

Doshisha University Policies on Handling Misuses of Public Research Funds

Established on March 25,2023

(Purpose)

Article 1 These policies set out necessary particulars concerning the appropriate measures taken at Doshisha University (hereinafter referred to as "University") on the occurrence of public research fund misuse (hereinafter referred to as "misuses of public research funds") pursuant to the gist of "Guidelines for Managing and Auditing Public Research Funds at Research Institutions (implementation standards)" by Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (hereinafter referred to as "MEXT").

(Definition)

Article 2 1. In these policies, "public research funds" means research funds defined in Article 3 of "Doshisha University Policies on Operation and Management of Public Research Fund."

2. In these policies, "researcher(s)" means faculty, staff, research scholars and students of the University who engage in research funded by public research funds as well as in the work related to the said research.

3. In these policies, "misuse" means the use of public research funds for other purposes through intentional or gross negligence of researchers, etc. or the use of public research funds in violation of the content of the decision to grant public research funds or the conditions attached thereto.

4. In these policies, "the complainant" means a person who made an allegation concerning misuse of public research funds (hereinafter referred to as "allegation") in writing, FAX, email, phone call, in person, or any other means (hereinafter referred to as "in writing, etc.") to the allegation contact point.

5. In these policies, "the respondent" means a person against whom an allegation was made, and "the respondent, etc." indicate the respondent themselves as well as those who are subject to investigation related to the respondent.

(Allegation Contact Point)

Article 3.1. The allegation contact point shall be set up at the Office of the Ethics Review to ensure prompt and appropriate response to allegations and consultations.

2. An allegation contact point in addition to the one prescribed in the previous paragraph shall be set up at outside of the University.

3. The person in charge at the allegation contact point shall be the Director of the Office of the Ethics Review.

(Consultation about Making an Allegation)

Article 4 1. Those who suspect the existence of misuse of public research funds but have questions about whether to make an allegation or about the procedures may consult with the allegation contact point in writing, etc.

2. In the case of a consultation where the intention to make an allegation is not explicit, the allegation contact point shall check the case and if there is deemed to be sufficient reason to make an allegation, the contact point shall confirm with the consulter whether the consulter intends to make an allegation or not.

3. In the case of a consultation declaring that someone intends to commit misuse of public research funds or that someone was asked to commit such misuse, the person in charge at the allegation contact point shall report to the University President and the Chair of the Ethics Review Committee.

4. If the report described in the previous paragraph was made, the University President shall check and discuss the

case with the Chair of the Ethics Review Committee, and if there is deemed to be sufficient reason, shall issue a warning to the person concerned in the consultation and to other persons involved as far as necessary.

(Organizational Structure for Receiving Allegations)

Article 5 1. Those who suspect the existence of misuse of public research funds shall be able to make an allegation in writing, etc. to the allegation contact point.

2. As a general rule, in allegation documents, etc., it must clearly state the contact information of the complainant(s), the name(s) of researcher(s) or research group(s), etc., who allegedly misused public research funds, the mode of misuse, and other details of the case, as well as reasonable reason(s) to allege misuse of public research funds in specific.

3. If anonymous allegations or information are provided, the person in charge of the allegation contact point shall explain to the complainant that the restrictions described in each of the following items are inherent and accept the allegation after consulting how to handle the case with the Chair of the Ethics Review Committee.

(1) There may be cases in which it is not possible to carry out an adequate investigation regarding the misuse or to provide adequate protection of the complainant.

(2) Unless the complainant's contact information is specifically stated, the complainant shall not be notified as stipulated in these policies.

4. When an allegation is received based on the previous paragraph, the person in charge at the allegation contact point shall promptly report to the University President, the vice University President, who is the Integrated Management Office prescribed in paragraph 2, Article 5 of "Doshisha University Policies on Operation and Management of Public Research Fund," as well as the Chair of the Ethics Review Committee. The University President shall then notify the case to the dean of the respondent's affiliated faculty or graduate school, etc.

5. If an allegation is made by means other than phone call or in person, the notification shall be made to the complainant that the allegation was received.

6. If the suspicion of misuse of public research funds is pointed out by news media such as a newspaper, etc., the Board of Audit, the researcher community, or the Internet, etc., the Chair of the Ethics Review Committee shall be able to treat it in accordance with an anonymous allegation (limited to cases in which the contact information of the complainant(s), the name(s) of researcher(s) or research group(s), etc., who allegedly misused public research funds, the mode of misuse, and other details of the case are specifically stated, as well as reasonable reason(s) to allege misuse of public research funds is shown.)

(The Obligations of Allegation Contact Point Staff)

Article 6 1. The staff at the allegation contact point must ensure the confidentiality and protection of the complainant.

2. When receiving an allegation, the staff at the allegation contact point must use proper methods, such as holding consultations in a private room in the case of an interview, and taking measures to ensure that the allegation is not heard or seen by other persons at the same time or afterwards in the case of a written allegation.

3. The provisions in the previous two paragraphs shall also apply to consultations about making an allegation.

(Duty of Confidentiality)

Article 7 1. All persons involved in consultations, investigations and other works stipulated in these policies must

not leak any confidential information that they have come to know in these processes. This shall also apply to when a person is no longer the faculty or staff of the University.

2. To prevent information from being leaked outside, the University President and the Chair of the Ethics Review Committee must ensure the confidentiality of the complainant, the respondent, etc., details of the allegation, and details and progress of the investigation, up until the investigation results are made public.

3. If an investigated case is leaked outside, the University President shall, after consulting with the Chair of the Ethics Review Committee and, with the consent of the complainant and respondent, etc., be able to provide a public explanation of the case even if the investigation is still ongoing. If the reason of the leak is attributable to the complainant or the respondent, etc., however, the person's consent shall not be needed.

4. When contacting or giving notice to the complainant, the respondent, etc., cooperators in the investigations or other persons involved, the University President, the Chair of the Ethics Review Committee and other persons giving such notice must take care so as not to infringe the human rights, honor and privacy of the complainant, the respondent, etc., cooperators in the investigations or other persons involved.

(Protection of the Complainant)

Article 8 1. The dean of the faculty or graduate school etc. concerned must take appropriate measures to prevent deterioration of the working environment of or any discriminatory treatment against the complainant on the basis of having made an allegation.

2. All persons affiliated with the University must not disadvantage the complainant for having brought an allegation.

3. The University President shall take appropriate measures if there is a person who has disadvantaged the complainant.

4. Unless an allegation is determined to have been lodged out of malice, the University President must not disadvantage the complainant for having brought an allegation.

(Protection of the Respondent)

Article 9 1. The University and all persons affiliated with the University must not, without a legitimate reason, disadvantage the respondent, etc. because an allegation was brought.

2. If there is a person who has disadvantaged the respondent, etc. without a legitimate reason, the University President shall take appropriate measures against the said person.

(Allegations Lodged out of Malice)

Article 10 1. It is prohibited for any person to make an allegation out of malice. In these policies, "allegation lodged out of malice" means an allegation made for the purpose of damaging the respondent, or of hindering research being conducted by the respondent, or otherwise to cause some kind of detriment to the respondent or the organization with which the respondent is affiliated.

2. If an allegation is determined to have been lodged out of malice, the University President shall take appropriate measures against the complainant(s).

(Commencement of Preliminary Investigation)

Article 11 The Ethics Review Committee must conduct a preliminary investigation if any of the following cases occurs:

- (1) An allegation based on Article 5 was made
- (2) An order was issued by the University President
- (3) A preliminary investigation is deemed necessary by the Ethics Review Committee for other reasons
(Establishment of Preliminary Investigation Committee)

Article 12 1. For the purpose of conducting a preliminary investigation, the Ethics Review Committee shall establish a Preliminary Investigation Committee under the Ethics Review Committee.

2. The Preliminary Investigation Committee shall consist of three Ethics Review Committee members appointed by the Ethics Review Committee.
3. The Chair of the Preliminary Investigation Committee shall be appointed by the Ethics Review Committee from among the members of the Preliminary Investigation Committee.
4. The Preliminary Investigation Committee must conduct a preliminary investigation promptly. However, the Preliminary Investigation Committee may decide not to conduct a preliminary investigation if it is apparent from the content of the document, etc. that the conduct in question does not fall under misuse of public research funds.
5. The Preliminary Investigation Committee shall, as need arises, be able to request the respondent, etc. to submit related materials and other necessary documents, etc. for conducting the preliminary investigation or conduct interviews with the respondent, etc.
6. The Preliminary Investigation Committee shall be able to take measures to preserve related documents, etc. that may be used as evidence.

(Method of Preliminary Investigation)

Article 13 The Preliminary Investigation Committee shall conduct a preliminary investigation of the likelihood that the reported misuse of public research funds occurred and all the other matters that are necessary upon proceeding with the procedure established by the policies.

(Investigation to Replace Primarily Investigation)

Article 14 1. Notwithstanding Article 11, if it is deemed that the existence of misuse of public research funds is highly likely based on the result of the investigation at department, course, institute, center, etc. (including committee established by the University) or the investigation carried out within the Doshisha, the Ethics Review Committee shall be able to regard the said investigation as preliminary investigation.

2. In the case of the previous paragraph, the University President shall order prompt commencement of the formal investigation to the Chair of the Ethics Review Committee.

(Decision on Implementation of Formal Investigation)

Article 15 1. The Preliminary Investigation Committee shall report the results of the preliminary investigation to the Ethics Review Committee.

2. Based on the results of the preliminary investigation, the Ethics Review Committee shall immediately decide whether or not to launch a formal investigation.
3. If the Ethics Review Committee decides to launch a formal investigation, it shall notify this decision to the complainant and the respondent, etc. and ask for their cooperation in the formal investigation. If the respondent, etc. is affiliated with an organization other than the University, notification shall be made also to that organization.
4. If the Ethics Review Committee decides not to launch a formal investigation, it shall notify the complainant of the

decision with reasons. In this case, materials related to the preliminary investigation shall be preserved so that they may be disclosed when requested by organization funding the research expenses related to the case in question, MEXT, and other related government ministries and agencies (hereinafter referred to as "related organizations and agencies"). If the respondent was involved in preliminary investigation, a notification described in this paragraph shall also be sent to the respondent.

5. Notwithstanding whether a formal investigation shall be launched or not, the Ethics Review Committee shall report the content of the decision to the University President.

6. The University President shall, within 30 days from the day the allegation described in Article 5 was accepted, or from the day the order for preliminary investigation was issued by the University President, or from the day the preliminary investigation was deemed necessary for other reasons by the Chair of the Ethics Review Committee, or from the day the commencement of the formal investigation was ordered to the Chair of the Ethics Review Committee by the University President, report to the organization funding the public research funds relating to the said case that a formal investigation will be carried out. The University President, if necessary, shall also notify the related government organizations and agencies to that effect.

7. In addition to the previous paragraph, the University President shall notify the head of a department, a graduate school, etc. to which the respondent, etc. belongs that the investigation will be carried out. If the affiliation of the respondent, etc. differs from that at the time of the corresponding case, the University President shall also notify the head of the department, graduate school, etc. to which the respondent, etc. belonged at the time.

(Establishment of Expert Investigation Committee)

Article 16 If the Ethics Review Committee decides to launch a formal investigation, it shall promptly establish an Expert Investigation Committee and report it to the University President under Article 14 or Article 15.

