

## SECINTEL Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

<b>Student Matriculation No.</b>	Glasgow 2263260	Charles 2247459
<b>Dissertation Title</b>	National Resilience in CyberSpace: The UK's National Cyber Security Strategy Evolving Response to Dynamic Cyber Security Challenges	

### INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION GRADING

<b>Glasgow Marker</b> Office Use	<b>Charles Marker</b> Office Use	<b>Charles Additional Info</b> Please advise ranking
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---

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

**Final Agreed Mark. Markers should make reference to the Joint Charles University-University of Glasgow Grade Conversion Table**

C1 [14]    C [Good]

### 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>	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>	Very Good
• <i>Selection of relevant primary and/or secondary evidence to support argument</i>	Good
• <i>Critical analysis and evaluation of evidence</i>	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>	Good
• <i>Accurate spelling, grammar and punctuation</i>	Very Good
• <i>Consistent and accurate referencing (including complete bibliography)</i>	Excellent
• <i>Is the dissertation free from plagiarism?</i>	Yes
• <i>Evidence of ethics approval included (if required based on methodology)</i>	Not Required
• <i>Appropriate word count</i>	Yes

## SECINTEL Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

### ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

#### **Glasgow Marker**

The basic intention of this dissertation is to analysis the response of the UK via its national cyber Security strategies to large scale cyber attack. It looked at three such attacks, Stuxnet, WannaCry and NotPetya. The basic premise of the research rationale is sound and essentially the dissertation is a critical policy review, however, I am not sure that the students adequately recognised the critical policy requirement. In saying tha the later parts of the dissertation where by far the strongest, although they failed to hark back to the literature review and theoretical basis - i.e. strategic cyber culture? While the assumption is made - it is not adequately tested. I felt that the introduction and first few chapters where confused and lacking in direction or purpose. The introduction in particular could have been more substantic and included a more detailed synopsis of the dissertation. At the same time, while the literature review reflected a series of themes the connections or relationship to the central research questions are not clear. Does the research question relate to a puzzle identified from the existing literature? Perhaps, but thisis not clearly set out for the reader. Some of the language was messy with poor use of language in places and obvious stylistic challenges. The dissertation requires careful proof editing as there were a number of grammatically errors which could easily have been fixed. I felt that the student introduced a number of apologies for the limitations of the work, rather than seeking to adequately address those limitations, and there is a danger of contradiction at times. For example. on the issue of generalisability, the student suggests that the UK casestudy may not be applicable to other cases as threats vary from state to state but then the students goes on to say that there may be some applicability of the case at organisation levels. The student's background of being a US citizen and therefore unfamiliar with the UK policy set up is not valid as an explanation of not getting to the heart of the issues. Overall, there was much scope for this dissertation, but it failed to strike out in a bold way. On the positive side, there was a solid review of the casestudy examples and the chapter on the UK's eveolution of a Cyber Security Strategy was well put together. There was some critical reflection in the final conclusion and it is clear that the student has put a lot of work into identifying information, but how this was then brought together into a coherent discussion needs more time and focus. Certainly, there is scope for further refinement, but this will only work if the research design is reflected upon and tidied up.

#### **Charles Marker**

The thesis intends to link recent global cyber security incidents with the evolution of the UK's cyber security policies. Conceptually, the thesis suffers from several confusions. Interestingly, it brings forward an idea of cyber strategic culture, however, it fails to define, operationalise, and later apply it to emprical analyses. Besides this revelant direction, the theoretical part is riddled with several notions that do not communicate well with the thesis goals nor with the emprical analysis offered in the latter part of the thesis. Given the emprical observations, it is for example a shame that the theoretical part did not reflect the notion of policy reactivness along with the conceptualisation of the cyber security culture. As a result, there is a gap between the poorly elaborated theoretical framework and decently realised emprical discussion of the evolution of UK's cyber security policy. That said the latter deserves an appreciation as it delivers on the particularities of the individual cyber threats mitigations. The concluding part of the thesis also reads much better than the preceding parts. All in all it is a decent thesis addressing a relevant and contemporary issue that suffers from a rather large gap between theory and emprics. On the other

## SECINTEL Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

hand, the empirical per se offers some interesting insights and a conclusion indeed proving that the global cyber incidents inform the cyber policy formation in the UK.

