

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

Student Matriculation No.	Glasgow 2336332 DCU 17116261 Charles 45620395
Dissertation Title	HEALTH SECURITY - ROLE OF THE SECURITY SECTOR IN COMBATING THE 2014 EBOLA OUTBREAK IN SIERRA LEONE

INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION GRADING

Reviewer 1 Initial Grade <i>Select from drop down list</i>	Reviewer 2 Initial Grade <i>Select from drop down list</i>	Late Submission Penalty <i>no penalty</i>
Word Count Penalty (Under 1-15% = 1 GP; 15-20% = 2 GP; 20-25% = 3 GP; more than 25% = zero)		
Word Count: 16479 Suggested Penalty: 2 points penalty		

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

Final Agreed Mark. (Following correspondence reviewers should list the agreed final internal grade taking before and after any penalties to be applied).

Before Penalty: D1 [11] **After Penalty:** D3 [9]

DISSERTATION FEEDBACK

Assessment Criteria	Rating
A. Structure and Development of Answer	
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>	Weak
• <i>Logically structured argument and flow of ideas reflecting research questions</i>	Satisfactory
• <i>Application of theory and/or concepts</i>	Poor
B. Use of Source Material	
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
C. Academic Style	
This refers to your ability to write in a formal academic manner	
• <i>Appropriate formal and clear writing style</i>	Satisfactory
• <i>Accurate spelling, grammar and punctuation</i>	Satisfactory
• <i>Consistent and accurate referencing (including complete bibliography)</i>	Very Good
• <i>Is the dissertation free from plagiarism?</i>	Yes
• <i>Evidence of ethics approval included (if required based on methodology)</i>	No

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

- *Appropriate word count*

No

ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

Reviewer 1

This thesis is a revised version of the IMSISS dissertation. It addresses a highly relevant topic of civil/military relationship with regards to the health emergency on a national level. Comparing to the previous version, the author builds on a clear research question (it asks what was the role of the security sector in addressing the 2014 Ebola outbreak in Sierra Leone), which is further divided into 3 dimensions (civil emergency structure before the crisis, effectiveness of the security sector when deployed, and the civil-military relationship), complemented by policy recommendation. The author showed a deep engagement with the topic, worked with relevant sources; the dissertation offers interesting insights into the case. However, the overall research design and the thesis itself contains several flaws.

As regards theoretical considerations, it is not entirely clear what is the theoretical background of the thesis. On several occasions, securitisation theory is mentioned, but the work does not take on a critical perspective. The key concept seems to be the "security sector" but is not properly defined/conceptualised and, according to the author, includes actors like volunteers or media, which blurs the concept even more. The reader also asks what the added value of the thesis is, as the gap in the literature is not clearly identified. It seems the work mainly aims to evaluate the "effectiveness" of the deployment of the security sector, but this concept is (again) not properly defined, and in this respect, the author mainly repeats the conclusion of other studies which claimed the deployment effective. Another novel aspect could be a new perspective based on analysing the conducted interviews or discussing, e.g., aspects of community engagement, but even though it is mentioned in the introduction, it is not present in the main body of the thesis.

From the methodological point of view, there are many aspects of that research that remained unanswered. First, the thesis promises to present the findings coming from the analysis of several interviews. However, the reader does not know how many people have been interviewed (both 15 and 20 are mentioned in the text), what does the sample represents (whole population? security actors? health personnel?), how the findings relate to the whole population, nor what was the structure of the interview (what were the questions asked / topics explored). But primarily, it seems no findings from the interviews are presented in the thesis, or at least the interviews are not referred to as a source in the text. Moreover, the thesis does not include the evidence of the ethics approval needed for such type of research. Secondly, the author suggests that the thesis explores the causal relationship between the poor public health system, and the role played by the security sector. It is a reasonable proposition, but the causal relationship would be more difficult to prove (or at least convince the reader that it is there). Thirdly, on a similar note, the author suggests that the findings can be generalised to other developing countries (e.g., page 14 and 19), but the basis for the generalisation are not laid out, mainly the selection of the case (in relation to the theoretical population of states) is not discussed.