(Structure of Expert Investigation Committee)

Article 17 The Ethics Review Committee shall appoint three or more persons who have no direct conflict of interest with the complainant or the respondent, etc. including outside experts who do not belong to the University, as members of the Expert Investigation Committee (hereinafter referred to as "Expert Investigation Committee members").

(Notification of Formal Investigation and Filing of Objection Concerning Expert Investigation Committee Members)

Article 18 1. After establishing the Expert Investigation Committee, the Ethics Review Committee must notify the complainant and the respondent, etc. of the names and affiliations of Expert Investigation Committee members.

2. Upon receiving the notification described in the previous paragraph, the complainant or the respondent, etc. shall be able to raise an objection to any of the Expert Investigation Committee members in writing to the Ethics Review Committee within 7 days from the day the notification is received.

3. If an objection described in the previous paragraph is raised, the Ethics Review Committee shall examine the details of the objection, and if the objection is deemed to be reasonable, the member concerned shall be replaced, and notification to this effect must be made to the complainant and the respondent, etc. A notification must also be made to the complainant who raised objections and the respondent, etc. in the case where the objection was deemed not to be reasonable.

4. It shall not be possible to file further objections against the decision described in the previous paragraph.

(Conduct of Formal Investigation)

Article 19 1. The Expert Investigation Committee shall start the formal investigation within 30 days from the day the Ethics Review Committee decided to conduct the formal investigation.

2. The Expert Investigation Committee shall carry out the formal investigation of the suspected misuse of public research funds in the allegation made in the preliminary investigation or the investigation under Article 14 by close examination of the materials relating to the misuse of public research funds in question, interviews to parties involved in the case, as well as other methods.

3. The Expert Investigation Committee must give the respondent, etc. an opportunity to offer a counterargument in writing or orally.

4. The complainant, the respondent, etc. and other persons involved in the investigated case must cooperate in good faith with the formal investigation, by offering active cooperation for smooth progress of the investigation and faithfully stating the truth.

(Scope of Formal Investigation)

Article 20 The subject of formal investigation is the public research funds relating to the allegation. The Expert Investigation Committee may decide to include in the formal investigation other public research funds funded to the respondent relating to the formal investigation if deemed relevant to the formal investigation.

(Preservation of Evidence)

Article 21 In conducting the formal investigation, the Expert Investigation Committee may take measures to preserve materials used as evidence and other related documents regarding the research activities subject to the investigated case.

(Interim Report on the Formal Investigation)

Article 21 1. If an interim report is requested by the related organizations and agencies, the Expert Investigation Committee shall submit an interim report on the formal investigation to the Ethics Review Committee, even if the proceedings are ongoing.

2. The Chair of the Ethics Review Committee shall report to the University President regarding the interim report described in the previous paragraph. Upon receiving the report, the University President shall submit the interim report to the said related organizations and agencies.

(Procedures Related to Findings)

Article 23 1. The Expert Investigation Committee shall within 150 days from the start date of the formal investigation summarize the findings of the investigation, giving its determination as to whether research misuse of public research funds occurred or not.

2. Notwithstanding the preceding paragraph, if there is a rational reason for being unable to reach a decision within the 150 days, the Expert Investigation Committee shall notify the Ethics Review Committee with the reason thereof and the new estimated date of decision and receive its approval for the postponement. The Chair of the Ethics Review Committee shall report this to the University President.

3. If it is determined that misuse of public research funds occurred, the Expert Investigation Committee shall issue findings concerning the content and malicious nature of the misuse, the persons involved in the misuse and the

degree of their involvement, the equivalent amount of the misuse, as well as other necessary matters.

4. If it is determined that misuse of public research funds did not take place and the investigation shows that the allegation was lodged out of malice, the Expert Investigation Committee shall at the same time issue this as its finding.

5. In making a finding described in the previous paragraph, the complainant must be given the opportunity to offer a counterargument in writing or orally.

6. When the findings as per the paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 above have been completed, the Expert Investigation Committee must immediately issue a report to the Ethics Review Committee.

