

National University Corporation Kyushu University Rules for Appropriate Research Activities

Kyushu University Employment Regulation No.14 of 2009

Effective date: December 1, 2009

Last amended: July 31, 2024

(Kyushu University Employment Regulation No.3 of 2024)

The National University Corporation Kyushu University Rules for Prevention of Misconduct in Research Activities (Kyushu University Employment Regulation No. 10 of 2006) are amended in their entirety.

(Purpose)

Article 1 The purpose of these Rules is to promote appropriate research activities at National University Corporation Kyushu University (hereinafter referred to as the "University") by providing for the responsibilities of researchers in their research activities at the University, implementation of research ethics education, prevention of misconduct, response to allegations, etc. concerning misconduct, measures to be taken in the event of misconduct, and other necessary matters.

(Definitions)

Article 2 In these Rules, the meanings of the terms set forth in the following items are as provided respectively in those items:

(i) Researcher: the following persons:

- (a) officers and persons subject to the General Regulations of Employment who engage in research;
- (b) students, and other persons engaging in research at the University;
- (c) persons who receive research guidance at the University;
- (d) persons who conduct research using research facilities and equipment of the University;
- and
- (e) persons who formerly fell within any of the categories set forth in (a) to (d) at the time of the occurrence of the research misconduct allegation;

(ii) misconduct: the following acts in research activities (excluding acts that have been clearly shown by evidence to be neither intentional nor the result of gross negligence in breach of the fundamental duty of care expected of a researcher):

- (a) fabrication: making up data or research results;
- (b) falsification: manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes to change data or

results obtained from research activities into those that are not genuine;

(c) plagiarism: appropriating the ideas, analytical methods, data, research results, research papers, or words of other researchers without obtaining the permission of the researchers or giving appropriate credit;

(d) other acts: inappropriate acts not listed in (a), (b), or (c), the severity of which constitutes a serious deviation from the ethics that researchers are expected to uphold, in light of the Code of Conduct for Scientists and prevailing social norms; and

(e) destroying evidence or obstructing presentation of evidence of any of the acts mentioned above;

(iii) competitive research funding, etc.: funds distributed based on open calls for proposals, chiefly consisting of competitive funds allocated by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (hereinafter referred to as “MEXT”) or by incorporated administrative agencies under MEXT jurisdiction.

(iv) research institution: any institution whose affiliated researchers conduct research activities funded by competitive research funding, etc., by administrative cost grants to national university corporations or to incorporate administrative agencies under MEXT jurisdiction, by private school subsidies or other funding for basic operating expenses, or by other funding budgeted or allocated by MEXT; and

(v) research funding organization: an organization allocating competitive research funding, etc. to research institutions.

(Responsibilities of Researcher)

Article 3 (1) A researcher must conduct appropriate research activities in accordance with the Behavioral Criteria for Researchers provided by the University (hereinafter referred to as the "Behavioral Criteria"), these Rules, and related laws and regulations.

(2) A researcher must store research data for a predetermined time period and disclose the data as needed.

(3) The content, period of storage, method of storage, and method of disclosure of the research data to be stored or disclosed, and other matters, are provided separately by the President based on the nature of the data and the characteristics of the research field.

(Responsibilities of Research Manager and Supervisor)

Article 4 A person who is in the position to manage research as a principal researcher (hereinafter referred to as the "research manager") and a person who is in the status to supervise and guide researchers (hereinafter referred to as the "supervisor") must maintain appropriate research activities and fulfill their management responsibilities to create a sound research environment

where no misconduct would occur, in accordance with the Behavioral Criteria, these Rules, and related laws and regulations.

(Responsibilities of the President)

Article 5 The President shall raise awareness of the Behavioral Criteria, these Rules, and related laws and regulations thoroughly among researchers, research managers, supervisors, and research ethics education officers provided in Article 7, and take necessary measures to conduct appropriate research activities.

(Responsibilities of Executive Vice President in Charge of Research)

Article 6 (1) An Executive Vice President in charge of research presides over the prevention of misconduct at the University and measures, etc. to be taken in the event of misconduct.

