

## IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

<b>Student Matriculation No.</b>	<b>Glasgow 2132613 DCU 20109865 Charles 36946278 Trento</b>
<b>Dissertation Title</b>	UK Information Sharing and Counterterrorism after Brexit

### INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION GRADING

<b>Reviewer 1 Initial Grade</b>	<b>Reviewer 2 Initial Grade</b>	<b>Final Grade</b> B2	<b>Late Submission Penalty</b> N/A
<b>Word Count Penalty</b> (1-15% over/under = 1gr point; 15-20% over/under = 2 gr points; 20-25% over/under = 3 gr points; more than 25% over/under = 0 fail) <b>Word Count: 20,427 Suggested Penalty: N/A</b>			

### JOINT GRADING (subject to agreement of the external examiner and approval at Joint Exam Board)

<b>Final Agreed Mark.</b> (Following correspondence reviewers should list the agreed final internal grade taking before and after any penalties to be applied). <b>Before Penalty: B2</b>	<b>After Penalty: B2</b>
--	--------------------------

### DISSERTATION FEEDBACK

Assessment Criteria	Rating
<b>A. Structure and Development of Answer</b>	
This refers to your organisational skills and ability to construct an argument in a coherent and original manner	
• <i>Originality of topic</i>	Very Good
• <i>Coherent set of research questions and/or hypothesis identified</i>	Very Good
• <i>Appropriate methodology and evidence of effective organisation of work</i>	Good
• <i>Logically structured argument and flow of ideas reflecting research questions</i>	Good
• <i>Application of theory and/or concepts</i>	Good
<b>B. Use of Source Material</b>	
This refers to your skills to select and use relevant information and data in a correct manner	
• <i>Evidence of reading and review of published literature</i>	Excellent
• <i>Selection of relevant primary and/or secondary evidence to support argument</i>	Good
• <i>Critical analysis and evaluation of evidence</i>	Very Good
• <i>Accuracy of factual data</i>	Very Good
<b>C. Academic Style</b>	
This refers to your ability to write in a formal academic manner	
• <i>Appropriate formal and clear writing style</i>	Yes
• <i>Accurate spelling, grammar and punctuation</i>	Yes
• <i>Consistent and accurate referencing (including complete bibliography)</i>	Yes
• <i>Is the dissertation free from plagiarism?</i>	Yes

## IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

• Evidence of ethics approval included (if required based on methodology)	N/A
• Appropriate word count	N/A

### ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

#### Reviewer 1

This is a very difficult subject for which to find evidence, which is why I feel very unhappy giving a B-mark in the section referring to primary evidence. The candidate could not have come up with better evidence as this would all be classified.

What is very regrettable is that the University of Glasgow's procedure for obtaining ethics approval is so cumbersome as to put students off attempting to obtain it. I speak from experience when I say that Cambridge and King's College London and the University of Reading are much more light-touch in their handling of ethics approvals for interviews with officials who are grown-up people who can themselves decide on what they will divulge and in what form.

It is particularly sad in this context that I could not put the candidate in touch with Sir David Omand – honorary Doctor of the University of Glasgow – or Lord Ricketts – cited in the text and also very much in the know about what measures have been adopted in this field since Brexit as he worked on this in a House of Lords Committee.

But given collective experiences with the Ethics Committee, and given that there was not enough time to devote to this extraordinarily cumbersome process, the candidate chose not to proceed with an application for an ethics approval.

In short, in my judgement the candidate has done the best s/he can given the paucity of evidence available on the subject.

I have been slightly harsh on language and grammar as there are incomplete sentences, and some expressions – “incredibly many” or “a large amount of instances” that jar.

#### Reviewer 2

Very solid outline and strong research topic. Potential to add to the literature re. EU counterterrorism issues/intelligence. Reflects on a real and ongoing security dilemma for the UK (but also for other states in the EU who rely on intelligence sharing etc.) The student has a clear stance against Brexit, which is understandable and shared by countless, but at times, this stretches into the territory of overt subjectivity, which can weaken the argument. The introduction does a decent job of outlining what is to come, but it could have been a little tighter.

#### Lit review:

The literature is presented as a flowing narrative, which makes it easy and interesting to read, but the concomitant loss is that the ‘meat’ of what many of the sources are actually saying (and how) is somewhat lost. Without this deep excavation, an artificial ceiling is placed on: a) how the gap(s) in the literature are identified and; b) how their dissertation contributes to filling that gap. Nonetheless, the student shows they have done some good research in the area and are familiar with the literature's main beats. What is most conspicuous by its absence is a deep dive into literature on EU counterterrorism—which is quite rich; this is something of a missed opportunity. The concluding sentence “The literature surrounding the relationship between Brexit and counterterrorism efforts is still largely being produced” is accurate; all the more reason to dive into foundational literature that is most adjacent to it. A solid literature review overall, nonetheless.

#### Methodology

The methodology is more so an outline of the argument to follow (which was already provided in the introduction). The student should be commended in not choosing a methodology beyond qualitative research for its own sake, but nonetheless, some justification and explication around theoretical assumptions and so on is necessary.

#### Empirical Chapters

Chapter 3 is well judged and plays to the apparent strengths of the author, to spin a neat historical/contextual narrative to set the scene for the proceeding chapter on Brexit. The scope is a little

## IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

limited and the intricacies of EU counterterrorism processes could have been fleshed out with more reference to the appropriate literature, but it is solid overall—focusing on Europol, the SIS II and the EAW is an appropriate and smart move.

The pivot to anti-migration narratives and extremism re. Brexit is also appropriate and grounded in the literature. A bit more of this would have been welcome. The discussion on the Lisbon Treaty is procedural and a little perfunctory—at this stage of the dissertation, a description of the events of Brexit should have been more so ‘put to bed’ and it takes up valuable space for deeper analysis. It is well sourced, nonetheless. Positive use of primary sources throughout and the dissertation progressively gets into the procedural issues that are at play (e.g. European Arrest Warrant). Chapter 4 provided very solid empirical evidence overall, necessitating a strong analytical chapter to follow.

The following chapter provides a neat, well researched overview of where the UK finds itself (and possibly will find itself) post-Brexit; again, it is most so empirical reflection. This would function as a very useful status report for policy-makers, for example. However, with regard to the requirements of a dissertation, it is somewhat light on deeper *analysis*—a dynamic that defines the dissertation as a whole.

Overall, a finely research piece of work that informs the reader very well on the current situation without necessarily explicating some of the deeper conceptual issues that are at hand, with reference to the appropriate literature.