Chapter four presents the key evidence of the case related to the research question. From my point of view, this is the most developed part of the text. The chapter is structured according to the three dimensions of the research question and even though it suffers from the insufficiencies of the previous chapter (insufficient theoretical background and methodology of the research), it provides the interesting insides into the case. However, the chapter could be substantially

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

improved by reflecting more critically on the secondary sources and adding new perspectives/data coming from the author's own work (interviews, other analysis of primary sources).

As regards formal requirements, the text is short of words (18 thousand words, without bibliography, instead of 20 thousand). The numbering of the section is not correct (there is no 3.1 and 4.0 section). Even though we can find a list of appendices on the last page, there are no appendices to the thesis (this section refers probably to the figures and tables used in the text, but they have already been listed on page 10). The figures and tables (e.g. table 1, figure 2) are not referred to in the text, and the question is why they were included if they are not clearly related to the argument. Some parts of the text ("Sierra Leone ... to ameliorate the situation at hand", p. 13-14) is repeated in the text.

In the bibliography, section "Government Policies and Laws", refers to "unpublished" documents, which probably only denotes sources not published in article/book format. Or are these meant to be a primary source obtained by the author in the archive, or in person? Similarly, section "Internet (websites, blogs)" is not cited properly, as the URL link is not sufficient.

Last but not least issue of the thesis is the language. Even though the language improved since the last version, it still contains many language errors that make the thesis hardly readable. One can wonder how the argument would be better if the thesis went through proper proofreading.

The thesis shows an engaged author who is passionate about the topic but would benefit from more a structured design overall.

Reviewer 2

The student has provided a suitable context introduction. There are 4 confirmed aims, which are clear but need to be better embedded within the wider literature and justification for why these are appropriate aims linked to a puzzle needs to be better explained.

Some decent awareness of the literature. Subjective viewpoints are made in relation to the literature and the rate of citation is relatively consistent. Overview of preceding pandemics is useful and, it seems to me, accurate. Second section is more problematic and it doesn't really tie the disparate threads of the literature together to form a 'gap', which can then be 'filled' by the proceeding analysis. I'm not sure it gets into the root of the research question here. However, the conclusion does attempt to justify the proceeding structure—this shows awareness re. research design and is positive.

The methodology is weak and in places confusing. It appears that the student did interviews but not clear if ethics approval was obtained. Overall there is a weak engagement with methods and it is not clear that the student is fully familiar with key approaches. There is confusion about inclusion of statistical methods for interviews. Clarity should be requested in the oral defence. What type of questions were asked? The interview data was not presented within the dissertation so it is not clear if this was actually done or how the data was used. This is problematic.

The student claims that the study is theory driven but this is not adequately established and needs to be questioned withing the oral defence. There is a difference between the securitization of Ebola and the militarisation of the disease.

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

Content wise, a significant amount of information is present but this is often chaotic in presentation and structure.

The student does present an awareness of the processes of dealing with the Ebola outbreak, so it is clear that engagement with literature and reports has taken place, but this is overly descriptive and less critically reflective in nature.

Overall, the topic is very interesting and relevant for the degree. The student has clearly undertaken engagement with the literature, but the degree of critical reflection is weak and how it informs the empirical work is not clear. The empirical section of the dissertation is almost non-existent. There are serious question to be asked about methods and approaches and if the student followed appropriate procedures linked to the interviews.

The student has produced a basic literature based essay which makes some interesting points but the wider research elements are extremely weak. Stylistically there are many problem areas including use of language, sentence structure, and grammar. This makes the dissertation challenging to read in places.

The dissertation appears rushed and is still short of the required word count.

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

PLEASE READ: Information Notes for Markers:

IMPORTANT Please note that all grading should be done using the University of Glasgow Marking Scale. Details of this scale and advice on how to use it are included at the end of this information section.

When grading the IMSIS Dissertation reviewers are asked to reflect upon the aims and learning outcomes for the dissertation. Each dissertation should also adopt a clear security focus relevant to the programme.

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 MUST meet the required word length as detailed below.

- Route A (Standard dissertation/ non-work placement students) – minimum 22000 words (10%+ upper limit = 24200 words)
- Route B (Work placement students) – minimum 20000 words (10%+ upper limit = 22000words)

Word counts exclude the title page, abstract, contents, bibliography and appendices). All dissertations must display an accurate word-count including the citations, footnotes/endnotes and chapter/section titles. A 10% leeway is provided for additional words, but the dissertation **must not be less than the stated minimum word length** for each route. The minimum word count is necessary to ensure that students meet the Czech legal requirements for the degree. One secondary band point (on the Glasgow 22-point scale) should be deducted for each 500 words under the minimum or over the 10% upper maximum 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 band points 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 the University of Glasgow. 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.

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

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 an agreed joint final grade, taking into consideration any late submission or word count penalty. Where markers cannot come to a joint agreement then the dissertation should be referred to the Programme Directors who will appoint a third review to take place. The external examiner will be used to moderate any dissertation in this position and the comments referred back to the internal markers for confirmation.

Programme Directors:

All correspondence for the programme directors should be directed to Dr Eamonn Butler who will directly liaise with the co-directors. For information the 3 programme directors are:

- At University of Glasgow: Éamonn Butler (eamonn.butler@glasgow.ac.uk)
- At Dublin City University: James Fitzgerald (james.fitzgerald@dcu.ie)
- At Charles University: Vítek Střítecký (vit.stritecky@fsv.cuni.cz)

External Examiner:

The external examiner for the IMSIS programme is Dr James Worrall from the University of Leeds (UK). The external examiner is responsible for final moderation of grading. The external examiner cannot overrule the internal examiners but can make recommendations which will be considered following consultation with the internal reviewers and confirmed at the programme examination board.

Feedback and Marking Sheet:

The above feedback form utilises drop down boxes. It is important that your selected assessment criteria rating reflects the overall grading mark for the dissertation. For example, if the dissertation is graded in the 'A' band, then we would expect to see a majority of excellent ratings. Student matriculations numbers for each university should be added to the form. These numbers should be obtained from the front cover of the dissertation. Occasionally students do not add these numbers so if you do not find them all then please do not worry. Both reviewers should include some written comment on the dissertation. Please note that these comments will be provided to the students in advance of their oral defence examination.

Ethics is required for any dissertation where the students has undertaken person-to-person research (e.g. interviews, survey).

IMPORTANT – Only one feedback and grade sheet should be returned to the IMSIS team. It must include both reviewers initial suggested grade, the agreed joint grade, details of any penalty, both sets of written comments and revised rating descriptors to reflect the final agreed grade. Reviewer 1 should take responsibility to complete the form and check it before emailing it to the IMSIS mail box – IMSIS@glasgow.ac.uk no later than Tuesday 27th August.

Oral Defence:

Each student will be required to sit an oral defence of their dissertation. These will take place on Thursday 12th and Friday 13th September. We must provide students with their provisional grade and a copy of the written feedback by Monday 2nd September to allow them time to make arrangements for the oral defence and written Czech State exam.

Deadline for return of joint agreed grade:

IMPORTANT - We have set a deadline of Tuesday 27th August for return of the joint agreed feedback and grading sheet. It is essential that reviewers meet this deadline, because we have to undertake moderation, process grades and confirm to students that they are allowed to sit their oral defence exam and an additional end of programme written exam (based on courses taken during Semester 3 at Charles University) which takes place on Monday 9th September. Students can only sit these if they have met a minimum GPA for the dissertation and we have to confirm this grade with students at least one week in advance to allow them time to make arrangements to take the written paper.

Reviewer list:

You will be sent an excel document with the names and email address of the different reviewers. Reviewers for each dissertation are listed as Reviewer 1 and Reviewer 2. Reviewer 1 has been given responsibility to complete the final version of the mark sheet and return it to the IMSIS@glasgow.ac.uk email inbox. Please consult these list to identify who you should be liaising with to confirm a final grade.