(2) If the Executive Vice President in charge of research is unable to perform their duties due to travel, disease, any accident or the like, the President shall designate a substitute from among Executive Vice Presidents to perform those duties on behalf of that Executive Vice President in charge of research during the period when that Executive Vice President in charge of research is unable to perform the duties.

(3) The Executive Vice President in charge of research shall formulate research ethics education and other specific initiatives based on the Behavioral Criteria and check the status of implementation of those initiatives and report it to the President,

(Research Ethics Education Officer)

Article 7 (1) In order to prevent misconduct and promote appropriate research activities, a research ethics education officer is appointed for each faculty as a person responsible for implementing education to train researchers on the ethical standards that they are required to comply with (hereinafter referred to as "research ethics education"), and the head of each faculty serves in this capacity.

(2) The research ethics education officer must, based on the instruction by the Executive Vice President in charge of research, provide research ethics education regularly to all researchers involved in research activities at the faculty that the research ethics education officer is responsible for.

(3) Each faculty may have in place one or more research ethics education vice officers to assist the research ethics education officer.

(4) The content, implementation method, and other matters regarding research ethics education are provided separately by the Executive Vice President in charge of research.

(Establishment of Contact Point)

Article 8 (1) In order to deal with allegations or requests for consultation concerning misconduct or comments given by academic societies or the like concerning misconduct (hereinafter referred to as "allegations, etc." in Article 10, paragraph (1) and Article 17), research misconduct contact points (hereinafter referred to as the "contact points") are established in the Administrative Bureau and each faculty's Administrative Office.

(2) Beyond what is provided in the preceding paragraph, in order to deal with allegations, etc., a contact point is established at an organization outside the University (this contact point is hereinafter referred to as an "off-campus contact point").

(3) The names, locations, contact information, method of receiving allegations, etc., and other matters regarding the contact points and off-campus contact point shall be announced in and outside the University.

(4) If a staff member or any other relevant person assigned to a contact point or off-campus contact point has any interest in a case of an allegation, etc., the staff member or relevant person must not be involved in the relevant case.

(Method of Making an Allegation)

Article 9 (1) An allegation must be made by clearly presenting the name of the person who makes an allegation (hereinafter referred to as the "complainant") in principle, by means of a document or the like which clearly indicates the following matters:

- (i) the name of the researcher who is suspected of committing misconduct (hereinafter referred to as the "respondent");
- (ii) the nature of the misconduct and the description of the case; and
- (iii) scientific and rational reason for considering the alleged act as misconduct.

(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of the preceding paragraph, if an allegation is made anonymously, the allegation may be received by deeming this allegation to be an allegation made under the preceding paragraph, depending on the content of the allegation.

(3) If a case in which an allegation is made pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2) is irrelevant to any research institution that the University should investigate, the allegation may be forwarded to the research institution or research funding organization that should investigate the case. An allegation forwarded to the University from a research institution or research funding organization other than the University may be deemed to be an allegation referred to in paragraph (1).

(4) If an allegation is made by a method that would preclude the complainant from knowing whether the allegation is received by a contact point or off-campus contact point, notification to the effect that the allegation has been received shall be provided to the complainant (excluding an anonymous complainant; provided, however, that an anonymous complainant is treated as a non-

anonymous complainant if the complainant's name is ascertained before the investigation results are produced).

(5) A contact point which has received a request for consultation made without an explicit indication of the intention to make an allegation shall check or examine the content of the request for consultation, and if it finds a sufficient reason, it shall confirm with the person who has filed the request for consultation about whether the person has the intention to make an allegation.

(6) A contact point which has received an allegation or request for consultation to the effect that someone intends to commit misconduct or someone is asked to commit misconduct shall check or examine the content of the allegation or request for consultation and report it to the Executive Vice President in charge of research. If an off-campus contact point receives the allegation, the University shall check or examine the allegation and report it to the Executive Vice President in charge of research.

(7) If the Executive Vice President in charge of research finds an adequate reason, the Executive Vice President in charge of research may issue a warning to the respondent.

(8) A person responsible for a contact point shall make a report of the content of an allegation (hereinafter referred to as an "allegation report") to the Executive Vice President in charge of research.

(9) If the Executive Vice President in charge of research receives an allegation report and finds that it is not necessary to conduct investigation on matters including whether the content of the allegation is reasonable and whether it is possible to investigate the case, the Executive Vice President in charge of research shall provide notification to that effect to the complainant, or the research institution or any other organization that has given comments, and state the reason therefor.

(10) When the Executive Vice President in charge of research makes the notification referred to in the preceding paragraph, the Executive Vice President in charge of research shall report to the President.

(Treatment of Complainant and Respondent)

Article 10 (1) When receiving allegations, etc., measures must be taken to protect the confidentiality of the content of an allegation and the complainant by an appropriate method, so that an interview at a private room, email or the like would not be seen or heard by a person other than the staff member in charge at the contact point.

(2) The information of the complainant and the respondent, the content of the allegation and the content of the investigation brought to a contact point or off-campus contact point must not be leaked to persons other than those involved in the investigation, against the will of the complainant and the respondent, until the investigation results are announced.

(3) In conducting investigation, consideration must be given not to allow the complainant to be identifiable to anyone other than those involved in the investigation of the alleged misconduct or to the respondent, except when the complainant approves.

(4) If a case of an allegation is leaked before it is announced, an explanation of the case may be provided to the public, with the consent of the complainant and the respondent; provided, however, that this does not apply if the complainant or the respondent is responsible for the leak.

(5) Unless an allegation is ascertained to have been made maliciously (meaning the intention to damage the respondent, hinder research being conducted by the respondent, or otherwise solely to cause some kind of harm to the respondent or to disadvantage the research institution with which the respondent is affiliated; the same applies hereinafter), the University does not disadvantage the complainant, such as by dismissal, demotion, compensation reduction or other sanction, simply because the complainant made an allegation.

(6) The University does not, without a sufficient reason, disadvantage the respondent, such as by limitation or prohibition of research activities, dismissal, demotion, compensation reduction or other sanction, simply because an allegation against the respondent has been made.

(Handling of a Case Not Received as an Allegation)

Article 11 (1) In the case of a request for consultation made without an explicit indication of the intention to make an allegation referred to in Article 9, paragraph (5), even when no intention to make an allegation is indicated, an investigation of the request for consultation may be conducted at the discretion of the University.

(2) If misconduct is suspected by a scientific community such as an academic society or by the media, the case may be deemed as if an allegation referred to in Article 9, paragraph (1) has been made.

(3) If a suspicion of misconduct of a researcher belonging to the University is posted on the internet (limited to the case where the researcher or group suspected of misconduct, the nature and other matters of the misconduct, and the description of the research misconduct are clearly indicated, and the scientifically rational reason is indicated for considering the act suspected as misconduct), the case may be deemed as if an allegation referred to in Article 9, paragraph (1) has been made.

(Preliminary Investigation)

Article 12 (1) If the Executive Vice President in charge of research receives an allegation report and finds that it is necessary to conduct investigation on matters including whether the content of the allegation is reasonable and whether it is possible to investigate the case, the Executive Vice President in charge of research shall establish a Preliminary Investigation Committee in order to

conduct the necessary investigation (hereinafter referred to as the “Preliminary Investigation”).

(2) The Preliminary Investigation Committee is composed of the following members; provided, however, that this does not apply if the Executive Vice President in charge of research finds special circumstances with regard to the case subject to the investigation:

- (i) persons designated by the Executive Vice President in charge of research from among Executive Vice Presidents, Senior Vice Presidents or Vice Presidents;
- (ii) persons designated by the Executive Vice President in charge of research from among the heads of the related faculties, etc.;
- (iii) other persons who the Executive Vice President in charge of research finds necessary;

(3) A preliminary investigation shall be conducted to investigate matters including whether the content of the allegation is reasonable and whether it is possible to investigate the case.

(4) A preliminary investigation shall be concluded within 30 days in principle from the date of receipt of the allegation or from the date on which an allegation is deemed to have been made pursuant to Article 9, paragraph (2), Article 11, paragraphs (1), (2) and (3).

(5) The Preliminary Investigation Committee shall promptly report the results of the preliminary investigation to the Executive Vice President in charge of research.

(Handling of a Case Where Misconduct Is Obvious)

Article 12-2 Notwithstanding the provisions of the preceding Article, if the Executive Vice President in charge of research finds, in light of the content of an allegation report, that the fact of misconduct is obvious or that the probability of misconduct is extremely high, the Executive Vice President in charge of research may implement a full-fledged investigation provided in the following Article, without going through a preliminary investigation.

(Decision on the Necessity of Formal Investigation)

Article 13 (1) When the Executive Vice President in charge of research receives an allegation report or a report of a preliminary investigation referred to in Article 12, paragraph (5), the Executive Vice President in charge of research shall promptly decide whether or not it is necessary to implement a full-fledged investigation (hereinafter referred to as a "formal investigation").

(2) If the Executive Vice President in charge of research finds that it is not necessary to conduct a formal investigation, the Executive Vice President in charge of research shall report it to the President, and notify the complainant with the reason. In this case, the Executive Vice President in charge of research shall preserve documents and other materials relating to the preliminary investigation, and disclose them at the request of the research funding organization relating to the relevant case and the complainant.

(3) If the Executive Vice President in charge of research receives a report of the results of the preliminary investigation referred to in Article 12, paragraph (5) and finds that it is necessary to conduct a formal investigation, the Executive Vice President in charge of research shall notify the complainant, the respondent, and the head of the department or equivalent to which the respondent belongs, and shall also report the case to the relevant funding agency and MEXT. If the respondent belongs to a research institution other than the University, the Executive Vice President in charge of research shall also notify that institution.

(Investigative Committee)

Article 14 (1) In order to implement a formal investigation and consider initiatives to be carried out, the Executive Vice President in charge of research shall establish a Research Misconduct Investigation Committee (hereinafter referred to as the "Investigative Committee").

(2) The Investigative Committee is composed of the following members; provided, however, that this does not apply if the Executive Vice President in charge of research finds special circumstances with regard to the case subject to the investigation:

- (i) persons designated by the Executive Vice President in charge of research from among Executive Vice Presidents, Senior Vice Presidents or Vice Presidents;
- (ii) persons designated by the Executive Vice President in charge of research from among the heads of the related faculties, etc.;
- (iii) researchers in and outside the University who are specialized in the research field of the case subject to the investigation;
- (iv) attorneys at law and other outside experts; and
- (v) other persons who the Executive Vice President in charge of research finds necessary.

(3) More than half of the members of the Investigation Committee shall be individuals from outside the University.

(4) In order to conduct an investigation in a fair manner, all members of the Investigative Committee must be persons who have no direct interest in the relationship with the complainant and the respondent of the case subject to the investigation.

(5) The member of the Investigative Committee referred to in paragraph (2), item (i) serves as the Committee Chairperson (hereinafter referred to as the "Chairperson"); provided, however, this shall not apply if the Executive Vice President in charge of research finds special circumstances.

(Formal Investigation)

Article 15 (1) When the Executive Vice President in charge of research establishes the Investigative Committee, the Executive Vice President in charge of research shall notify the complainant and the respondent of the names and affiliations of the members of the Investigative

Committee.

(2) If the complainant and the respondent have an objection with regard to any member of the Investigative Committee, they may file an objection with the Executive Vice President in charge of research, with the reason, within one week from the date following the date on which they have received the notification referred to in the preceding paragraph.

(3) If the Executive Vice President in charge of research determines that the objection referred to in the preceding paragraph is reasonable, the Executive Vice President in charge of research shall replace the member of the Investigative Committee who is subject to the objection and notify the complainant and the respondent to that effect.

(4) A formal investigation shall be initiated within 30 days in principle from the date on which the implementation of the investigation has been decided.

Article 16 (1) In a formal investigation, a necessary investigation shall be conducted by close examination of the research papers, experimental and observation notes, raw data, and other materials relevant to the research activities concerning the case subject to the investigation, as well as interviews with the parties involved, and other measures.