7. Upon receiving the report described in the previous paragraph, the Chair of the Ethics Review Committee must immediately report the detail of the report to the University President.

(Notification and Reporting of Investigation Results)

Article 24 1. If the report described in paragraph 7 of the previous Article is received, the University President shall promptly notify the result of the investigation to the complainant, the respondent, etc. and persons other than the respondent, etc. determined to have been involved in misuse of public research funds, as well as notify it to persons to whom the report or the notification of conducting the formal investigation was sent based on paragraph 6 and 7 of Article 15.

2. Even if the report described in paragraph 6 of Article 15 was not sent, the University President shall, if necessary, report the result of the investigation to the related organizations and agencies. If the respondent, etc. is affiliated with an organization other than the University, notification shall be made also to that organization.

3. If it is determined that the allegation was lodged out of malice, the University President shall notify the decision to the complainant and the respondent, as well as notify it to the persons to whom the report or the notification of conducting the formal investigation was sent based on paragraph 6 and 7 of Article 15. If the complainant is affiliated with an organization other than the University, notification shall be made also to that organization.

(Objection Filing)

Article 25 1. If it is decided based on paragraph 4 of Article 15 that a formal investigation shall not be conducted, the complainant shall be able to file an objection to the Chair of the Ethics Review Committee within 14 days from the day the notification is received. It shall not be possible, however, to file repeated objections for the same reason, even if it is within the deadline. If the respondent cooperated in preliminary investigation, a notification described in this paragraph shall be also sent to the respondent.

2. If it is decided based on paragraph 1 of Article 23 that misuse of public research funds has occurred, the respondent, etc. shall be able to file an objection with grounds and in writing to the University President within 14 days from the day the notification is received. It shall not be possible, however, to file repeated objections for the same reason, even if it is within the deadline.

3. If it is decided based on paragraph 4 of Article 23 that the allegation was lodged out of malice, the complainant shall be able to file an objection with grounds and in writing to the University President within 14 days from the day the notification is received. It shall not be possible, however, to file repeated objections for the same reason, even if it is within the deadline.

4. If an objection described in paragraph 2 is filed, the University President shall notify the complainant of the

objection, and notify the persons to whom the report or the notification of misconduct was sent based on paragraph 1 and 2 of the previous Article in the same manner.

5. If an objection described in paragraph 3 is filed, the University President shall notify the respondent, etc. of the objection, and notify the persons to whom the report or the notification of the objection was set based on paragraph 3 of Article 24.

6. If an objection described in paragraph 3 is filed by the complainant who is affiliated with an organization other than the University, the University President shall notify that organization of the objection.

(Examination of Validity of Objection)

Article 26 1. If the Ethics Review Committee received an objection based on paragraph 1 of the previous Article, it must deliberate whether to conduct a new formal investigation under the Ethics Review Committee in order to examine the validity of the objection.

2. If it is decided that a new formal investigation will not be conducted based on the previous paragraph, the complainant shall not be able to file any further objections.

3. If an objection based on paragraph 2 or 3 of the previous Article was received, the University President shall establish the Objection Examination Committee. The Objection Examination Committee shall examine the validity of the objection and deliberate whether to conduct a new investigation.

4. The Objection Examination Committee shall consist of three members delegated by the University President, including outside expert(s).

5. A member of the Expert Investigation Committee or the Ethics Review Committee may not be a member of the committee described in the previous paragraph.

6. The University President must notify the names and affiliations of the committee members described in the paragraph 4 to the objector.

7. The objector to whom the notification was sent out based on the previous paragraph shall be able to file an objection in writing to the University President concerning the committee members described in the paragraph 4 within 7 days from the day the notification is received.

8. If an objection described in the previous paragraph is filed, the University President must examine the details of the objection, and if the objection is deemed to be reasonable, the member concerned shall be replaced or new member(s) shall be added, and notification to this effect must be made to the objector. A notification must also be made to the objector in the case where the objection was deemed not to be reasonable.