University of Glasgow Marking Scale:

This is a joint degree so the programme has agreed to use one single marking scale. Therefore, all marking must be done to the University of Glasgow marking scale. We are aware that you may not be familiar with this scale so please read over the following table and advice carefully. It will help you to identify the most appropriate marking band. The Glasgow grading Scale is based on a list of 22 grade points reflecting primary grade bands A-H. Each primary grade is divided into secondary bands which indicate the degree to which the work possesses the quality of the corresponding descriptor. Please note that while there are normally 3 secondary bands for each primary grade, the A-grade has 5 secondary

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

bands to reflect the need to distinguish the specific quality of the A grade. It is advised that reviewers place the work at the midpoint of the secondary band scale and then make a decision whether the work is of a top level, standard/average or lower level for that primary grade. Please note that reviewers are actively encouraged to use the full range of the 22-point scale should be used. Examples are listed below:

- Student 1's dissertation is regarded to be of excellent quality and to be given an A-grade. The secondary point band should be placed at A3 initially, however, the reviewer believes that this piece of work is of the highest standard therefore the secondary band is increased to A1 to reflect the quality of the work.
- Student 2's dissertation is regarded to be of excellent quality and to be given an A-grade. The secondary point band should be placed at A3 initially, however, the reviewer believes that this piece of work is while an A grade is a lower quality A therefore the secondary band is decreased to A5 to reflect the quality of the work.
- Student 3's dissertation is regarded to be of very good quality and to be given a B-grade. The secondary point band should be initially placed at the mid-point of the B range which is B2, the reviewer believes that this piece of work is a solid average B grade so the secondary band remains as B2 to reflect the quality of the work.
- Student 4's dissertation is regarded to be of weak quality and to be given an E-grade. The secondary point band should be initially placed at the mid-point of the E range which is E2, the reviewer believes that this piece of work while weak does have some redeeming elements of analysis so the secondary band is increased to an E1 to reflect the quality of the work.
- Student 5's dissertation is regarded to be of good quality and to be given a C-grade. The secondary point band should be initially placed at the mid-point of the C range which is C2, the reviewer believes that this piece of work is a solid average C grade so the secondary band remains as C2 to reflect the quality of the work. However, the student was 1000 words over the word limit, so this incurs a 2 secondary point penalty so the final grade should be listed as D1.

Primary Grade	Gloss	Secondary Band	Grade Point	Primary verbal Descriptor for Attainment of Intended Learning Outcomes	Honours Class Equivalent
A	Excellent	A1 A2 A3 A4 A5	22 21 20 19 18	Exemplary range and depth of attainment of intended learning outcomes, secured by discriminating command of a comprehensive range of relevant materials and analyses, and by deployment of considered judgement relating to key issues, concepts and procedures	First
B	Very Good	B1 B2 B3	17 16 15	Conclusive attainment of virtually all intended learning outcomes, clearly grounded on a close familiarity with a wide range of supporting evidence, constructively utilised to reveal appreciable depth of understanding	Upper 2 nd
C	Good	C1 C2 C3	14 13 12	Clear attainment of most of the intended learning outcomes, some more securely grasped than others, resting on a circumscribed range of evidence and displaying a variable depth of understanding	Lower 2 nd
D	Satisfactory	D1 D2 D3	11 10 9	Acceptable attainment of intended learning outcomes, displaying a qualified familiarity with a minimally sufficient range of relevant materials, and a grasp of the analytical issues and concepts which is generally reasonable, albeit insecure	Third
E	Weak	E1 E2 E3	8 7 6	Attainment deficient in respect of specific intended learning outcomes, with mixed evidence as to the depth of knowledge and weak deployment of arguments or deficient manipulations	
F	Poor	F1 F2 F3	5 4 3	Attainment of intended learning outcomes appreciably deficient in critical respects, lacking secure basis in relevant factual and analytical dimensions	
G	Very Poor	G1 G2	2 1	Attainment of intended learning outcomes markedly deficient in respect of nearly all intended learning outcomes, with irrelevant use of materials and incomplete and flawed explanation	Fail
H			0	No convincing evidence of attainment of intended learning outcomes, such treatment of the subject as is in evidence being directionless and fragmentary	
CR	CREDIT REFUSED			Failure to comply, in the absence of good cause, with the published requirements of the course or programme; and/or a serious breach of regulations	



IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet