

## IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

<b>Student Matriculation No.</b>	<b>Glasgow</b> 2696514 <b>DCU</b> 21108951 <b>Charles</b> 42030775
<b>Dissertation Title</b>	Predictive Policing Using AI & ML for Domestic Law Enforcement: Critical Analysis & Framework Development in EU

### INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION GRADING

<b>Word Count:</b> 23246		

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

<b>Final Agreed Mark :</b> C2 [13]
------------------------------------

### DISSERTATION FEEDBACK

<b>Assessment Criteria</b>	<b>Rating</b>
<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>	Satisfactory
• <i>Appropriate methodology and evidence of effective organisation of work</i>	Satisfactory
• <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>	Good
• <i>Selection of relevant primary and/or secondary evidence to support argument</i>	Satisfactory
• <i>Critical analysis and evaluation of evidence</i>	Weak
• <i>Accuracy of factual data</i>	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>	Good
• <i>Accurate spelling, grammar and punctuation</i>	Good
• <i>Consistent and accurate referencing (including complete bibliography)</i>	Good
• <i>Is the dissertation free from plagiarism?</i>	Yes
• <i>Evidence of ethics approval included (if required based on methodology)</i>	No
• <i>Appropriate word count</i>	Yes

## IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

### ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

#### **Reviewer 1**

The thesis addresses an important and innovative topic and brings together a lot of relevant information. I also appreciate that the author conducted several interviews to support the analysis. However, the thesis also has major weaknesses. The formulation of the research question is unfortunate because it is too broad compared to what the author actually does (i.e. studies the negative human security impacts of predictive policing and possible ways to address them). To be more specific, the "problems" in predictive policing practices within the EU is a broad category potentially covering much more than human security related issues. The thesis is also rather selective, it focuses only on particular and only on negative impacts of predictive policing on human security, without placing the conclusions in the broader context. Moreover, this seemingly core part of the analysis is weaker and shorter than the part devising possible solutions. The structure of the text is also random sometimes, with the lack of a clear single line of argument going from one section to another and throughout the whole text. Communication between theory, which is unnecessarily detailed in some respects, and practice, which has not eventually built on all the conceptual and technical aspects introduced earlier in the text (on the contrary, sometimes new frames appeared at the stage of the empirical analysis such as the concept of human rights, i.e. a concept different from human security), is not always straightforward. Redundant empirical details were also present sometimes diverting the focus from the key arguments of this study. In general, however, the author succeeded in systematizing the core knowledge on the topic.

#### **Reviewer 2**

A timely project exploring the implications of the EU AI Act through the experience of predictive policing in Germany and the Netherlands. On a positive, it is generally well-written and easy to follow. There is clear evidence that the student has read widely about PP and is aware of the key arguments about how algorithms and 'big data' might transform society (for better and worse). The three interviewees all had appropriate knowledge of the topic and I liked how the human security framework was applied to this area (a clear original contribution to the literature). However, there are a number of issues that I felt needed to be addressed in order for a higher grade to be awarded. First, the dissertation is very descriptive throughout with little evidence of synthesis and analysis. For example, there is a literature on critical data studies (see Safiya Noble for example) that is conspicuously absent here. At times the lit review feels very hypothetical with few detailed examples of the impact of predictive policing. A related issue is that the decision to focus on both AI and ML is not clearly justified - it might have been easier to focus on one rather than both. Second, the theoretical framework appears to spend more time defining key terms and providing background that might have been included in the lit review. Third, the research question is not well-written and could have been clearer. A related issue is the lack of detail on the research design. More detail was needed on how the interview data were examined, how the case study method was actually operationalised, and the questions asked of these three experts. I was also surprised to see no mention of research ethics for a project that involved interviews (and identified these experts too). Finally, the results are very descriptive and feel as if they are more of an extension of the lit review. There are no quotes from participants and it lacked critical engagement with the data. Overall, a quite good project that needed a stronger analytical narrative and research design (including reflection on the limitations of the sample and method) in order for a higher grade to be awarded.



## **IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet**