

Rules for Preventing and Responding to Research Misconduct at Tokyo International University

Last Revised on July 30, 2021

Chapter 1: General Provisions

Article 1. (Purpose)

These Rules shall set forth necessary provisions required for preventing and responding to research misconduct at Tokyo International University (hereinafter “the University”), along with appropriate responses if such misconduct occurs, based on the Guidelines concerning Responses to research misconduct” (Decision of August 26, 2014, issued by the Minister of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology).

Article 2. (Definitions)

1. In these Rules, the following terms listed below shall be defined as set forth below:

a. research misconduct:

1) Fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism made knowingly or by significantly neglecting to perform the basic duty of care that should be known by a researcher.

2) Inappropriate conduct in research other than the conduct set forth in the preceding Paragraph 1), and that considerably deviates from ethical standards relating to research, as set forth in scientists’ codes of conduct and general societal values (including, but not limited to, duplicate publication and improper authorship such as gift authorship, ghost authorship etc.) .

b. Researcher or the like (hereinafter “researcher”)

A person who is employed by the University to engage in research or who uses facilities and equipment of the University to engage in research.

Article 3. (Obligations of Researchers)

1. A researcher shall not commit research misconduct and shall strive to prevent other persons from committing research misconduct.

2. A researcher must undertake training or a study course that presents ethical standards for researchers, along with laws and regulations concerning research activities.

3. A researcher must follow research procedures that ensure the correctness of his/her research activities, and must preserve and manage research materials and the like, including experiment notebooks, observation-recording notebooks, and experimental data, for a period of time long enough for one or more third parties to verify the

researcher's research results. If the University decides that the disclosure of such materials is necessary and appropriate, the researcher shall disclose such materials. Such materials shall be preserved in accordance with the following:

(Preservation of research materials and the like)

a. Research materials (documents, numeric data, images, and the like) and the like shall in principle be preserved for 10 years after publication of a thesis, a research paper, or the like (hereinafter simply "thesis") that contains a researcher's research results and/or data relating thereto. Computerized data shall be preserved by organizing and managing metadata (summarized data for retrieval), and creating an appropriate backup, so that the data is reusable. In addition, paper materials are desirably preserved for at least 10 years, but if compelling circumstances, such as limited storage space, exist, such materials may be disposed of within a reasonable time period.

b. If a researcher is transferred from the University to another institution or resigns from the University, the President of the University (hereinafter "President") shall take measures for the materials to be preserved with other materials relating to that researcher's research activities, with such measures including (a) creating a backup of the materials for preservation, or (b) specifying the location(s) of the materials so that the location(s) of the materials can always known be ascertained even if they are moved.

c. Handling of materials, such as personal data that is subject to legal restrictions or that is subject to ethical considerations when being dealt with, shall be subject to regulations or guidelines provided by the government and/or other relevant organizations regarding such materials. Also, if there is an agreement with a funding institution regarding a particular research project in dealing with the research results of the project, the research results shall be dealt with in accordance with that agreement.

Chapter 2: System for Preventing Research

Article 4. (Responsibilities and Duties of the President)

1. The President, as a person responsible for improving research ethics and preventing research misconduct, shall take appropriate measures to advance the integrity of research conducted at the University.

2. The President shall act concerning the following matters so as to prevent misconduct by researchers:

(i) planning and implementing training and educational instruction regarding research ethics;

(ii) collecting information from within Japan and other countries regarding

research ethics, and making that information known to researchers;

(iii) investigating and accusing alleged research misconduct by researchers at the University;

(iv) other matters concerning research ethics.

3. The FD Committee shall assist the President regarding (i) and (ii) of the preceding paragraph, and shall be in charge of carrying out practical measures relating to those matters.

Article 5. (Research Ethics Education Supervisor)

1. A research-ethics-education supervisor position shall be established and filled by a person who shall be given responsibility and supervisory authority for providing research-ethics education at the University.

2. The research-ethics-education supervisor shall periodically provide education regarding researchers' ethics to researchers who are affiliated with the University.

