

Course Report WASP Graduate School

Date: 2026-09-29

Authors: Nina Khairova

Name of course, “Ethical, Legal and Social Impact of AI and AS”

Semester: Spring/2026

Number of registered students: 150

Answering frequency (course evaluation): 30 (20%)

Examination results

Number of students examined: 150

Fail: 0 (0%)

Pass: (150) (100%)

Brief summary of student viewpoints and suggestions

Results of WASP base-line quantitative questions

- What is your overall rating of the course? – **average 3,2**

Compared with 2025, the proportion of students rating the course highly (4 or 5) decreased from 60% to **36.7%**, while ratings of 1, and 2 increased from 5% and 10% to **6.7%** and **16.7%**, respectively.

- Did you enjoy the course? (1-5) – **average 3,2**

Compared with 2025, the proportion of students who rated their enjoyment highly (4 or 5) decreased from 60% to **33.3%**, while the proportion assigning ratings of 1 or 2 increased slightly from 20% to **23.3%**.

- Was it time well spent? (1-5) – **average 3,07**

Compared with 2025, the proportion of students who rated the time spent on the course as 3, 4, or 5 increased from 60% to **66.7%**; however, the proportion giving the highest rating of 5 decreased from 25% to **10%**.

- 1.4 How would you evaluate this year’s course format as a winter school?

The winter-school format was evaluated positively, with **63.3%** of students assigning a rating of 4 or 5 and an average score of **3.6**

“Strengths” according to students

- Interesting, relevant and diverse topics offering a broad perspective on AI ethics, policy and explainable AI.
- High-quality and inspiring lectures delivered by knowledgeable and engaging experts.
- Interactive ethical scenarios, team-based AI-tool activities, practical tasks and group exercises encouraging active participation and discussion of different viewpoints.
- Opportunities to meet other doctoral students, members of the WASP community and representatives of the AI Policy Lab, and to establish new professional connections.
- A well-paced, self-contained three-day winter-school format with sufficient time for networking.
- A poster session supporting interaction and exchange of information about participants' research.

"Weaknesses" according to students

- A lecture-heavy schedule, with some sessions considered too long and insufficient breaks, making it difficult to maintain concentration.
- Insufficient time for group discussions, practical activities, reflection and presentation of group results, causing some interactive exercises to feel rushed.
- Repetition and limited coherence across some lectures and workshops, with parts of the content perceived as too general or insufficiently adapted to participants from computer science and mathematics.
- Limited use of concrete cases, particularly in the legal and ethical sessions, and insufficient connection between the course content and participants' own research.
- Uneven participant engagement, including late arrivals and unrelated computer work
- Some organisational shortcomings, including unsuitable rooms for group work and insufficient dietary alternatives during fika.

Comments from teachers on the implementation and outcome of the course

- The winter-school format was successfully implemented and provided a suitable environment for intensive learning, networking and exchange among doctoral students.
- The course covered a broad range of relevant topics and benefited from contributions by knowledgeable lecturers and experts from different disciplines. The interactive exercises and poster session supported discussion, collaboration and exchange of research perspectives.
- The evaluation nevertheless indicates that the balance between lectures and interactive activities should be improved.
- Participant engagement varied considerably, with late arrivals and unrelated computer use negatively affecting some sessions and the learning environment.

Proposed changes/comments/measures

- Shorten individual lectures to 45–60 minutes and schedule regular breaks.

- Allocate more time to group discussions, practical exercises, and reflection.
- Improve coordination among lecturers to reduce repetition.
- Provide preparatory materials and information about course activities in advance.
- Clarify and, if necessary, strengthen the coursework and assessment to ensure that they correspond to the expected workload and learning outcomes of a three-credit doctoral course.' Provide suitable dietary alternatives during fika.
- Distribute the course evaluation shortly after the course.