

International Christian University Regulations Governing the Prevention of Fraudulent Activities in Research

Enacted: ICU Official Document No. 08-15, November 19 , 2008

Revised: ICU Official Document No. 14-06, October 10 , 2014

ICU Official Document No. 14-29 , March 12 , 2015

ICU Official Document No. 16-31, March 2, 2017

ICU Official Document No. 17-20, September 21, 2017

ICU Official Document No. 18-15, June 28 , 2018

ICU Official Document No. 22-34, March 2, 2023

ICU Official Document No. 24-07, May 16, 2024

(Purpose)

Article 1. The purpose of these regulations is to prevent research misconduct and misuse of research funds (hereinafter referred to collectively as “fraudulent activities”) by individuals involved in research (hereinafter referred to as “researchers”) at International Christian University (hereinafter referred to as the “University”) and to determine matters necessary for responding appropriately to cases of such fraudulent activities or fears of such cases.

(Definitions)

Article 2. The definition of “fraudulent activities” in these regulations shall be set forth as follows:

- (1) Research misconduct: the following acts either willfully or due to gross neglect of the basic duty of care expected of a researcher.
 - (a) Fabrication: making up data or results that do not exist
 - (b) Falsification: manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes to change data or results obtained from research activities.
 - (c) Plagiarism: appropriating another person’s ideas, analysis, analytical methods, data, research results, research paper(s), or words without obtaining the permission of the person or giving appropriate credit
 - (d) Other research misconduct (duplicate submission, inappropriate authorship, etc.)
 - (2) Misuse of research funds: using funds in a manner that violates the law, the regulations established by the organization providing research funds, or the regulations of the University
2. When suspicion arises regarding the matters specified in (a) to (c) of item (1) of the preceding paragraph, which are defined as “specific research misconduct” by the Japanese government, or regarding matters specified in item (2) of the preceding paragraph, prompt investigations and measures, as set forth in Article 13 et seq., shall be conducted appropriately.

(Chief Administrative Officer)

- Article 3. The University shall have a Chief Administrative Officer who holds ultimate responsibility for the administration and management of research funds and the prevention of research misconduct, and the President shall serve in this capacity.
2. The Chief Administrative Officer shall endeavor to understand the causes of fraudulent activities, formulate plans to prevent such misconduct, and oversee the implementation progress of the plans. The Chief Administrative Officer shall also respond strictly and appropriately to cases of fraudulent activities or concerns related to research misconduct.
 3. The Chief Administrative Officer shall lead the deliberations at the Board of Trustees in formulating the basic policy and specific fraud prevention measures, and shall report on the implementation status and effectiveness of the measures to the Board of Trustees while seeking opinions from its members.

4. The Chief Administrative Officer shall regularly conduct various awareness-raising activities for fraud prevention in order to enhance and instill awareness among the members.

(General Management Officer)

Article 4. The University shall have a General Management Officer who assists the Chief Administrative Officer, and have substantive authority and responsibility for the administration and management of research funds and the prevention of fraudulent activities at the University, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall serve in this capacity.

2. The General Management Officer shall systematically and continuously provide education and training to researchers and general staff in charge of the administration and management of research funds in order to prevent fraudulent activities at the University.

(Compliance Promotion Officer and Research Ethics Education Officer)

Article 5. The University shall have a Compliance Promotion Officer who, under the direction of the General Management Officer, implements measures to prevent misuse of research funds in divisions, groups, etc., and confirms and reports the implementation status. The Assistant Director of the Center for Research Planning and Support shall serve in this capacity. The Compliance Promotion Officer shall also bear responsibility as a Research Ethics Education Officer, who fulfills a similar role regarding research misconduct.

2. In order to prevent fraudulent activities, the Compliance Promotion Officer shall regularly provide compliance education on misuse of research funds and research ethics education on research misconduct to full-time researchers affiliated with the University and general staff in charge of the administration and management of research funds. In addition, the Compliance Promotion Officer shall monitor whether constituent members are appropriately managing and executing competitive funds, etc., and provide guidance for improvement as necessary.

(Responsibility of Researchers and Research Supporters)

Article 6. Researchers shall maintain high ethical standards and must not engage in fraudulent activities.

2. If researchers are academic staff of the University, they shall be responsible not only for the matter prescribed in the preceding paragraph, but also for providing appropriate guidance to students under their supervision so that their students will not engage in fraudulent activities.
3. All researchers and research supporters involved in the management and administration of research funds shall, in order to instill awareness of fraud prevention, bear the responsibility of attending compliance education (research ethics education) and of signing a written pledge not to engage in fraudulent activities.
4. If any suspicion arises concerning fraudulent activities, all researchers and research supporters involved in the management and administration of research funds shall need to present scientific evidence on their own responsibility to counter allegations of misconduct, etc. Thus, they shall bear the responsibility of preserving research data, such as research papers, laboratory and observation notebooks, raw data, etc., for a certain period of time. In addition, if it is deemed necessary and reasonable to disclose evidence, disclosure must be made. The specific research data to be preserved or disclosed, the time period, and the method of preservation shall be decided separately in consideration of the nature of the data and the characteristics of the research field.

(Committee for the Prevention of Fraudulent Activities)

Article 7. A Committee for the Prevention of Fraudulent Activities shall be established under the Chief Administrative Officer.

2. The Committee for the Prevention of Fraudulent Activities shall be composed of the members set forth in each of the following items. Except for committee officers, committee members shall serve a term of two years; provided, however,

that the term of service shall expire at the end of the academic year following the year in which the members join the committee.

- (1) General Management Officer (committee chair)
- (2) Vice President for General Affairs
- (3) Dean of the College of Liberal Arts
- (4) Dean of the Graduate School
- (5) Director, Center for Research Planning and Support
- (6) Several others with research experience who are appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer
- (7) Others whom the Chief Administrative Officer deems necessary for the committee

3. The Committee for the Prevention of Fraudulent Activities shall be engaged in the following duties set forth in each of the following items.

- (1) Matters concerning the developing and compiling plans for the prevention of fraudulent activities
- (2) Matters concerning the advancement of plans for the prevention of fraudulent activities
- (3) Matters concerning the inspection of plans for the prevention of fraudulent activities
- (4) Matters concerning improvement measures against causes of research misconduct

4. The Center for Research Planning and Support shall serve as the administrative office for the Committee for the Prevention of Fraudulent Activities.

(Internal Audits)

Article 8. To ensure the appropriate management of public research funds, the Auditor's Office shall conduct internal audits in accordance with the School Juridical Person International Christian University, Regulations Governing Internal Audits.

(Auditors)

Article 9. The Auditors shall confirm the status of the maintenance and operation of internal controls for fraud prevention from the perspective of the University as a whole, and provide their opinions.

2. The Auditors shall confirm, in particular, whether the factors causing the occurrence of fraud, as revealed by the monitoring conducted by the General Management Officer and the Compliance Promotion Officer and internal audits, are reflected in the fraud prevention plans, and whether the fraud prevention plans are properly implemented, and shall provide their opinions.

(Consultation Desk)

Article 10. The Center for Research Planning and Support shall have a contact point for receiving consultations from both inside and outside the organization regarding rules for the use of competitive funds, etc. at the University.

(Reporting Desk)

Article 11. The contact point for receiving allegations, consultations, and provision of information (hereinafter referred to as "allegations") concerning fraudulent activities at the University (hereinafter referred to as the "reporting desk") shall be the Director of the Auditor's Office and the Managing Trustee for General Affairs.

2. The General Management Officer shall determine the name, location, and contact methods of the reporting desk and make these known both within and outside the University.

(Receipt of Allegations)

Article 12. Allegations shall be made directly to the reporting desk by sealed letter, e-mail, in-person, etc.

2. In principle, allegations shall be made non-anonymously and must clearly indicate the researcher suspected of fraudulent activities, the nature of such misconduct, a description of the case, and reasonable grounds for considering it as fraudulent

activities. Provided, however, that, if an allegation is made anonymously, it may be treated similarly to non-anonymous allegations depending on its nature.

3. If allegations are made in writing or by other means that would preclude the complainant from knowing whether it was received, the University shall notify the complainant that the allegation was received.
4. If doubts are raised about fraudulent activities by the Board of Audit of Japan, the news report, or academic societies, they shall be handled in the same manner as with allegations as prescribed in the proviso of paragraph 2.
5. In cases of consultation where the intent to make an allegation is not explicit, the content of the allegation shall be checked and carefully examined. If there is deemed to be a sufficient reason to make an allegation, the University shall confirm with the complainant whether they intend to make an allegation or not. Provided, however, that even in cases where there is no indication of intent to make an allegation, the University may initiate an investigation into the matter.

