERE!** It will take a few weeks for all of us to get accustomed to the rhythm of the course and one another. But if you follow all of the advice above, I assure you that it will get easier – and more fun.

**University College Policies**

**Academic Integrity**
Do your own work. Plagiarizing, cheating, copying or collaborating without permission and fabricating or falsifying data will not be tolerated. Washington University’s policy can be found here: [http://ucollege.wustl.edu/faculty/academic_integrity](http://ucollege.wustl.edu/faculty/academic_integrity)

You will need to register your compliance with this policy in the first week of class.

Here ([https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/section/2/](https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/section/2/)) is a useful resource for citation and attribution techniques. If I suspect you have engaged in any sort of academic dishonesty, I will report it to the Dean of University College, who may take punitive action after conducting an investigation.

**Student Accommodations**
Washington University is committed to providing equal opportunity for students with disabilities. The Disability Resource Center (DRC) assists students with disabilities by providing services and arranging for reasonable accommodations. Students wishing to request services or accommodations must register and provide appropriate documentation to the DRC at cornerstone.wustl.edu.

**Campus Privileges**
You are entitled to all the privileges of a student taking a traditional course on the WU campus. You are encouraged to use the library, bookstore, counseling services, computer labs and all other campus facilities and services. I recommend the following specifically:

- **Cornerstone** provides mentoring, helps hone studying and test-taking skills and is a great resource for first-generation college students.
- **The Writing Center** is a great resource; call in advance to make an appointment.
- **The Career Center** offers workgroups and one-on-one advising for students considering their future – be it graduate school, a new job, a career transition or even study abroad. I co-lead a workgroup for students interested in government and public policy – a great way to learn about careers in government, policy and advocacy and network with like-minded peers and alums.
**Course Schedule and Assignment Due Dates**

The assignments included here are those that have specific points afforded to them. *Please note that assignments are not always due on the same day of the week, and are usually due prior to the last day of the unit, to accommodate collaboration and discussion.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1: 18-24 Jan</td>
<td>Introductions to Online Learning and One Another</td>
<td>Engagement (10 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2: 25-31 Jan</td>
<td>Strategic Context</td>
<td>Engagement (10 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3: 1-7 Feb</td>
<td>Who’s Who in the IC</td>
<td>Agency Perspective Brief Due: Sunday, Feb 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4: 8-14 Feb</td>
<td>The Relationship Between Intel and Policy</td>
<td>Engagement (10 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5: 15-21 Feb</td>
<td>Case Study in Intel Failure: Iraqi WMD Simulation</td>
<td>Synchronous Simulation –TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6: 22-28 Feb</td>
<td>Reforming the IC</td>
<td>Collaboration (25 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 7: 1-7 Mar</td>
<td>HUMINT and EITs</td>
<td>Engagement (10pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 8: 8-12 Mar</td>
<td>Technical Collection and Drones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 9: 12-18 Mar</td>
<td>SPRING BREAK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 10: 19-25 Apr</td>
<td>The Drone Debate</td>
<td>Group Paper due Wed, Mar 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 11: 29 Mar-4 Apr</td>
<td>Secrecy, Leaks and Oversight</td>
<td>Rebuttal due Fri, Mar 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 12: 5-11 Apr</td>
<td>Analytic Standards</td>
<td>Q and A from Mar 25-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 13: 12-18 Apr</td>
<td>Current Intelligence</td>
<td>Collaboration (25 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 14: 19-25 Apr</td>
<td>National Intelligence Estimate: Key Questions, Assumptions and ACH</td>
<td>Engagement (10 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 15: 26 Apr-2 May</td>
<td>NIE Coordination</td>
<td>NIE Due: Tuesday, May 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 16: 3-9 May</td>
<td>Final Project Prep and Presentation</td>
<td>Final Paper and Elevator Brief Due: Monday, May 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Syllabus**

**Week 1: 18-24 January**

**Introductions to Online Learning and One Another**
This week we will be introduced to online learning as well as one another. You will become familiar with course goals and expectations and the virtual learning environment. We will ensure that you have the technological capabilities and personal fortitude to succeed in the course, and most importantly, get to know our virtual colleagues.


**Part I: Understanding the Intelligence Community**

**Week 2: 25-31 January**

**The Strategic Context**
We will explore the major strategy documents that (are supposed to) guide our national security policy in order to provide the necessary strategic context in which the Intelligence Community functions.


[https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/2015_national_security_strategy.pdf](https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/2015_national_security_strategy.pdf)


**Week 3: 1-7 February**

**Who’s Who in the IC**
In this week, we will get to know the vast and varied intelligence bureaucracy – the sixteen agencies, their missions, priorities, constraints – and how they relate to one another.


Charles S. Robb and Laurence H. Silberman, “Appendix C: An Intelligence Community Primer”


Assignment: Pick one of the 16 agencies within the IC and consider its priorities and perspective. Build a 3 slide powerpoint brief with audio explaining the agencies priorities, perspective and constraints. Who is its primary customer, and how does this impact their work? How does their work overlap and/or complement other agencies? Conduct additional research if necessary to consider these questions. Post your presentation in the Discussion Board by Sunday, February 5 for review by your classmates.