3. The research-ethics-education supervisor shall be the chairperson of the FD Committee.

Chapter 3: Receiving Allegations of Research Misconduct

Article 6. (Contact Office regarding Possible Research Misconduct)

In order to provide a prompt and appropriate response to an allegation of research misconduct or to a requested consultation concerning possible research misconduct, the "Compliance Desk" for receiving such allegations or requests for consultation shall be established in the Foundation Headquarters.

Article 7. (System for Consultation regarding Possible Research Misconduct)

1. Any person who is affiliated with the University who suspects that a person (or group) affiliated with the University is committing, or has committed, research misconduct can submit to the contact office a written report via facsimile, e-mail, postal mail, or telephone, or in person, alleging possible research misconduct by that person (or group).

2. The allegation report shall, in principle, include the name of the person(s) reporting the allegation and the name of the researcher(s) or research group that has allegedly committed research misconduct, and shall clearly and expressly set forth the specific form of research misconduct, other concrete information relating to the alleged misconduct, and reasonable grounds for alleging misconduct.

3. The person in charge of the contact office may receive, after consulting with the

President, an anonymous allegation if said person finds that to be necessary.

4. If the contact office receives an allegation, it shall promptly report that to the President, who shall notify the head of the relevant University department or graduate school of that allegation.

5. If a person who reports alleged misconduct is not able to confirm that his/her allegation has been received by the contact office, because, for example, the allegation was reported by postal mail, the contact office shall notify that person that the allegation has been received, unless the allegation was made anonymously.

6. If an allegation relating to the University is reported on by the media, by a research organization or the like, or on the World Wide Web (WWW), the President may deal with such an allegation as if it were an anonymous allegation (but only if the allegation expressly states the name of the researcher(s) or the research group that allegedly has committed research misconduct, and clearly and expressly sets forth the specific form of research misconduct, other concrete information relating to the alleged misconduct, and reasonable grounds for alleging said misconduct).

Article 8. (Consultation regarding Reporting Allegation of Research Misconduct)

1. A person who has concerns about the conduct of research, but who is hesitant about reporting an allegation or does not know with certainty the procedure for reporting such an allegation, may consult with the contact office about such matters.

2. If the contact office is consulted by a person who has not explicitly expressed an intent to report an allegation, and if the contact office, after checking the content of the consultation, deems that research misconduct probably has been committed, the contact office shall confirm whether the consulting person intends to report an allegation.

3. If the consultation indicates that research misconduct probably has occurred or is likely to occur, or that the consulting person(s) has/have been invited to be involved in research misconduct, the contact office shall report that to the President.

4. If the President receives a report referred to in the preceding paragraph, the President shall check the content of the report, and President shall advise the consulting person and the inviting person(s) not to be involved in research misconduct, if the President deems that such advice is appropriate.

Article 9. (Obligations of the Contact Office's Personnel)

1. Upon receiving an allegation of research misconduct, the contact office's personnel shall thoroughly ensure the confidentiality of the person(s) who has/have reported the allegation (hereinafter "accuser(s)") and shall take other measures to ensure that the

accuser is protected from being adversely affected.

2. The contact office's staff shall take appropriate measures in receiving an allegation so that if the allegation is reported in person, the contact office's personnel shall meet the accuser(s) in a room with no irrelevant person(s) present. If the allegation is received in writing, or via facsimile, e-mail, postal mail, or telephone, the staff shall take measures so that the content of the allegation cannot be known to others while the allegation is being received or thereafter.

3. The provisions of the preceding two paragraphs shall also apply to in-person reports of allegations of research misconduct.

Chapter 4: Dealing with Parties Relevant to Allegations of Research Misconduct

Article 10. (Requirement of Confidentiality)

1. No person who is engaged in the duties set forth in these Rules shall divulge any secret that is learned in connection with the duties. This shall apply to persons who are no longer personnel or the like of the contact office.

2. The President shall thoroughly ensure the confidentiality of the accuser(s), the person(s) against whom an allegation has/have been reported (hereinafter "accused person(s)"), the content of the allegation, the content of the investigation regarding the allegation, and developments concerning the investigation, until the results of the investigation are made public, in order that confidential information will not leak out against the will of the accuser(s) or the accused person(s).

3. If an investigation regarding alleged research misconduct referred to in the preceding paragraph has leaked out, the President may make an official announcement about that investigation if the accuser(s) and the accused person(s) consent thereto, even if the investigation is still underway. However, if information about the case has leaked out due to an accuser or accused person, the consent of the person responsible for the leak shall not be required.

4. If the President or other involved party contacts an accuser, an accused person, any person(s) concerned with the investigation, or other relevant person(s), or informs any of those people of anything relating to the investigation, the President and other involved person(s) shall be careful not to infringe on the human rights, honor, privacy, or the like of the accuser(s), accused person(s), person(s) concerned with the investigation, or other person(s).

Article 11. (Protection of Accuser(s))

1. The President shall take appropriate measures so that the work situation of an accuser

is not adversely affected, and so that the accuser is not discriminated against because of having alleged research misconduct.

2. No person who is affiliated with the University shall treat an accuser disadvantageously due to the accuser having alleged research misconduct.
3. Any person who treats an accuser disadvantageously may be subject to disciplinary action in accordance with the University's various Rules and Regulations.
4. No disadvantageous measure, including dismissal, change of position, disciplinary action, demotion, or reduction of salary, shall be taken by the University and/or other organization against an accuser simply because the accuser has alleged research misconduct, unless it is found that the allegation is based on bad faith.

Article 12. (Protection of Accused Person(s))

1. No person who is affiliated with the University shall treat an accused person disadvantageously, without probable cause to do so, simply because an allegation of research misconduct has been made against the accused person.
2. If a person treats an accused person disadvantageously without probable cause to do so, that person may be subject to disciplinary action in accordance with the University's various Rules and Regulations.
3. Disadvantageous measures, including dismissal, change of position, disciplinary action, demotion, or reduction of salary of an accused person, or a total ban on research activities by the accused person, may not be taken against an accused person without a separate probable cause to do so, simply because an allegation of research misconduct has been made against the accused person.

Article 13. (Bad-faith Allegations)

1. No person shall in bad-faith allege research misconduct by another person. In these Rules, a "bad-faith allegation" means an allegation intended to adversely affect an accused person or the organization with which an accused person is affiliated; for example, an allegation intending to frame an accused person or to interfere with an accused person's research activities.
2. If it is found that an allegation is based on bad faith, the University can take necessary measures, such as making public the name(s) of the accuser(s), imposing disciplinary action on the accuser(s), and initiating criminal action against the accuser(s).
3. If any measure referred to in the preceding paragraph is taken, that shall be reported to relevant research-funds distributing organization(s) and to relevant government

agencies.

Chapter 5: Investigation of Allegations

Article 14. (Implementation of Preliminary Investigation)

1. If a report alleging research misconduct is submitted per Article 8, or if for other reasons the President recognizes that it is necessary to implement a preliminary investigation, the President shall establish a Preliminary Investigation Committee, which shall promptly conduct a preliminary Investigation.
2. The Preliminary Investigation Committee shall consist of three members who shall be nominated by the President following deliberations by the University Personnel Committee.
3. The Preliminary Investigation Committee can ask the person(s) subject to the preliminary investigation to submit relevant materials and other documents required for the preliminary investigation, and shall gather oral opinions from relevant persons as needed.
4. The Preliminary Investigation Committee can take measures to preserve relevant documents, research notes, experimental materials, and the like, which might serve as evidence in a full investigation.

Article 15. (Preliminary Investigation)

1. The Preliminary Investigation Committee shall conduct a preliminary investigation regarding the likelihood that alleged research misconduct was in fact committed, the validity of the scientific reasons presented in the allegation, the feasibility of a full investigation, and any other matters deemed necessary.
2. If a preliminary investigation is conducted regarding an allegation relating to a thesis that had been retracted before the allegation was reported, the Preliminary Investigation Committee shall investigate in order to decide whether an investigation for research misconduct is warranted, considering the conditions and circumstances leading to the retraction of the thesis.

Article 16. (Full Investigation)

1. The Preliminary Investigation Committee shall report to the President the results of a preliminary investigation within 30 days from the day of receiving the allegation or the day of receiving the President's instruction to initiate a preliminary investigation.
2. The President shall decide whether a full investigation should be conducted, based on the results of the preliminary investigation and following the decision by the Executive

Board.

3. If the President decides that a full investigation should be conducted, the President shall notify the accuser(s) and the accused person(s) about that, and shall ask them to cooperate in the full investigation

4. If the President decides that a full investigation need not be conducted, the President shall inform the accuser(s) of that decision and the reasons therefor. In this case, the materials relating to the preliminary investigation shall be preserved, so that the materials can be disclosed if a research funding organization or an accuser requests that the President disclose such materials.

5. If the President decides that a full investigation should be conducted, the President shall inform the relevant research-funds distributing organization(s) and the relevant government agencies of the University's decision to conduct a full investigation.

Article 17. (Establishment of Investigation Committee)

1. If the President has decided that a full investigation should be conducted, the President, after approval by the Executive Board, shall promptly establish an Investigation Committee.

2. The majority of the Investigation Committee members shall be knowledgeable persons who are not affiliated with the University.

3. The Investigation Committee members shall be the following:

(i) One Executive Board trustee;

(ii) One or more knowledgeable persons nominated by the President, after approval by the Executive Board;

(iii) One or more persons having legal knowledge and not affiliated with the University.

4. No Investigation Committee member may have a direct interest in an accuser or an accused person.

Article 18. (Notification of Full Investigation)

1. If the President has established an Investigation Committee, the President shall notify the accuser(s) and the accused person(s) of the names of that committee's members and the names of the organization(s) with which each committee member is affiliated.

2. An accuser or accused person who has received notification as set forth in the preceding paragraph may, within 7 days from the day of receiving that notification, submit to the President a written objection to the nomination of one or more of the Investigation Committee's members.

3. If an objection referred to in the preceding paragraph is submitted, the President shall examine the content of the objection, and if the President deems that objection to be valid, the President shall replace the objected-to committee member by a different person after approval by the Executive Board, and shall notify the accuser and the accused person of that change.

Article 19. (Implementation of Full Investigation)

1. The Investigation Committee shall initiate a full investigation within 30 days from the day of decision to conduct a full investigation.

2. The Investigation Committee shall promptly notify the accuser(s) and accused person(s) that a full investigation is being conducted, and shall ask them to cooperate in the investigation.

3. The Investigation Committee shall conduct a full investigation by carefully examining the thesis, experiment notebooks, observation notebooks, raw experimental data, and other materials relating to the research regarding which the allegation of misconduct has been reported, by gathering orally expressed opinions from the relevant persons, and by other means.

4. The Investigation Committee shall provide the accused person(s) with an opportunity to defend against the allegation.

5. The Investigation Committee may ask an accused person to demonstrate the reproducibility of the research results by repeating one or more experiments or by other means. Also, if an accused person submits a request to repeat one or more experiments, and the Investigation Committee deems that to be necessary, the Investigation Committee shall ensure that the accused person is provided with the time and opportunity required to repeat the experiment(s) and is allowed to use the equipment necessary to repeat the experiment(s).

6. The accuser(s), the accused person(s), and other persons relevant to the allegation must actively and sincerely cooperate with the Investigation Committee, so that the investigation can be smoothly conducted and the truth determined.

Article 20. (Objective of a Full Investigation)

As an objective of a full investigation, the Investigation Committee may investigate, at its own discretion, in addition to the research relevant to the allegation, an accused person's other research that is relevant to the full investigation.

Article 21. (Preservation of Evidence)

1. In conducting a full investigation regarding the research relevant to an allegation, the

Investigation Committee shall take measures to preserve evidentiary materials and other relevant documents.

2. If the research institution at which research relevant to an allegation is conducted is not the University, the Investigation Committee shall request that the research institution take measures to preserve evidentiary materials and other relevant documents regarding the research relevant to the allegation.

3. In cases where an allegation of research misconduct at another research institution is made and the research under investigation was conducted at the University, the Investigation Committee shall take measures to preserve evidentiary materials and other relevant documents regarding the research relevant to the allegation upon the request of the other research institution.

4. The Investigation Committee shall not limit the research activities of an accused person unless the measures set forth in the preceding three paragraphs must be taken.

