1

Presentation Overview

- Background & Context
- Method
- Results
  - Overall Characteristics
  - Sentiment Analysis
  - Values
  - Advice and Actions
- Relevance to Our Profession

2

Recent Studies

- Robert & McCormack (2025): 42% of the universities had AI policy (N = 783 around the world)
- Alba et al. (2025), An et al. (2025): Emerging themes from universities around the world
- Alqahtani and Wafula (2025) surveyed 25 top ranked US universities
- Dai et al (2025) surveyed 60 top ranked Asian universities

3

Core Themes at 50 American Universities

Alba et al. (2025)

- academic integrity and responsible use
- clear communication of AI policies
- data privacy and security concerns
- ethical considerations
- continuous adaptation and policy evolution
- documentation and transparency in AI usage
- instructor discretion

4

Concerns at 25 American Universities

Alqahtani and Wafula (2025)

- Instructor discretion (and clear policy)
- Assessment redesign to promote critical thinking and avoid cheating
- Advice to students to use GenAI as a tutor
- Lack of training for faculty/expectation of self-driven training
- Diverse responses to promoting integrity
- Equity and accessibility
- Intellectual Property
- Privacy

5

Characteristics at Top 60 Asian Universities

Dai et al (2025)

- Narratives of GenAI (informed but cautious, embracing AI, responding to change)
- Focus on commercially available GenAI, not development of AI tools, and more on Text than other media generators
- General principles more than categorical dos and don'ts
- Diverse approaches to assessment responsibility

6

Context

- Constitutionally and ethically, universities and university instructors are supposed to have academic freedom.
- The uses of AI depend on each individual discipline.
- Administrative law in Japan requires each university to make its own curriculum policy.

7

Method

- Gallagher (2024)'s list: 394 AI policies from Japanese universities
- Sudachi to tokenize for quantitative analyses
- Japanese Sentiment Polarity Dictionary for sentiment analysis
- AntConc for corpus analysis
- Taguette for qualitative analysis
- Interview with MEXT officials

8

Overall Characteristics

- Great length variation (101 to 5223 morphemes)
  - from thoughtful to cursory
- Mostly students as the target audience (256 = students, 76 students and teachers, 22 = teachers, 40 = general)
- University president as the most frequent author
- Some policies: departmental/faculty-level

9

Sentiment Analysis

-1	0	1
negative----------	----------neutral----------	----------positive

	Score	Positive	Negative	Matches	Tokens	Density
Average	0.391254	39.14467	16.04569	55.19036	790.033	0.069889
Sum		15423	6322	21745	311273	

- Overall positive: + 0.39
- Score range: from -0.33 (negative) to 1 (positive)
- Match density range: 0.011628 (less opinionated) to 0.146789 (more opinionated)

10

Correlations

Sentiment x Length				
n = 394	r = 0.099538	t = 1.980595	df = 392	p = 0.048335

- The small r makes a weak relationship, even though technically significant.

Sentiment x University Type				
	National	Public	Private	F = 1.72 p = 0.180
n	40	69	286	
Mean	0.338027	0.381729	0.400963	
SD	0.237988	0.208017	0.201164	

- The difference is not statistically significant.

11

Value Categories

- Ethics
- Humanity
- Information
- Thinking

12

Values: Ethics

- Appropriateness (Particularly vague and undefined)
- Fairness
- Personal Morality (Undefined)

13

Values: Humanity

- Accountability (Human/User accountability)
- Control (Human control/agency, AI as a tool)
- Instructor discretion
- Society (for building a better society or combating social problems)
- Human well-being

14

Discretion

N-Gram Analysis

- **担当 教員 の 指示 に 従う て 下さる** (One of two 8-grams with 50+ frequency and range)
- #1 in in 7-gram

MEXT Interview

- Each university has an authority and an obligation to create its own curriculum policy.
- MEXT does not claim to know any better than classroom teachers.

15

Values: Information

- Accuracy (often paired with "Verification")
- Confidentiality (of institutional and other privileged info)
- Copyright
- Plagiarism (implying the value of academic integrity)
- Privacy (of personal information)
- Research data, protection of
  - "Confidentiality," "Plagiarism," and "Research" are often grouped together

16

Values: Thinking

- Critical thinking (actively questioning AI outputs)
- Independent thinking (one's own thinking)
- Originality (unique)
  - These three categories are often conflated
- AI literacy
- Learning
- Verification (often paired with "Accuracy")

17

Advice & Action: View from the Ministry

- Galapagos approach? Other countries not being used as a model
- Information sharing structures already in place
- Encouragement, not direction
- Broader concern for science and humanities

18

Advice & Action: View from the Ministry

- University level: rejection of one-size fits all approaches
  - Institutional independence
  - Subject specificity
  - Academic independence
- Secondary education: more direct encouragement
  - Promote mathematics, science and AI
  - Source of growth in a declining population

19

Advice & Action: University Policies

- General ban on C&P of LLM output
- Emphasis on output evaluation
  - Strong awareness of hallucination
  - Strong awareness of copyright issues
  - Some awareness of quality problems
- Threat to critical thinking and creativity
  - Appeals to integrity and educational values, little concrete advice

20

Advice & Action: University policies

- Delegation to individual teachers
- Range of responses in how to exploit
  - Dialoguing
  - Brainstorming
  - Proofing
  - Programming*
- Assessment integrity
  - Oral examinations, ban on use in final exams

21

Relevance for Our Profession

- Universities view AI as positive but acknowledge a threat to the development of critical thinking skills.
- *Responsibility* and *authority* for integrating AI in education is on frontline teachers
- Institutions are appealing to students' sense of ethics – how do we support that?
- Assessment integrity is a big concern.
- Technology is changing fast.
  - Institutions offer limited training support for teaching staff regarding AI
  - Teachers need to build active sharing networks within their specialization (SLA)
  - Expect evolving policies.

22

Questions?

Tosh Tachino
tosh@toshtachino.com
Cameron Smith
casmith@dpc.agu.ac.jp

Presentation Materials:
https://toshtachinho.com/jaltcall2025/

23

References

An, Y., Yu, J. H., & James, S. (2025). Investigating the higher education institutions' guidelines and policies regarding the use of generative AI in teaching, learning, research, and administration. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *22*(10), 1-23. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-025-00507-3

Alba, C., Xi, W., Wang, C., & An, R. (2025). ChatGPT comes to campus: Unveiling core themes in AI policies across U.S. Universities with large language models. *SIGCSETS 2025: Proceedings of the 56th ACM Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education* (vol. 2), 1359–1360. https://doi.org/10.1145/3641555.3705141

Alqahtani, N., & Wafula, Z. (2025). Artificial intelligence integration: Pedagogical strategies and policies at leading universities. *Innovative Higher Education*, *50*(2), 665–684. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-024-09749-x

Dai, Y., Lai, S., Lim, C. P., & Liu, A. (2025). University policies on generative AI in Asia: Promising practices, gaps, and future directions. *Journal of Asian Public Policy*, *18*(2), 260–281. https://doi.org/10.1080/17516234.2024.2379070

Gallagher, A. B. (2024, May 17–19). *Tertiary education artificial intelligence policies across Japan in 2024 and the new user experience* [Paper presentation]. The Annual Conference of the Japan Association for Language Teaching Computer Assisted Language Learning Special Interest Group, Nagoya, Aichi, Japan.

Robert, J., & McCormack, M. (2025). 2025 EDUCAUSE AI landscape study: Into the digital AI divide. EDUCAUSE. https://www.educause.edu/content/2025/2025-educause-ai-landscape-study/introduction-and-key-findings

24