Week 4: 8-14 February
The Relationship between Intel and Policy
The relationship between the policymaker and the intelligence analyst is very important, yet it is fraught with misunderstanding and even ill will (even more so than usual lately). We will examine these misunderstandings and the competing priorities and perspectives from which they derive. We will get to know what intelligence support to policy and politicization look like and we will consider the impact of the new administration’s attitude towards intelligence.

John McLaughlin, “Serving the National Policymaker,” Analyzing Intelligence, Chapter 4, pgs. 71-81

James B. Steinberg, “The Policymaker’s Perspective: Transparency and Partnership,” Analyzing Intelligence, Chapter 5, pgs. 82-90

Gregory F. Trevorton, “Intelligence Analysis: Between “Politicization and Irrelevance,” Analyzing Intelligence, pgs. 91-104

Paul Pillar, “Intelligence, Policy and the War in Iraq” Foreign Affairs, March/April 2006
https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/bush/pillar.htm

Graham Allison, “How it Went Down” Time, May 7, 2012 (on Blackboard)

http://warontherocks.com/2015/09/on-the-politicization-of-intelligence/

http://wpo.st/4wLQ2

Hayden, Playing to the Edge, pgs. 428-429
Week 5: 15-21 February
Iraqi WMD: Simulation in Intelligence Failure (Time TBD)
This week we will explore first-hand the relationship between analyst and policymaker. In our only simultaneous meeting (to be held at a mutually agreed upon time), we will simulate the drafting of the 2002 National Intelligence Estimate on Iraqi WMD and brief policymakers on this assessment. We will then read the NIE, as well as the Commission Report that details the poor tradecraft that led to the NIE’s flawed conclusions.

http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB129/nie_first%20release.pdf

Robb and Silberman, Report on the Commission on the Intelligence Capability of the US Regarding Weapons of Mass Destruction, Overview, pgs.3-8

Robb and Silberman, Chapter One Case Study: Iraq, pgs. 45-111, 157-196 (skim conclusions)

Michael Hayden, Playing to the Edge, pgs. 48-52

For further reading:
Chapters 12 and 2, Analyzing Intelligence
For more on Denial and Deception: Chapter 8, Analyzing Intelligence

Week 6: 22-28 Feb
Reforming the IC
This week will be devoted to understanding the history of Intelligence Community reform, and the negotiation and implementation of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act specifically. We will examine the impact of oversight and politics on intelligence and we will emulate “new analysis” by collaborating on a wiki that assesses the process, status and future of reform.


Hayden, Playing to the Edge, pgs. 153-178

Carmen A. Medina, “The New Analysis,” Analyzing Intelligence, Chapter 15, pgs. 238-248

Jane Harman, “Disrupting the Intelligence Community,” Foreign Affairs, March/April 2015
https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2015-03-01/disrupting-intelligence-community

For further reading:
The 9/11 Commission Report, Chapter 13, pgs. 399-428
Part 2: Collection

Week 7: 1-7 Mar

**HUMINT and Enhanced Interrogation Techniques**

We will explore the collection of human intelligence (HUMINT) through the controversial “enhanced interrogation techniques” used to elicit it post 9/11. Our readings will provide some insight into the context in which decisions about EITs were being made and the diverging perspectives of the well-intentioned professionals who were debating and executing those decisions. We will also gain insight into Congress’ role in oversight and the highly political overtones to the debate centered on the effectiveness of the techniques. This debate – once considered over - is sure to be revived as the new administration has promised to reinstate “torture.”


Ali Soufan, Testimony before the U.S. Senate Committee on the Judiciary, May 13, 2009  


[http://wpo.st/4qLQ2](http://wpo.st/4qLQ2)

[https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/strategic-costs-torture](https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/strategic-costs-torture)

For further reading:

U.S. Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, “Committee Study of the CIA’s Detention and Interrogation Program,” December 9, 2014  
Week 8: 8-12 March

**Technical Collection: Drones**

We will learn about the UAV’s evolution from a tactical surveillance and signals collection platform to a vehicle from which to conduct “targeted killings.” We will do a lot of reading during this week in preparation for next week’s debate. You will be divided into work groups to begin drafting a position paper either for or against the use of armed drones.