Article 22. (Interim Report of Full Investigation)

If a research-funds distributing organization that budgeted or funded the research relevant to the allegation requests from the Investigation Committee an interim report of the full investigation, the Investigation Committee shall submit such a report to that organization, even if the investigation has not yet been completed.

Article 23. (Protection of Research-related Information and Technical Information During an Investigation)

In conducting a full investigation, the Investigation Committee shall take full care to ensure that confidential research-related information and confidential technical information, such as prepublication data or the content of a thesis that is an object of the investigation, will not be divulged beyond the scope necessary for conducting the Investigation.

Article 24. (Duty to Clarify Suspicion of Research Misconduct)

1. If, during a full investigation by the Investigation Committee, an accused person wishes to remove suspicion concerning research relevant to the allegation, the accused person shall, on his/her own responsibility, prove that the research was conducted pursuant to scientifically appropriate methods and procedures, and that the thesis also was written in an appropriate manner based on such research, presenting scientific evidence in support of his/her explanation.

2. If repeating one or more experiments and the like is required pursuant to the preceding paragraph, the Investigation Committee shall ensure for the accused person

the conditions of Article 19, Paragraph 5.

Chapter 6. Determining Research Misconduct

Article 25. (Procedure for Determining Research Misconduct)

1. The Investigation Committee shall within 150 days from the day of initiating a full investigation organize the content being investigated, and shall determine (a) whether research misconduct occurred; (b) if the Committee concludes that research misconduct was committed, the content of the research misconduct and the maliciousness of the conduct; (c) the person(s) involved in the research misconduct and the degree of involvement of each person; (d) regarding the author(s) of any thesis relating to the research deemed to be research misconduct, the role of each author in authoring the thesis and in performing the research; and (e) other necessary matters.

2. If there are legitimate reasons why the Investigation Committee is not able within 150 days to determine whether research misconduct occurred, the Committee shall inform the President of that, the reasons therefor, and the expected date by which such a determination can be made, and shall seek the President's approval of that date.

3. If, as a result of the investigation, the Investigation Committee finds that research misconduct was not committed, and finds that the allegation was based on bad faith, the Investigation Committee shall inform the President about that.

4. If the Investigation Committee finds that an allegation was based on bad faith as referred to in the preceding paragraph, the Committee shall provide the accuser(s) with an opportunity to defend the allegation.

5. If the Investigation Committee makes a determination as referred to in either Paragraph 1 or Paragraph 3 of this Article, the Committee shall inform the President of the Committee's conclusion.

Article 26. (Method of Determining Research Misconduct)

1. The Investigation Committee shall receive testimony from the accuser(s), and shall consider all the evidence, including physical evidence, scientific evidence, the testimony of other persons, and the admission of research misconduct by the accused person(s), whereby the Committee shall determine whether research misconduct was committed.

2. The Investigation Committee may not conclude that research misconduct was committed based only on an accused person's admission of research misconduct.

3. If the Investigation Committee, by considering the explanation(s) of the accused person(s) and other evidence, cannot overcome the suspicion that research misconduct

was committed, the Committee may conclude that research misconduct was committed. This shall apply if, due to the non-existence of fundamental evidentiary elements that are expected to exist, such as raw data, experiment notebooks, observation-recording notebooks, experimental materials, reagents, and relevant documents, the accused person(s) cannot overcome the suspicion that the accused person(s) committed research misconduct.

Article 27. (Reporting the Results of an Investigation)

1. The President shall promptly report the results of an investigation (including the determination whether research misconduct was committed) to the accuser(s), the accused person(s), and any other person(s) identified as concerned with the possible research misconduct. If an accused person(s) is affiliated with an organization other than the University, the President also shall report the results of the investigation to that organization.
2. In addition to reporting pursuant to the preceding paragraph, the President also shall report the results of the investigation to the research-funds distributing organization(s) concerned with the research and to the relevant government agencies.
3. If the Investigation Committee has determined that an allegation was based on bad faith, and if an accuser is affiliated with an organization other than the University, the President also shall notify that organization of that determination.

Article 28. (Appeals)

1. An accused person who is judged to have committed research misconduct may file an appeal with the Investigation Committee for up to 14 days from the day of receiving notification of that judgment of misconduct. However, during that period, filing multiple appeals based on the same reason is not allowed.
2. An accuser who is judged as having made an allegation in bad faith (including by a judgment made during the course of an appeal filed by an accused person) may file an appeal regarding that judgment in accordance with Paragraph 1.
3. The appeal proceeding shall be conducted by the Investigation Committee. If a new judgment that requires knowledge of experts is sought during the appeal proceeding, the President shall replace one or more current Committee members who lack the necessary expertise with one or more new members who have the necessary expertise, and may add to the Committee one or more new members who have the necessary expertise, or may allow other persons to handle the appeal in place of the Investigation Committee. However, this shall not apply if there is no reasonable ground for changing the members of the Investigation Committee.

4. The new committee member(s) referred to in the preceding Paragraph shall be nominated pursuant to Article 17, Paragraphs 2 and 3.
5. If the Investigation Committee has decided to reject an appeal without reinvestigating the case, the Committee shall promptly report that to the President, who upon receiving that report shall inform the appellant(s) of that decision. If the Investigation Committee has concluded that the appeal was filed with the intention of prolonging the investigation or delaying implementation of measures decided upon as a result of the Committee's decision to reject the appeal, the notification of the decision shall specify that no subsequent appeal will be accepted.
6. If the Investigation Committee has decided that, in response to an appeal, a reinvestigation should be conducted, the Committee shall promptly report that to the President, who upon receiving that report shall notify the appellant(s) of that decision.
7. If an accused person has filed an appeal with the Committee, the President shall notify that to the accuser(s), and if an accuser has filed an appeal with the Committee, the President shall notify the accused person(s) about that. The President also shall notify the research-funds distributing organization(s) relating to the research, as well as the relevant government offices, that an appeal has been filed with the Committee. This shall apply to cases in which an appeal has been rejected or in which the Committee has decided that a reinvestigation should be conducted.

Article 29. (Reinvestigation)

1. If the Investigation Committee has decided that a reinvestigation should be conducted in response to an appeal made pursuant to the preceding article, the Committee shall request the appellant(s) to submit to the Committee materials that the appellant(s) believes/believe are sufficient to overturn the results of the previous Investigation, and shall also request the appellant(s) to cooperate with the Committee in the reinvestigation so that the case can promptly be resolved.
2. If the appellant(s) does/do not satisfy the Investigation Committee's requests referred to in the preceding paragraph, the Committee may terminate the proceeding before initiating a reinvestigation and then shall report that to the President, who upon receiving that report shall notify the appellant(s) of that decision.
3. If the Investigation Committee has initiated a reinvestigation, the Committee shall decide, within 50 days from the day of initiating the reinvestigation, whether to overturn the results of the previous investigation, and shall promptly report that decision to the President. However, if there are legitimate reasons why the Investigation Committee is unable to decide within 50 days whether the results of the previous investigation should

be overturned, the Committee shall inform the President about that, about the reasons therefor, and about the date scheduled for rendering the decision to seek the President's approval.

4. Based on the reports made pursuant to Paragraphs 2 and 3 of this Article, the President shall promptly notify the results of the reinvestigation to the accuser(s), the accused person(s), and any persons, other than the accuser(s) and the accused person(s), who have been identified as being concerned with the research misconduct. If an accused person is affiliated with an organization other than the University, the President also shall notify that organization, of the results of the reinvestigation. The President also shall report the results of the reinvestigation to the research-funds distributing organization(s) relating to the research and to the relevant government agencies.

Article 30. (Making Public the Results of an Investigation)

1. If the Investigation Committee has concluded that research misconduct was committed, the President shall promptly make public the results of the investigation.

2. The content of the publicizing referred to in the preceding paragraph shall include the following: the name of the person(s) involved in the research misconduct, and the name(s) of the organization(s) with which each person is affiliated; the content of the research misconduct; the measures taken by the University before publicizing the results of the investigation; the names of the committee members of the Investigation Committee and the organization(s) with which each committee member is affiliated; and the method and procedure of the investigation.