9. It shall not be possible to file objections against the decision described in the previous paragraph.

10. If the Objection Examination Committee decides to reject the objection based on paragraph 2 or 3 of the previous Article without conducting a new investigation of the case or decides to conduct a new investigation in response to the objection, the decision must be reported immediately to the University President.

11. Upon receiving the report described in the previous paragraph, the University President shall notify the decision to the objector and the persons to whom the report or the notification of the objection was sent based on paragraphs 4 to 6 of the previous Article.

12. The objector shall not be able to file any further objections against the decision described in paragraph 10.

(New Investigation)

- Article 27 1. If a decision is made to conduct a new investigation in response to the objection described in paragraph 1 of the previous Article, the University President shall request a new investigation carried out by the Expert Investigation Committee to the Chair of the Ethics Review Committee.
2. If the new investigation described in the previous paragraph necessitates a decision requiring new expertise, the Ethics Review Committee shall replace or add new Expert Investigation Committee members, or restructure the Expert Investigation Committee and have the investigation carried out by the restructured committee.
 3. The appointment, etc. of new Expert Investigation Committee members described in the previous paragraph shall be carried out in accordance with Article 17 and 18.
 4. The Expert Investigation Committee shall request the objector to submit materials that the objector considers sufficient for overturning the earlier investigation result, and to cooperate with the new investigation in other ways toward the prompt resolution of the case.
 5. If the cooperation of the objector described in the previous paragraph is not obtained, the Expert Investigation Committee shall be able to terminate the procedures without conducting a new investigation.
 6. The Expert Investigation Committee must report the decision described in the previous paragraph immediately to the Ethics Review Committee, and upon receiving the decision, the Chair of the Ethics Review Committee must report it to the University President. The University President shall notify the objector of the decision.
 7. If the Expert Investigation Committee starts a new investigation in response to the objection described in paragraph 2 of Article 25, the committee must decide whether to overturn the earlier investigation result within 50 days from the start date of the new investigation.
 8. If the Expert Investigation Committee starts a new investigation in response to the objection described in paragraph 3 of Article 25, the committee must decide whether to overturn the earlier investigation result within 30 days from the start date of the new investigation.
 9. Notwithstanding the preceding two paragraphs, if there is a rational reason for being unable to reach a decision on whether to overturn the earlier investigation result within the period provided, the committee shall notify the Ethics Review Committee with the reason thereof and the new estimated date of decision and receive its approval for the postponement. The Chair of the Ethics Review Committee shall report this to the University President.
 10. The Expert Investigation Committee must report to the Ethics Review Committee the results of the new investigation in response to the objection described in paragraph 2 or 3 of Article 25. The Chair of the Ethics Review Committee must report the result of the new investigation to the University President.
 11. Based on the report described in the previous paragraph, the University President shall promptly notify the results of the new investigation to the complainant, the respondent, etc. and persons other than the respondent, etc. determined to have been involved in the misuse of public research funds, as well as notify the results to the persons to whom the report of the notification of the objection was sent based on paragraphs 4 to 6 of Article 25 in the same manner.
 12. The objector shall not be able to file any further objections against the result of the new investigation.

(Announcement of Investigation Results)

Article 28 1. When it is decided that misuse of public research funds has occurred, the University President shall promptly announce the results of the investigation to the public. However, regarding matters to be submitted to the

Disciplinary Actions Committee, the University President may refrain from disclosing the results of the investigation until the Disciplinary Actions Committee has completed its deliberations.

2. The announcement described in the previous paragraph shall include the names and affiliations of the persons involved in the misuse of public research funds, details of the misuse, the equivalent amount of the misuse, sanctions imposed by the University before the announcement, and the methods and procedures of the investigation.

3. Notwithstanding the provision of the previous paragraph, the names and affiliations of the persons involved in the misuse of public research funds may not be made public if it is deemed by the University President that there is a rational reason.

4. When it is decided that misuse of public research funds did not occur, the results of the investigation shall not be made public as a general rule. If, however, it is deemed necessary to restore the honor of the respondent, etc. or the case under investigation has been leaked outside, the results of the investigation shall be made public.

5. The announcement of the case described in the proviso of the previous paragraph shall include that no misuse of public research funds had occurred as well as the name and affiliation of the respondent, etc. and the methods and procedures of the investigation.

6. If it is decided that the allegation was lodged out of malice, the University President shall make public the complainant's name and affiliation, the reason for determining that the allegation was lodged out of malice, and the methods and procedures of the investigation. However, regarding matters to be submitted to the Disciplinary Actions Committee, the University President may refrain from disclosing the results of the investigation until the Disciplinary Actions Committee has completed its deliberations.

(Temporary Measures during Formal Investigation)

Article 29 1. The University President shall be able to take necessary measures against the respondent, etc. such as temporary payment suspension of the alleged public research funds during the period from when the decision is made to conduct a formal investigation until when the Expert Investigation Committee's report of the investigation results is received.

2. If the research funding organization has issued an order for payment suspension of relevant public research funds to the respondent, etc. or other measures, the University President shall take such measures accordingly.

(Discontinuation of Use of Research Funds)

Article 30 The University President shall be able to order the persons determined to have been involved in the misuse of public research funds (hereinafter collectively referred to as 'persons determined to be responsible for the misuse') to stop using the research funds immediately.

(Lifting of Measures and Restoration of Honor)

Article 31 1. If it is decided that misuse of public research funds did not take place, the University President shall lift the measures taken at the time of formal investigation such as suspension of research funding. With regard to the measure of preservation of evidence, it shall be lifted promptly after the deadline for filing an objection has passed or after the result of the examination of the objection is finalized.

2. The University President shall take measures to restore the honor of the person(s) determined to have not been involved in misuse of public research funds and to protect the person(s) from being disadvantaged.

(Report of Penalties)

Article 32 1. If it is decided that misuse of public research funds has occurred and any penalties are imposed on those who were involved in the misuse of public research funds in accordance with the procedures stipulated in the Disciplinary Regulations etc., the University President shall report the details of the penalties to the related organizations and agencies.

2. If any penalties are imposed on the complainant in accordance with the procedures stipulated in the Disciplinary Regulations etc., following the decision that the allegation was lodged out of malice, the University President shall report the details of the penalties to the persons to whom the report or the notification of the detail of the penalties was sent based on paragraph 3 of Article 24 in the same manner.

3. If it is decided that the content of the misuse is highly malicious, such as for personal use, the University President may request the Chairman of the University to take legal action.

(Corrective Measures)

Article 33 1. If it is decided as a result of the formal investigation that misuse of public research funds has occurred, the Ethics Review Committee shall be able to recommend the University President to promptly take corrective measures, measures to prevent recurrence and other necessary measures for environmental improvement (hereinafter collectively referred to as "corrective measures etc.").

2. Based on the recommendation described in the previous paragraph, the University President shall order the dean or director of the relevant faculty or graduate school etc. to take corrective measures etc. The University President shall also take corrective measures etc. for the university as a whole.

3. The University President shall report the details of the corrective measures etc. taken based on the previous paragraph to the related organizations and agencies, etc.

(Clerical Work)

Article 34 Clerical work relating to these policies shall be handled by the Office of the Ethics Review.

(Revision or Abolition)

Article 35 The revision or abolition of these policies shall be determined by the University President through the deliberation of the Ethics Review Committee and Directors Meeting.

Supplement

1. These policies shall take effect on the first day of April, 2023.

2. In addition to the provisions of these policies, MEXT's "Guidelines for Managing and Auditing Public Research Funds at Research Institutions (implementation standards)" shall also be referred to when dealing with a case of misuse of public research funds.