

I see the classroom as a space of exploration where students are prompted to do hard thinking. I value **curiosity**, **structure**, and **practicality**. First, the most important job of an instructor is to keep students curious. I spend time to build sharp and intriguing dilemma questions and adopt experimental methods. Second, a clear structure helps students to set their expectations and motivates them to take intellectual risks without losing their footing. Third, I show students that classroom inquiries can turn into tangible research and their future careers. Durable motivation comes when students can envision who they might become. My aim is to train students in AI law, policy, and ethics, who will perform a vital role in guiding the future relationship between human and AI.

## 1 Proposed Courses

I am qualified to teach Constitutional Law, Administrative Law, Law and Technology, Law and Social Science, Civil Rights, Privacy Law, and Freedom of Expression. In addition, I propose the following courses that integrate doctrinal foundations with emerging challenges in AI and platform regulation.

1. **Governing Artificial Intelligence.** This course examines both technical and legal AI governance. It covers the mechanisms of developing and deploying large language models (LLMs) (e.g., pre-training, RLHF), and emerging attempts to regulate them through domestic and international laws and technical standards (e.g., EU AI Act, NIST Risk Management Framework, ISO Standards). Students explore policy debates around balancing innovation and safety, human-machine responsibility allocation, and value incorporation in AI frameworks. Students engage with historical analogues, current legal debates, and emerging oversight models while considering AI's implications for transnational law and geopolitics.
2. **Platform Governance and Power.** This course offers an in-depth analysis of how different legal systems worldwide are grappling with the governance challenges posed by digital platforms. It includes content moderation policies across jurisdictions (Germany's NetzDG, EU Digital Services Act, Texas HB-20), platform market power and competition policy (EU Digital Markets Act, U.S. antitrust cases against Google and Amazon), and data protection regimes (GDPR, state privacy laws, and China's data localization rules). Students analyze real-world cases including Australia's news media bargaining code, Brazil's standoff with X/Twitter, and platform labor classification disputes.
3. **Law and Computer Science Research.** Does regulation on content moderation chill online discussions? Can conversational AI help pro se litigants navigate court procedures? Answering these questions require expertise in both law and empirical research. Students learn to design studies using survey platforms, apply Large Language Models (LLM) classifications to text data, and create interactive tools such as chatbots and deliberation platforms. The curriculum emphasizes question refinement, methodology selection, and research ethics including IRB processes. Students develop research briefs clarifying policy questions and methods that can turn into submissions to major computer science conferences and journals like Nature Machine Intelligence, Artificial Intelligence and Law or AI and Ethics.

## 2 Teaching Methods

I am not hesitant to experiment with methods to spark students' curiosity and engagement. I bring various interactive methods to classroom, inspired by the literature on Human-Computer Interactions [3], including whiteboarding, sticky-note walls, role-playing, polling, and collaborative visualization. In the Technology Law and Public Policy Seminar that I **independently designed and taught at the University of Washington School of Law in 2023**<sup>1</sup>, students chose the role of **privacy attorneys from the United States, France, and Germany**, debating cultural and doctrinal differences, grounded in Whitman's The Two Cultures of Privacy [7] and Jacobsen & Raffel's Role-playing Method [6]. To show the potential career paths, I hosted a panel of **four lawyers**

---

<sup>1</sup>The syllabus is available at: <https://inyoungcheong.github.io/lawe553/>

**from TikTok’s Trust & Safety team** and discussed what questions they wrestle with daily and why T&S-fluent attorneys are in high demand across industry. Based on my conviction that publication is a powerful accelerator of professional growth, I **met one-on-one with all twenty-seven students** to develop individualized publication goals. Some of them **advanced their work to law review publication** including work on government’s collection of intimate health data [2] and AI and fair use [1].

My excitement about interactive pedagogy extends into broader scholarly communities. At the Berkeley Center for Human-Compatible AI (CHAI) Workshop, I led a **tutorial on Emotional Reliance on AI**, using a real-time polling system and whiteboarding activities to reflect on how emerging forms of human-AI attachment transform human connections [5]. The lessons from this tutorial shaped **my recent law review paper** [4]. Similarly, at the Law-Following AI Workshop at Cambridge University, I facilitated a **discussion with thirty law professors** on the **intentionality and accountability of AI systems**, using interactive polling and visualization. I look forward to expanding these facilitation efforts with my students, creating spaces where senior and junior scholars brainstorm together while building the professional networks essential for academic careers.

