

Course Report WASP Graduate School

Date: yyyy-mm-dd

Authors: Nina Khairova

Name of course: “WASP Ethical, Legal, Societal and Economical Aspects of AI and AS”

Semester: Spring 2024

Number of registered students: 92

Answering frequency (course evaluation): 24 (26%)

Examination results

Number of students examined: 85

Fail: 1 (1 %)

Pass: (84) (99%)

Brief summary of student viewpoints and suggestions

Results of WASP base-line quantitative questions

The course was generally well received, with the majority of students (58%) rating it 4 or 5. Only a small fraction (4%) gave the lowest rating, suggesting overall satisfaction with the course content and delivery.

While a small portion of students (around 20%) gave lower ratings (1 or 2), the majority (over 67%) rated their enjoyment as average to high. Notably, one third of respondents (33.7%) gave the course a score of 4 or 5, indicating that many students had a positive experience overall.

While half of the students (50%) rated the course positively (4 or 5), a notable portion (33.4%) gave lower ratings (1 or 2), indicating that some students did not feel the course fully met their expectations. This feedback highlights both the value seen by many and the opportunity to improve the course experience further.

Nearly half of the students (45.8%) found the course assignments useful, giving them a rating of 4 or 5. While a small number of students (around 16.6%) rated them as less helpful (1 or 2), the overall feedback suggests that the assignments were valuable for many, with some room for improvement.

Answers to free text-questions to be (shortly) summarized under “Strengths” and “Weaknesses”

The most appreciated aspects of the course were its diverse and interdisciplinary content, especially the legal and ethical perspectives such as the AI Act and GDPR. Many participants highlighted the value of peer learning, including group assignments, peer review, and open discussions that encouraged reflection on their own PhD projects.

- What would you suggest improving?
- What advice would you like to give to future participants?
- Other comments. Is there anything else you would like to add?

"Strengths" according to students¹

- Diverse and interdisciplinary content (law, ethics, AI, GDPR, AI Act)
- Insightful lectures from a range of experts (lawyers, AI specialists)
- Group assignments and peer review that encouraged reflection and collaboration
- Open discussions and exchange of perspectives with coursemates
- Opportunities to relate course topics to individual PhD projects
- A friendly and diverse learning environment
- Social activities (e.g., group dinner) that supported networking across universities

Some students found the lecture format too passive and recommended adding more interactive elements, group discussions, and improved scheduling. Logistical concerns included uncomfortable seating, lack of desks, limited access to materials on Canvas, and insufficient consideration of dietary restrictions. There were also suggestions to improve the venue and enhance the overall quality and delivery of lectures.

"Weaknesses" according to students¹

- Make the lecture format more interactive
- Add more group discussions and improve session scheduling
- Improve seating comfort and provide desks
- Ensure better access to course materials (e.g., via Canvas)
- Better respect dietary restrictions during meals and fika
- Change the lecture venue used on the first day
- Include more pressing ethical issues in AI and autonomous systems
- Introduce methodologies for building ethical systems by design

Comments from teachers on the implementation and outcome of the course²

The teachers noted that the course successfully brought together participants from diverse academic and professional backgrounds, which contributed to rich discussions and peer learning. The interdisciplinary content—covering law, ethics, and AI—was well received overall, and the group assignment encouraged students to reflect on their own research. At the same time, feedback from students highlighted areas for improvement, such as the need for more interactive elements and smoother scheduling. These comments will be carefully considered to enhance future editions of the course, with particular attention to lecture format, group engagement, and accessibility of course materials.

¹ Based on both quantitative results and key viewpoints from students' free-text answers

² Including changes effected during the course

Proposed changes/comments/measures

- Introduce more interactive elements, including smaller group discussions and collaborative assignments
- Streamline the lecture schedule to ensure better coherence and reduce cognitive overload
- Make course materials accessible in advance via Canvas