Course Report for the Optional Course Cyber Law (JU668A, JU668B), 15hp, Spring Term 2026

Course Director: Stanley Greenstein

About This Course Report

This course report follows the rector's template for course reports (Dnr SU FV 1.1.2-34-20). The course report is a compilation of the students' views on the course that emerged through the course evaluation (see appendix) as well as the teachers' views.

About the Course Evaluation

The course evaluation was answered by 7 students out of a possible 27, (which amounts to a 26 % rate of answer). This answer frequency is low despite numerous attempts to encourage the students to fill in the course evaluation. It was however an improvement from the previous year.

Description of Eventual Changes and Decisions Taken Since the Last Time the Course Was Given

The number of mandatory seminars was left unchanged from the previous year. The teaching responsibilities for seminar 2, which concerns the course essay, was once again taken on by the course director in order to ensure that the course essay requirements were clearly communicated and assessment criteria covered. In addition, the course essay was graded by the course director. The benefit of this is that there was a correlation between what was communicated to students during seminar 2 (and other course essay supervision) and the expected performance level for the course essay.

The list of relevant reading was updated so as to include articles that were up-to-date and relevant in relation to current technological and legal developments.

External teachers were also chosen depending on the latest technological developments in society and the corresponding legal developments. The number of visits to law firms remained the same while a new visit was to the Swedish Data Protection Board (IMY).

Finally, the focus of the teaching was aligned with the availability of in-house teaching resources and based on economic considerations.

Strengths of the Course Based on the Opinion of Students (summary based on quantitative results, free text answers and any other evaluation during the course)

It follows from the free text responses that the general theme of the course was appreciated to the extent that its relevance corresponded to current technical trends taking place in society, especially within the development of artificial intelligence, and the demands for regulation being placed on the legal domain. In addition, the visits to law firms and public authorities were once again highly appreciated. It also follows from the free text responses

of the course evaluation that the students were satisfied with the teachers' efforts. The format of the course was appreciated to the extent that the course essay provides the students an opportunity to delve deeper into an area of law that they regarded as interesting during the lecture phase of the course. This was especially appreciated by students whose next academic stage is the writing of a longer thesis. In addition, the main idea behind the course format is to allow students the space to delve deeper into an area of law they deem interesting.

The examination format was also appreciated to the extent that the course essay promoted self-learning as well as an opportunity to sharpen the writing skills of students. It also gave the students the opportunity for individual research. The course essay opposition was also appreciated to the extent that it provided feedback both from teacher and fellow student. It provided an informative occasion from which to get feedback to a written work from fellow students as well as teacher. This examination form was also new to many students.

The 'low stress' aspect in relation to the submission of assignments was also appreciated to the extent that there was more of a focus on learning.

The course literature was judged to be good by students.

No student complained of being treated disrespectfully or of being discriminated in any way.

Weaknesses of the Course (summary based on quantitative results, free text answers and any other evaluation during the course)

Based on free text answers, a minor criticism of the course was the difference in level of commitment and engagement between Swedish students and exchange students. A view extracted from the course evaluation was that Swedish students had a higher level of commitment and engagement, whereas exchange students were not as motivated and engaged, especially regarding group work. It has previously been identified by the course director that running a course comprising two distinct groupings – Swedish students and exchange students – does not come without its challenges, where different education cultures but also student aspirations can come into conflict.

While the teacher led instruction in relation to the seminar on 'academic writing' was deemed useful, the peer-review aspect was deemed less useful. This point can potentially be interpreted in light of the above comment.

At times some students had difficulty understanding the spoken English of fellow students.

Course Director/equivalent and possibly other teachers' analysis of the course implementation and report

The course director and the rest of the teaching team are satisfied with the implementation of the course. The overall comments from the course evaluation were very positive. In general students were once again happy with the content of the lectures, the visits to law firms (and public authorities) and the examination form. It has previously been identified by the course director that there is a difficulty bringing together two distinct groupings of students with different academic levels and traditions, e.g. spoken English proficiency and

also different aspirations. There may also be different levels of motivation and expectations which can create a friction.