### 3 Advising Methods

Research is, first and foremost, a human process. The best work emerges from trust, clarity, and shared purpose [8]. At Princeton’s Center for Information Technology Policy and the University of Washington School of Law, I have **mentored 20+ students**, both “**model**” students—e.g., a law review editor-in-chief—and **non-traditional students**—e.g., a 14-year-old undergraduate, a parent beginning graduate study in the mid-thirties. Our collaborations have produced work published at the ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI), the ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAccT), the AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society (AIES), the Conference on Language Models (COLM).

This experience gave me three lessons: (1) each student has **the potential to become a great researcher**; (2) **students tend to over-commit**; and (3) **having a structure helps in setting clear expectations**. Across all types of students, I have prioritized regular meetings, proactive check-ins on workload, frequent alignment with students’ long-term and short-term goals, and make myself available for their pressing questions. When I start advising, I prefer to sit with research questions before we touch methods. I ask what is tugging at them, what change they hope their work will make, and who must be convinced. We then imagine the end product and its audience, sketch a living timeline, and name collaborators. This playful exchange becomes **the anchor that preserves momentum as data, methods, and interests evolve**. Prompts I use include:

- Why this problem, what personal experience or value, is at stake?
- Who is the ultimate reader, and what decision should this work inform (court, agency, product counsel, standards body, or scholarly peers)?
- What’s the right product for that audience, and what does that imply for scope and timing?
- If you could borrow anyone’s expertise, whose would it be, and why?
- What evidence would persuade that audience, and which methods follow from that?

I prioritize **long-term growth and well-being of students** even though it might not be the fastest path to short-term results. I perceive my role as calibrating scope, setting realistic goals, and checking workload proactively. After we define a minimum viable paper and a stretch goal, I mention that pivoting is part of the craft. When new challenges emerge—e.g., personal health concerns, conflicting findings in data—I help students decide whether to re-scope or redeploy ongoing work, evaluating: (1) narrow the claim, (2) change the method, (3) repurpose the output (blog post, dataset/tool), or (4) sunset the project. We weigh costs and impacts on career goals, then move decisively, protecting momentum while honoring the work already invested. By fostering both intellectual courage and personal sustainability, I seek to prepare students who will remain energized and committed to solving the complex challenges that emerge as AI transforms our legal landscape.

## References

- [1] Jacob Alhadeff, Cooper Cuene, and Max Del Real. Limits of algorithmic fair use. *Wash. J.L. Tech. & Arts*, 19:1, 2024.
- [2] Rhea Bhatia. A loophole in the fourth amendment: The government’s unregulated purchase of intimate health data. *Washington Law Review Online*, 98(2):67, 2024.
- [3] Ann Blandford, Dominic Furniss, and Stephann Makri. *Qualitative HCI research: Going behind the scenes*. Morgan & Claypool Publishers, 2016.
- [4] Inyoung Cheong. Epistemic and emotional harms of generative ai: Towards human-centered first amendment. *Rutgers Comp. & Tech L. J.*, forthcoming. <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=5435335>.
- [5] Inyoung Cheong et al. Emotional Reliance on AI: Design, Dependency, and the Future of Human Connection, August 2025. <https://blog.citp.princeton.edu/2025/08/20/emotional-reliance-on-ai-design-dependency-and-the-future-of-human-connection>.
- [6] Alec Jacobson and Colin Raffel. Role-playing paper-reading seminars. March 2021. <https://colinraffel.com/blog/role-playing-seminar.html>.
- [7] James Q Whitman. The two western cultures of privacy: Dignity versus liberty. *Yale LJ*, 113:1151, 2003.
- [8] Akbar Zaheer, Bill McEvily, and Vincenzo Perrone. Does trust matter? exploring the effects of interorganizational and interpersonal trust on performance. *Organization science*, 9(2):141–159, 1998.