(Handling of Allegations)

Article 13. If an allegation has been received pursuant to the provisions of the preceding article, the reporting desk shall promptly report it to the Chief Administrative Officer and the General Management Officer.

2. In the case of allegations declaring that someone intends to commit specific research misconduct, or that someone was asked to commit such misconduct, the General Management Officer shall, with the approval of the Chief Administrative Officer, check and examine the content of the allegation, and if there is deemed to be a sufficient reason, the University shall, in light of the urgency, issue a warning to the individual named in the allegation (hereinafter referred to as “the respondent”). If the respondent is affiliated with an organization other than the University, the University shall forward the notification to the organization of the respondent.

(Protection of Complainant and Respondent)

Article 14. When receiving an allegation, proper measures must be taken to protect the confidentiality of the contents and the complainant so that no one other than the reporting desk shall see or hear the allegation.

2. To prevent information from being leaked to persons outside the investigation against the will of the complainant and respondent, individuals in charge of the reporting desk and others involved in the case (hereinafter referred to as “parties involved in the investigation”), shall ensure to maintain the confidentiality. Such confidentiality shall apply to the complainant, the respondent, details of the allegation, and details of the investigation until the investigation results are made public.
3. The parties involved in the investigation must not divulge any confidential information learned in the course of the investigation to outside parties. The same applies even after such duties have been completed.
4. If a case under investigation is leaked to outside parties, the Chief Administrative Officer may, with the consent of the complainant and respondent, provide a public explanation of the investigation. However, if the complainant or the respondent was responsible for the leak, that person’s consent shall not be needed.
5. Unless an allegation is determined to have been made with malicious intent, the University must not give the complainant disadvantageous treatment, simply for having brought an allegation.
6. Without legitimate reason, the University must not give the respondent disadvantageous treatment, such as prohibition of research activities, simply because an allegation was brought.
7. Neither the Chief Administrative Officer, the General Management Officer, members of the Fraudulent Activities Investigation Panel as set forth in Article 17, nor the individuals in the reporting desk may participate in an investigation in which they are either the complainant or the respondent.

(Investigating Organization)

Article 15. If the respondent is affiliated with the University, in principle, the University shall investigate the reported case.

2. If the respondent is affiliated with multiple research organizations, in principle, the investigation shall be carried out jointly by the multiple research institutions concerned, with the central role being played by the research institution where the respondent conducted most of the research activities involved in the allegation.
3. If the respondent is affiliated with the University but the allegation concerns research conducted at a different research institution, the University shall jointly investigate the reported case with the other research institution where the research in question was carried out.
4. If the respondent has already left the University, the reported case shall be investigated jointly by the research institution where the respondent is currently affiliated and the University. However, if, after leaving the University, the respondent is no longer affiliated with any institution, and the research concerning the allegation was carried out at the University, then the University shall investigate the reported case.
5. The University may ask another institution or members of the scientific community such as academic societies to conduct an investigation on its behalf or to cooperate in conducting an investigation.

(Preliminary Investigation)

Article 16. Based on the report prescribed in Article 13, the Chief Administrative Officer shall promptly have the General Management Officer conduct a preliminary investigation.

2. The General Management Officer shall first conduct a preliminary investigation to determine the reasonableness of the allegation and whether it can be investigated properly, then decide whether to conduct a formal investigation, and report the results to the Chief Administrative Officer within 30 days from the date of receipt of the allegation. With respect to a case involving the misuse of research funds, the Chief Administrative Officer shall report the results within 30 days from the date of receipt of the allegation to the research funding organization that provided research funds for the case (hereinafter referred to as the “funding agency”) and to the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (hereinafter referred to as the “MEXT”).
3. If a preliminary investigation involves any research paper(s), etc., withdrawn before an allegation was brought, the University shall examine the situation, including the background and circumstances leading to the withdrawal, and determine whether or not a formal investigation should be conducted.
4. If it is determined not to conduct a formal investigation, the Chief Administrative Officer shall notify the complainant of this decision along with the reasons. In such cases, the University shall preserve the materials, etc. involved in the preliminary investigation and may disclose them to the complainant if so requested.