### Charles University > University of Glasgow Grade Conversion

CU General Grade	Grade Specification for Conversion	Percentage	UoG equivalent
<b>A - excellent</b>	Excellent upper (1)	100 – 96	22 (A1) Excellent
	Excellent lower (2)	95 - 91	19 (A4) Excellent
<b>B – very good</b>	Very good upper (1)	90 - 86	17 (B1) Very Good
	Very good lower (2)	85 – 81	16 (B2) Very Good
<b>C - good</b>	Good upper (1)	80 – 76	15 (B3) Very Good
	Good lower (2)	75 – 71	14 (C1) Good
<b>D - satisfactory</b>	Satisfactory upper (1)	70 – 66	13 (C2) Good
	Satisfactory lower (2)	65 – 61	12 (C3) Good
<b>E - sufficient</b>	Sufficient upper (1)	60 - 56	11 (D1) Satisfactory
	Sufficient lower (2)	55 – 51	9 (D3) Satisfactory
<b>F - fail</b>		50 – 0	8 (E1) Weak

### University of Glasgow > Charles University Grade Conversion

UofG General Grade	Grade Specification for Conversion	Percentage	CU equivalent
<b>A1-A3</b>	Excellent upper (1)	100 – 96	A - Excellent
<b>A4-A5</b>	Excellent lower (2)	95 - 91	A - Excellent
<b>B1</b>	Very good upper (1)	90 - 86	B – Very Good
<b>B2</b>	Very good lower (2)	85 – 81	B – Very Good
<b>B3</b>	Good upper (1)	80 – 76	C - Good
<b>C1</b>	Good lower (2)	75 – 71	C - Good
<b>C2</b>	Satisfactory upper (1)	70 – 66	D - Satisfactory
<b>C3</b>	Satisfactory lower (2)	65 – 61	D - Satisfactory
<b>D1</b>	Sufficient upper (1)	60 - 56	E - Sufficient
<b>D2-D3</b>	Sufficient lower (2)	55 – 51	E - Sufficient
<b>E1-H</b>		50 – 0	F - Fail

## SECINTEL Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

**Notes for Markers:** When grading the SECINTEL Dissertation markers are asked to reflect upon the aims and learning outcomes for the dissertation. Each dissertation should also adopt a clear security focus reflecting the relevant programme pathway

**Aims:** The course aims to provide students with independent research opportunities. It will include engagement with research methods training leading up to a period of independent research and the production of a substantial dissertation that builds upon themes and issues covered within the MSc International Security, Intelligence and Strategic Studies. Students will be encouraged to develop their own ideas and demonstrate their capacity for original thought and independent research. The dissertation element aims to enable students to identify and research particular issues or problems, linked to security, intelligence and strategy, at a deeper level than is possible within assessed essays and to develop a critical analysis of the existing body of academic work relating to their topic of choice. Students taking this course will be prepared for further research, study or professional careers through the development of their skills in data collection and analysis, use of original and secondary sources and the conducting and writing up of a detailed research project.

**Intended Learning outcomes:** By the end of the dissertation, students will be able to:

- > Devise a realistic programme of research on a topic reflecting the main themes of the programme;
- > Collect, select and critically analyse relevant background literature and arguments of a range of scholars;
- > Understand and select the appropriate methodology for dealing with information sources and data;
- > Apply these methods to gather and interrogate data in an open-minded, rigorous and undogmatic manner;
- > Be able to critically evaluate competing theories and apply relevant theoretical frameworks to guide the study
- > Organise the data collected and analyse the findings in a competent manner that allows for a fluid and logical argument to be presented;
- > Be reflexive and self-critical about findings and the limitations of analysis;
- > Work independently, organising and maintaining own programme of study to meet academic deadlines so as to produce work containing a substantial element of originality.

### **Word Count:**

Dissertations should be 20,000 words in length for students undertaking work-placement as part of the independent study portfolio and 22,000 words in length for standard dissertation students. Word counts exclude the title page, abstract, contents, bibliography and appendices). There is a 10% leeway for words above the upper limit, but no leeway for dissertation that fall under the word requirement. All dissertations must display an accurate word-count including the citations, footnotes/endnotes and chapter/section titles. One point (on the Glasgow 22-point scale) will be deducted for each 750 words under the minimum or over the 10% upper limit.

### **Language:**

The dissertation **must** be written in British English. A Czech Language cover page / abstract may be included

### **Late Submission Penalty:**

Dissertations that do not have an extension or are submitted after an extension deadline are subject to a penalty of 2 secondary bands per day (this includes weekends and holidays) on the Glasgow grading Scale.

### **Plagiarism:**

Dissertations which suffer from excessive (e.g. serious and/or deliberate) plagiarism will be subject to a grade of 0/Fail and be referred to the appropriate authorities at both universities. Dissertations that contain some elements of plagiarism, but which are deemed not to be excessive (e.g. minor instances that are not considered deliberate) based on consultation of both internal markers, should be graded accordingly and will be subject to scrutiny from the external examiner and could still result in a mark of 0 as well as referral to appropriate authorities for disciplinary action.

### **Consultation prior to final grading:**

First marking by both institutions should be completed blind with no prior consultation. Once both markers have graded the dissertation and provided written comments, they should consult on the grading and come to a joint final grade, taking into consideration any late submission or excessive word count penalty. It is the responsibility of the Glasgow marker to oversee this. Where markers cannot come to a joint agreement then the dissertation should be referred to the Programme Convenors at Glasgow and Charles (Dr. Eamonn Butler & Dr Vít Střítecký). The external examiner will be used to moderate any dissertation in this position and the comments referred back to the internal markers for confirmation.