3. Notwithstanding the provisions of the preceding paragraph, if the thesis relating to the research judged to have been research misconduct was retracted before the allegation of research misconduct was reported, the President may choose not to make public the name(s) of the person(s) involved in research misconduct or the name(s) of the organization(s) with which the person(s) is/are affiliated.

4. If the Investigation Committee has concluded that research misconduct did not occur, the Committee shall in principle not make public the results of the investigation. However, if the content of the investigation has leaked out, or if the thesis or the like includes any unintentional error(s), the President shall make public the results of the investigation.

5. The content of the publicizing referred to in the latter half of the preceding paragraph shall include the following: statements that research misconduct did not occur, but that the thesis included one or more unintentional errors; the name(s) of the accused person(s) and the name(s) of the organization(s) with which each accused person is

affiliated; the names of the Investigation Committee's members and the organization(s) with which each committee member is affiliated; and the method and procedure of the investigation.

6. If the Investigation Committee has concluded that an allegation was based on bad faith, the President shall make public the following: the name(s) of the accuser(s) and the name(s) of the organization(s) with which the accuser(s) is/are affiliated; the reasons why the Committee has concluded that the allegation was based on bad faith; the names of the Investigation Committee's members and the name(s) of the organization(s) with which each committee member is affiliated; and the method and procedure of the investigation.

Chapter 7: Measures and Actions

Article 31. (Temporary Measures During a Full Investigation)

1. During the period from the time when the Investigation Committee has decided to conduct a full investigation to the time when the President receives the Investigation Committee's report of the investigation, the President may take necessary measures regarding the case, including temporary suspension of research funds to be paid to the accused person(s).

2. If the President is ordered by a research-funds distributing organization to suspend paying to the accused person(s) the research funds provided by that organization, the President shall act accordingly.

Article 32. (Discontinuation of Expenditure of Research Funds)

The President shall immediately order the person(s) who has/have been determined to have been involved in research misconduct, the person(s) who has/have been determined to be responsible for the content of the thesis relating to the research misconduct that occurred, and the person(s) who is/are responsible for spending all or part of the research funds (hereinafter collectively "misconduct-related persons") to stop spending research funds.

Article 33. (Suggestion to Retract Theses)

1. The President shall suggest to said misconduct-related persons that they take measures, including retraction, correction, or other measures, relating to the thesis relating to the research misconduct.

2. Said misconduct-related persons shall inform the President, within 14 days from the day of receiving the suggestion set forth in the preceding paragraph, whether they accept the suggestion.

3. If said misconduct-related persons do not accept the suggestion referred to in Paragraph 1, the President shall make public that fact.

Article 34. (Termination of Measures Taken)

1. If it is determined that the alleged research misconduct was not committed, the President shall terminate the measures taken in the course of the full investigation, such as temporary suspension of research funds, Also, soon after the period for appeal has passed without an appeal being filed, or if an appeal decision regarding the investigation has become final and binding, the President shall terminate measures for preserving the evidentiary materials relating to the case.

2. The President shall take measures to restore the reputation of each person who has been judged to not have committed research misconduct, and shall take measures to prevent the creation of disadvantages for such person.

Article 35. (Disciplinary Action)

1. If, as a result of a full investigation, it is determined that research misconduct has been committed, necessary disciplinary action shall be imposed on the person(s) involved in the misconduct, in accordance with applicable laws and ordinances, the University's Rules regarding Employment of Full-Time Faculty Members, and other applicable rules and regulations.

2. If disciplinary action is taken, the President shall inform the relevant research-funds distributing organization(s) and the relevant government agencies of such action.

Article 36. (Corrective Measures and the Like)

1. If, as a result of a full investigation, it is determined that research misconduct has been committed, the President shall promptly take corrective measures to prevent further research misconduct and to improve the research environment (hereinafter "corrective measures and the like").

2. The President shall inform the relevant research-funds distributing organization relating, the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, and other relevant government agencies of the corrective measures and the like taken pursuant to the preceding paragraph.

Article 37. (Revision or Abolition of These Rules)

The Chancellor and Chair of the University's Board of Directors may revise or abolish these Rules upon approval by the Executive Board.

Supplementary Provisions

These revised Rules shall be effective and enforced as of April 1, 2021.