(2) The Executive Vice President in charge of research may take the following measures if The Executive Vice President in charge of research finds it necessary after receiving opinions from the Investigative Committee:

- (i) temporary suspension of the research activities subject to the investigation;
- (ii) preservation of equipment, experiment records, materials and other things relevant to the case subject to the investigation; and
- (iii) other measures which the Executive Vice President in charge of research finds necessary.

(3) In a formal investigation, the respondent must be given the opportunity for explanation; provided, however, that if the Investigative Committee finds that there is suspicion that the complainant has made an allegation maliciously, the complainant must also be given the opportunity for explanation.

(4) If a researcher faces an allegation of misconduct concerning the researcher's research activities and wishes to dispel the suspicion of the alleged misconduct, the researcher must, on their own responsibility, explain that the research activities have been carried out appropriately, by presenting a scientific basis.

(5) If, in order to investigate the likelihood that the alleged misconduct was committed, the Investigative Committee requests the respondent to demonstrate reproducibility by such means as replicating experiments, or the Investigative Committee finds that replication is necessary following a request by the respondent, the Investigative Committee shall provide the time and opportunity required to carry out experiment replication or any other activity within the scope

deemed to be reasonably necessary. In this case, that experiment replication or other activity shall be conducted under the direction and supervision of the Investigative Committee.

(6) Upon the request of a research funding organization relating to the case of the allegation, the University shall submit an interim report on the investigation to the research funding organization even before the formal investigation is completed.

(Preservation of evidence)

Article 17 (1) If allegations, etc. is a case relating to the research activities carried out at an institution other than the University, the Executive Vice President in charge of research shall request that institution preserve documents and other materials that might be used as evidence with regard to the research activities relating to the case subject to the allegations, etc.

(2) If a case in which allegations, etc. is made at an institution other than the University relates to the research activities carried out at the University, the Executive Vice President in charge of research shall, at the request of that institution, take measures to preserve documents and other materials that might be used as evidence with regard to the research activities relating to the case subject to the allegations, etc.

(Findings)

Article 18 (1) The Investigative Committee must make a finding as to whether the alleged misconduct, etc. was committed, in principle, within 150 days from the commencement of the formal investigation; provided, however, that this does not apply if it took more time to conduct the investigation due to conducting the experiment replication referred to in Article 16, paragraph (5) or any other activity in the process of the investigation.

(2) The finding referred to in the preceding paragraph must be made by making a comprehensive assessment of the evidence obtained through investigation, such as the physical and scientific evidence, the testimony of the parties involved, and any admission by the respondent.

(3) If, in the determination under paragraph (1), the respondent fails to present sufficient evidence to refute the suspicion of misconduct due to the absence of fundamental elements that should normally exist—such as raw data, laboratory or observation notes, experimental samples, or reagents—misconduct shall be deemed to have occurred, unless it is recognized that there is a legitimate reason not attributable to the respondent.

(4) If the Investigative Committee finds that the alleged misconduct was committed, it shall make findings as to the content of the misconduct, the persons involved in the misconduct and the degree of their involvement, the roles of each of the authors of any associated research paper or other forms of publication, with regard to the research activities that have been found to constitute misconduct, which are played in the research paper or other forms of publication, as well as their

roles in these research activities, whether the misconduct was committed intentionally (or, if not deemed intentional, whether the individual grossly neglected the fundamental duty of care expected of a researcher), and other necessary matters.

(5) If the Investigative Committee finds that the alleged misconduct was not committed, it shall promptly request the Executive Vice President in charge of research to lift the measures stipulated in Article 16, paragraph (2).

(6) If the Investigative Committee finds that the alleged misconduct was not committed and, in the process of the investigation, it is ascertained that the allegation was made maliciously, it shall also make a finding to that effect.

(7) The Investigative Committee shall compile the results of the findings and report them to the Executive Vice President in charge of research.

(8) The Executive Vice President in charge of research checks the results of the findings and reports them to the President.

(9) The President shall notify the complainant, the respondent (including any person other than the respondent who is found to have been involved in the misconduct; the same applies hereinafter), and the head of the faculty, etc. with which the respondent is affiliated, of the results of the findings.

(10) The President shall report the results of the findings to the research funding organization relating to the relevant case and MEXT.

(11) If the President finds it necessary, the President shall notify the related organization publishing the research paper and the related educational and research institution or any other organization which pertain to the research subject to the investigation, of the results of the findings.

(12) If a finding is made to the effect that the alleged misconduct was not committed, the President shall take sufficient measures to normalize the respondent's educational and research activities and restore their honor.

(Appeal)

Article 19 (1) If a respondent who is found to have committed misconduct, or a complainant who is found to have made an allegation maliciously is dissatisfied with the relevant finding, they may file an appeal in writing within 30 days from the date following the date on which they received the notification of the finding; provided, however, that they may not file repeated appeals for the same reason even within the period during which they may file an appeal.

(2) If an appeal is filed, the Executive Vice President in charge of research shall instruct the Chairperson to examine whether it is necessary to conduct a reinvestigation.

(3) If the Executive Vice President in charge of research determines that the object of the appeal necessitates a decision requiring new expertise, the Executive Vice President in charge of research

shall replace the existing members of the Investigative Committee or add new members of the Investigative Committee, or have the investigation conducted by other persons in place of the members of the Investigative Committee.

(4) If an appeal is filed, the Executive Vice President in charge of research shall notify the complainant (or the respondent in the case of the finding under Article 18, paragraph (5); the same applies hereinafter) and the head of the faculty, etc. with which the respondent (or the complainant in the case of the finding under Article 18, paragraph (5); the same applies hereinafter) is affiliated, and shall also report to the research funding organization relating to the relevant case and MEXT.

(5) If the Chairperson determines that it is necessary to conduct a reinvestigation by taking into consideration the object, reason, and other matters of the appeal, the Investigative Committee shall promptly initiate a reinvestigation.

(6) In order to promptly solve the reinvestigation, the Investigative Committee shall request cooperation from the person who filed the appeal and other persons.

(7) If the Investigative Committee is unable to obtain cooperation from the person who filed the appeal despite the request for cooperation referred to in the preceding paragraph, it may terminate the reinvestigation.

(8) If the object of the appeal is related to the composition or other matters concerning the Investigative Committee, and the Executive Vice President in charge of research determines the reason for the appeal to be appropriate, the Executive Vice President in charge of research replaces the members of the Investigative Committee or takes other measures.

(9) If an appeal is filed and the Chairperson determines that it is not necessary to conduct a reinvestigation, the Chairperson shall report it to the Executive Vice President in charge of research and the President.

(10) The President shall notify the person who filed the appeal and the head of the faculty, etc. with which that person is affiliated, and shall report to the research funding organization relating to the relevant case and MEXT, with the reason for not conducting a reinvestigation. If the Executive Vice President in charge of research determines that the main objective of the person who filed the appeal was to delay the relevant measure to be taken along with the finding, the President may decide not to accept any further appeal from that person.

(Reinvestigation relating to Appeal)

Article 20 (1) If an appeal is filed and the Chairperson determines that it is necessary to conduct a reinvestigation, the Chairperson shall report to the Executive Vice President in charge of research and the President.

(2) The President shall report the person who filed the appeal and the head of the faculty, etc. with which that person is affiliated, and shall report to the research funding organization relating to the

relevant case and MEXT, to the effect that a reinvestigation will be conducted.

(3) The Investigative Committee must decide whether or not to revoke all or part of the findings relating to the appeal within 50 days in principle (or within 30 days in principle in the case of the findings under Article 18, paragraph (6)) from the date on which the reinvestigation is initiated.

(4) The Investigative Committee shall compile the results of the findings and report them to the Executive Vice President in charge of research.

(5) The Executive Vice President in charge of research shall check the results of the findings and report them to the President.

(6) The President shall notify the complainant, the respondent, and the head of the faculty, etc. with which the respondent is affiliated, of the results of the findings, and shall report them to the research funding organization relating to the relevant case and MEXT.

(7) If the President finds it necessary, the President shall notify the related organization publishing the research paper and the related educational and research institution or any other organization which pertain to the research subject to the investigation, of the results of the findings.