- Mazzetti, Chapters 4, 5, 7, 12, 16 (pgs. 63-101, 115-135, 213-235, 229-31)
- Hayden, pgs. 331-344
- Audrey Kurth Cronin, “Why Drones Fail: When Tactics Drive Strategy,” *Foreign Affairs*, July/August 2013, pgs. 44-54 (on Blackboard)

  “Fact Sheet: U.S. Policy Standards and Procedures for the Use of Force in Counterterrorism Operations Outside the United States and Areas of Active Hostilities” The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, May 23, 2013

  [http://wpo.st/UpLQ2](http://wpo.st/UpLQ2)
http://wpo.st/WoLQ2


http://www.cfr.org/wars-and-warfare/reforming-us-drone-strike-policies/p29736

For further research:
http://www.lawfareblog.com/2013/07/a-meta-study-of-drone-strike-casualties/

Sarah Kreps and Micah Zenko, “The Next Drone Wars: Preparing for Proliferation” Foreign Affairs, March/April 2014 (on Blackboard)

Lynn E. Davis et al., “Armed and Dangerous? UAVs and National Security,” The Rand Corporation
http://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR449.html

Covert Drone Wars, Bureau of Investigative Journalism
https://www.thebureauinvestigates.com/category/projects/drones/

---

**Week 9: 12-18 March**  SPRING BREAK

**Week 10: 19-28 March**

The Drone Debate
We will engage in a wide-ranging debate about the advantages and drawbacks of the use of drones, the evolving policies regarding their employment, and whether they should fall under the purview of the CIA or DOD. **Mark your calendars: this debate will be fast-paced and require frequent collaboration and participation.**

**Exercise:** Debate the advantages and drawbacks of the use of armed drones. Consider the military, political, diplomatic, informational, psychological and legal implications of their use. In your assigned work groups, write a 2 page opening statement in Google Docs, to be posted on **Wednesday, March 22.** Beginning on Thursday, you will rebut the other group’s statement (as a group), and respond to my questions. Your group rebuttal is due **Friday, March 24** and you will need to respond to my questioning **between March 25-28.**

---

**Week 11: 29 March-4 April**

Secrecy, Leaks and Oversight
This week we will consider how the Intelligence Community came to collect information on millions of Americans, how we found out about this collection, and changes that are occurring as a result of this knowledge. We will explore the tension between national security and civil liberties, the role of the
media, Congress and the courts in oversight of intelligence activities, and the impact of leaks – on intelligence, diplomacy, the press and decision-making.


Hayden, Playing to the Edge, pgs. 21-26, 64-126, 403-426


For further research:


Part 3: Analysis

Week 12: 5-11 April

Analytic Standards
We will spend this first week in our analysis block familiarizing ourselves with the critical thinking skills and tools necessary for writing rigorous analytical products. You will learn about the questions, techniques and tradecraft that you will employ through the rest of the course in your production of intelligence analysis.

Richards J. Heuer, Jr., Psychology of Intelligence Analysis, Center for the Study of Intelligence, 1999, Chapter 1

For further reading:
Katherine Hibbs Pherson and Randolph H. Pherson, Critical Thinking for Strategic Intelligence, CQ Press, October 2012, Chapters 1, 2, 4-6, 11, 16, 19

Assignment: Write a 1-2 page Concept Paper for your final project. Choose your topic, your product type and your customer. Identify his/her requirements, your key questions, and sources. Lay out a research plan and outline your line of argument. Due Tuesday, April 11.

Week 13: 12-18 April

Current Intelligence
We will identify and get smart quick on whatever the week’s top story is regarding U.S. national security. We will work together to compile resources and expertise to this end and then write and review a brief article for inclusion in the President’s Daily Brief, using good analytic tradecraft.

Central Intelligence Agency, “Bin Ladin Determined to Strike in U.S.” September 6, 2001

“The Evolution of the President’s Daily Brief”, CIA.gov, February 27, 2014

Assignment: Write a 1 page article for the President’s Daily Brief. As part of the review process, review and provide feedback to a classmate, using the Principles of Analytic Writing Checklist. Article is due for peer review on Sunday, April 16, and the final is due Tuesday, April 18.

Week 14: 19-25 April

National Intelligence Estimate on Russia’s Cyber Activities
Over the course of two weeks, you will collectively build expertise on Russian cyber intrusions and intentions, and simulate the interagency writing and coordination of a National Intelligence Estimate on
the topic. In this first week, we will complete the first two steps in the analytic process: identifying key questions and assumptions, in order to generate hypotheses regarding Russian intentions. You will then each employ the Analysis of Competing Hypotheses structured analytic technique to assess the strength of these hypotheses.

*The readings for these weeks are forthcoming.*

**Week 15: 25 April-2 May**  
**NIE Coordination**  
You will spend this week in “coordination” – collaborating with your classmates to draft and edit your NIE. You will each emulate an agency’s perspective and negotiate both substance and delivery, based on your respective roles.

| Assignment: As a class, you will research, organize, write and coordinate a National Intelligence Estimate on Russia’s cyber activities. Each student will be assigned an agency and/or role in the drafting process. The final draft is due **Tuesday, May 2.** |

**Week 16: 3-9 May**  
**Final Projects**  
This week will be used to prepare an intelligence product on a topic of your choosing. You will also prepare a 1-minute elevator brief on your key take-aways to share with your classmates. Finally, we will listen to one another’s elevator briefs and discuss the various topics and take-aways, as well as some over-arching conclusions from the course.

| Assignment: Complete the research and writing project outlined in your Concept Paper by drafting an intelligence product on a topic and to a customer of your choice. Demonstrate good analytic tradecraft and knowledge of your agency’s priorities and purview. Once completed, record a 1-minute brief on your project to share with your classmates. Final draft and recording is due **Monday, May 8.** |