(Fraudulent Activities Investigation Panel)

Article 17. If the Chief Administrative Officer decides to conduct a formal investigation based on the report prescribed in the preceding article, the Chief Administrative Officer shall promptly establish the Fraudulent Activities Investigation Panel (hereinafter referred to as “the Investigation Panel”).

2. The Investigation Panel shall be composed of the following members with more than half of its members being outside experts not affiliated with the University.
 - (1) General Management Officer (panel chair)
 - (2) Vice President for General Affairs
 - (3) Director of the Center for Research Planning and Support
 - (4) Several academic staff members appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer
 - (5) Researchers not affiliated with the University but who are active in the field concerned
 - (6) Others whom the Chief Administrative Officer deems necessary for the panel
3. All members of the Investigation Panel must be persons who have no direct interest with the complainant or the respondent.

4. The Investigation Panel shall determine necessary matters concerning its operation.
5. The Chief Administrative Officer shall determine the investigative authority of the Investigation Panel in accordance with the matters to be investigated and inform the parties concerned.
6. The administrative office of the Investigation Panel shall be established under the Director of the University Secretariat.

(Formal Investigation)

Article 18. The Investigation Panel shall initiate the formal investigation within 30 days from the date the results of the preliminary investigation are reported to the Chief Administrative Officer.

2. The Chief Administrative Officer shall notify the complainant and the respondent that a formal investigation shall be conducted and ask for their cooperation in the investigation. If the respondent is affiliated with another research organization, the Chief Administrative Officer shall also notify the organization. The Chief Administrative Officer shall also notify the funding agency and the MEXT. With regard to investigations into the misuse of public research funds, the investigative policy, scope of the investigation, investigation methods, etc., shall be deliberated with the funding agency.
3. The Chief Administrative Officer shall notify the complainant and the respondent of the names and affiliations of the members of the Investigation Panel. The complainant and the respondent may raise an object to the composition of the Investigation Panel within 10 days following receipt of the notification.
4. If, under the preceding paragraph, an objection is raised, and if the objection is deemed to be reasonable, the Chief Administrative Officer shall take appropriate action and notify the complainant and the respondent of the results of such objection.

(Investigation Method)

Article 19. The Investigation Panel shall conduct their formal investigation by close examination of the research paper(s), experiment and observation notes, raw data, and other materials related to the research in question, as well as documents and evidence related to the use of expenses, and by interviews with the parties involved. In so doing, the Investigation Panel must hold hearings to give the respondent an opportunity to offer a defense.

2. The scope of the investigation may include, in addition to research related to the allegation, other research activities carried out by the respondent if deemed relevant to the investigation by the Investigation Panel.
3. The Investigation Panel shall take measures to preserve materials that may serve as evidence regarding the research activities subject to the allegation. If the research in question was conducted at a research organization that is not the University, the Investigation Panel shall request such documents to be preserved as evidence by the organization. If it does not affect these measures, the respondent's research activities shall not be restricted.
4. In conducting an investigation, all due care shall be taken not to leak information beyond the scope necessary for conducting the investigation. Such information includes data, research paper(s), or other information covered by the investigation that has not yet been made public and whose confidentiality should be maintained from a technical or research perspective.

(Temporary Measures During the Investigation, Etc.)

Article 20. If a formal investigation is decided to be conducted, the Chief Administrative Officer may suspend the expenditure of research funds related to research concerning the allegation during the period until the investigation results are reported.

2. If some of the alleged misconduct was found to have occurred, even if the investigation has not yet been completed, the Chief Administrative Officer shall promptly determine that fraudulent activities have been committed and report it to the funding agency.

3. If requested to do so by the funding agency, even if the investigation has not yet been completed, the Chief Administrative Officer shall submit a progress report and an interim report on the investigation to the agency.
4. The Chief Administrative Officer shall, at the request of the funding agency, submit materials related to the case in question and allow the agency to inspect those materials and conduct on-site investigations, except when there is a justifiable reason, such as hindrances to the investigation.

(Accountability of the Respondent)

Article 21. If, during the formal investigation, the respondent wishes to dispel the suspicion concerning research misconduct, the respondent must present and explain the scientific basis at their own responsibility.

2. If, during the formal investigation, the respondent wishes to dispel the suspicion concerning misuse of research funds, the respondent must present and explain with documentation to serve as evidence of such claims.

(Determination)

Article 22. The Investigation Panel shall submit a report of the investigation results to the Chief Administrative Officer within 150 days of the start of the formal investigation. The report shall determine the following matters:

- (1) Whether fraudulent activities were committed or not
 - (2) If it is determined that fraudulent activities have occurred: the nature of the misconduct, the persons involved in the misconduct, the degree of their involvement, and the amount of research funds misused
 - (3) If it is determined that fraudulent activities were not committed: whether the allegation was made with malicious intent or not; provided, however, that in order to determine that the allegation was made with malicious intent, the University must give the complainant an opportunity to offer a defense.
2. The Investigation Panel shall determine whether fraudulent activities have been committed or not by hearing the explanations given by the respondent and shall also make a comprehensive assessment of the evidence obtained through the investigation, including physical and scientific evidence, testimony, and any admission by the respondent.
 3. The Investigation Panel may not determine that fraudulent activities have occurred based solely on an admission by the respondent.
 4. If the suspicion of fraudulent activities is not dispelled by the respondent's explanations or other evidence, the Investigation Panel may determine that fraudulent activities have occurred. The same shall apply if the respondent does not present sufficient evidence to dispel the suspicion of fraudulent activities due to a lack of key components of research that should normally exist, such as raw data, experimental and observation notes, test samples and reagents, and related documents that fall within the scope of the mandatory retention period.

(Notification of Investigation Panel's Findings)

Article 23. The Chief Administrative Officer shall promptly notify the complainant and the respondent (including persons other than the respondent determined to have been involved in the fraudulent activities) of the investigation results.

2. The Chief Administrative Officer shall submit a final report to the funding agency and the MEXT within 210 days of receipt of the allegation, which includes the investigation findings, the causes of the misconduct, the status of the management and audit system for other competitive funds involving the person involved in the misconduct, and a plan to prevent recurrence. In the event that the investigation is not completed by the due date, an interim report shall be submitted to a funding agency. If the respondent is affiliated with an organization other than the University, notification shall also be made to the organization of the respondent. If it is determined that misconduct has occurred in the investigation of research paper(s), etc., that was withdrawn before allegations were made, the Investigation Panel shall also include in the report any corrective measures taken by the researcher, such as withdrawal of the paper, and the background and circumstances that led to those measures.

3. If it was determined that the allegation was made with malicious intent and the complainant is affiliated with an organization other than the University, the Chief Administrative Officer shall also notify that organization of the panel's findings.

(Filing of Objections)

Article 24. The respondent determined to have committed fraudulent activities may file an objection to the Chief Administrative Officer in writing within 10 days from the date of the notification prescribed in the preceding article.

(Examination of Objections Filed)

- Article 25. Examination of objections filed shall be carried out by the Investigation Panel. However, if the objection involves matters relating to the fairness of the Investigation Panel, such as the composition of the panel, the Chief Administrative Officer may have the objection examined by other persons in place of the Investigation Panel.
2. The Investigation Panel shall promptly decide whether or not to conduct a re-investigation of the case, taking into consideration the details of the objection and reasons given, etc. The Chief Administrative Officer shall notify the complainant and the respondent of the decision. The funding agency and the MEXT shall also be notified.
 3. If the Investigation Panel decides to conduct a re-investigation, it shall ask for cooperation of the respondent for the prompt resolution of the matter. If such cooperation is not obtained, the Investigation Panel may discontinue to examine objections and close the re-investigation.
 4. If a re-investigation is begun, the Investigation Panel shall decide whether to overturn the earlier investigation and shall report this decision to the Chief Administrative Officer within 50 days following receipt of the objection.
 5. The Chief Administrative Officer shall notify the complainant and the respondent of the result prescribed in the preceding paragraph. If the respondent is affiliated with an organization other than the University, the Chief Administrative Officer shall also notify that organization. The funding agency and the MEXT shall also be notified.
 6. If an objection is filed based on the preceding article, the Chief Administrative Officer may extend the time for measures to preserve evidence under Article 19, paragraph 3, and the time for temporary measures under Article 20, paragraph 1, until the results of the re-investigation following an objection, as specified in the preceding paragraphs of this article, are reported to the Chief Administrative Officer.

(Objections from the Complainant)

Article 26. If the complainant is determined to have made the allegation with malicious intent, objections may be filed by the complainant based on Article 24. The examination of objections and re-investigation shall be conducted in accordance with Article 25.

(Public Announcement of Investigation's Findings)

- Article 27. When it is determined that fraudulent activities have occurred, the Chief Administrative Officer shall make public the investigation's findings. Items to be made public shall include the name and affiliation of the person(s) involved in the fraudulent activities, the details of the misconduct, the details of measures taken by the University up to the time of publication, the name and affiliation of the Investigation Panel members, and the investigation methods and procedures. Provided, however, that the name and affiliation of the person(s) involved in the fraudulent activities may be withheld from being made public if there are reasonable grounds.
2. When it is determined that fraudulent activities have not occurred, in principle, the Chief Administrative Officer shall not make public the investigation's findings. If, however, the case under investigation has been leaked or if unintentional errors in any research paper(s) or other forms of publication have been uncovered, the investigation's findings may be made public.

3. If it is determined that the allegation was made with malicious intent, the Chief Administrative Officer shall publicly announce that no fraudulent activities have occurred, as well as the name and affiliation of the complainant and the reason their allegation was deemed to be made with malicious intent.

(Suspending Research Funds, etc.)

Article 28. When it is determined that fraudulent activities have occurred, the Chief Administrative Officer shall immediately order to suspend the use of research funds to persons determined to have been involved in the fraudulent activities as well as authors who are determined to bear responsibility for the content of research paper(s) or other forms of publication in which research misconduct was found (hereinafter collectively referred to as “the persons determined to have committed the fraudulent activities”). The Chief Administrative Officer shall also recommend that the persons determined to have committed the fraudulent activities withdraw any such papers.

(Lifting Measures, etc.)

Article 29. When it is determined that no fraudulent activities have occurred, the Chief Administrative Officer shall lift measures for preserving evidence prescribed in Article 19, paragraph 3, and other temporary measures prescribed in Article 20, paragraph 1.

2. In order to restore the honor of the respondent, the Chief Administrative Officer shall inform any parties involved in the investigation that no fraudulent activities have occurred in the case concerned. If the case has been leaked to parties other than those involved in the investigation, the parties shall also be informed.
3. When it is determined that fraudulent activities were committed, the Chief Administrative Officer shall take necessary measures for correction and further prevention.

(Measures to Be Taken)

Article 30. If it is determined that fraudulent activities were committed and the persons determined to have committed the fraudulent activities are affiliated with the University, the President shall take appropriate measures in accordance with the Rules of Employment and other related regulations.

2. If the allegation was determined to have been made with malicious intent and the complainant is affiliated with the University, the President shall take measures in the same manner as the preceding paragraph.

(Other)

Article 31. These regulations conform to the Guidelines for Responding to Research Misconduct (August 8, 2006, Special Committee on Research Misconduct, Council for Science and Technology), Guidelines for Management and Audit of Public Research Funds at Research Institutions (Implementation Standards; February 15, 2007, determined by the Minister of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology), and Guidelines for Responding to Misconduct in Research (August 26, 2014, determined by the Minister of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology). Other necessary matters shall be determined separately.

2. Revision or abolition of these regulations shall be conducted by the President after deliberation by the Committee for the Prevention of Fraudulent Activities and the Senate.

Supplementary provisions:

The Japanese version is the official text, and this English translation is provided only for reference. Should any discrepancies or doubts arise between the two versions, the Japanese version will prevail. These regulations shall come into effect as of January 1, 2009.

These regulations shall come into effect as of October 10, 2014, and shall apply as of September 1, 2014.

These regulations shall come into effect as of April 1, 2015.

These regulations shall come into effect as of March 3, 2017.

These regulations shall come into effect as of September 21, 2017, and shall apply as of September 1, 2017.

These regulations shall come into effect as of June 28, 2018.

These regulations shall come into effect as of March 2, 2023.

These regulations shall come into effect as of May 16, 2024, and shall apply as of April 1, 2024.