(Announcement)

Article 21 (1) Announcement of misconduct, etc. shall be made by the President.

(2) If a finding is made to the effect that the alleged misconduct was committed, the investigation results shall be announced promptly.

(3) The contents of the investigation results to be announced are the name of the researcher who committed the misconduct, the details of the misconduct, and other necessary matters.

(4) The provisions of the preceding paragraph do not apply if the President finds it necessary to refrain from announcing any of the contents of the investigation results to be announced as set forth in the preceding paragraph, on reasonable grounds.

Article 22 (1) If a finding is made to the effect that the alleged misconduct was not committed, no announcement relating to the finding is made in principle; provided, however, that if the relevant case has been leaked before the finding is made or if there are unintentional errors in any research paper or other forms of publication, the fact that the alleged misconduct was not committed, and other necessary matters shall be announced.

(2) If a finding is made to the effect that the allegation was made maliciously, the name of the complainant and other necessary matters shall be announced in principle.

(Cooperation for Investigation)

Article 23 The complainant, the respondent, and other parties involved must cooperate with the investigation in good faith.

(Confidentiality)

Article 24 Persons in charge of contact points, persons in charge of an off-campus contact point, members of the Investigative Committee, and other parties involved must not leak any information that they have learned in the course of duties.

(Measures against Misconduct)

Article 25 (1) If a finding is made to the effect that the alleged misconduct was committed or that the allegation was made maliciously , and it is found to be necessary to make a disposition or improve the research environment, the President shall take necessary measures.

(2) The President shall issue a recommendation to the person who is found to have been involved in the misconduct and the person who is found to have not been involved in the misconduct but is found to be responsible for the content of the research paper or other forms of publication which are found to involve the misconduct, to take appropriate measures such as the withdrawal or correction of the research paper or other forms of publication which are found to involve the misconduct.

Supplementary Provisions

These Rules come into effect as of December 1, 2009.

Supplementary Provisions (Kyushu University Employment Regulation No. 14 of 2010)

These Rules come into effect as of December 1, 2010.

Supplementary Provisions (Kyushu University Employment Regulation No. 23 of 2014)

1. These Rules come into effect as of April 1, 2015.

2. Prior rules continue to govern the handling of allegations of research misconduct made before these Rules come into effect; provided, however, that the operations of the Kyushu University Research Misconduct Prevention Committee and the Research Misconduct Investigative Committee, which were provided, when these Rules come into effect, in the National University Corporation Kyushu University Rules for Responding to Research Misconduct prior to the amendment by these Rules, shall be taken over respectively by the Kyushu University Committee for the Promotion of Responsible Research and the Research Misconduct Investigative Subcommittee, which will be provided in the National University Corporation Kyushu University Rules for Appropriate Research Activities as amended by these Rules.

Supplementary Provisions (Kyushu University Employment Regulation No.8 of 2015)

These Rules come into effect as of December 1, 2015.

Supplementary Provisions (Kyushu University Employment Regulation No. 19 of 2016)

These Rules come into effect as of December 1, 2016.

Supplementary Provisions (Kyushu University Employment Regulation No.4 of 2021)

These Rules come into effect as of June 1, 2021.

Supplementary Provisions (Kyushu University Employment Regulation No. 2 of 2022)

These Rules come into effect as of June 1, 2022.

Supplementary Provisions (Kyushu University Employment Regulation No. 23 of 2023)

1. These Rules come into effect as of March 1, 2024.

2. With respect to cases in which, at the time of enforcement of these Regulations, a decision has already been made and a notification has been issued to conduct the formal investigation under Article 13, paragraph (4) of the former National University Corporation Kyushu University Rules for Appropriate Research Activities, such cases shall continue to be governed by the former provisions even after the enforcement of these Regulations.

Supplementary Provisions (Kyushu University Employment Regulation No. 3 of 2024)

1. These Rules come into effect as of August 1, 2024.

2. With respect to allegations of research misconduct made prior to the enforcement of these Regulations, such cases shall continue to be handled in accordance with the former provisions even after the enforcement of these Regulations.