

Program for the Prevention of Research Misconduct at Kumamoto University

April 1, 2015

Established by the President

June 20, 2018

Partial revision

December 16, 2022

Partial revision

This program is established based on the provisions of Article 8, paragraph 8-1 of the “Rules for the Prevention of Research Misconduct at Kumamoto University” for the improvement of research ethics and prevention of research misconduct.

This program shall be revised whenever necessary in view of factors leading to any research misconduct cases arising during the course of its implementation.

1. Establishment of a responsibility structure within the university

Factors leading to research misconduct	Research misconduct prevention program
<ul style="list-style-type: none">-Officers do not have an adequate understanding of their roles and responsibilities within the responsibility structure.-Awareness of responsibility weakens over time.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-Periodically provide information for raising awareness to each officer via such occasions as the conferences of division and department heads.-When there is a change of officers, an adequate handover briefing shall be provided.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">-Research misconduct cases go unnoticed because rules on the handling of whistleblowing, investigations, and penalties are not well recognized.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-To prevent those who have noticed research misconduct cases from hesitating to report for fear of disadvantageous treatment, disseminate information, via web pages, briefing sessions, and other means, which states that the university has whistleblowing counters to receive whistleblowing information and that it keeps whistleblowing information strictly confidential and always protects informants.

2. Development of a foundational environment for proper management and control

Factors leading to research misconduct	Research misconduct prevention program
<ul style="list-style-type: none">-There is no adequate understanding of researchers' responsibilities (such as the retention and disclosure of research materials) and rules concerning research funds.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-Disseminate information on researcher's responsibilities and rules concerning research funds via web pages, briefing sessions, Fair research Handbook, and other means.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">-Researchers' official authorities are not well	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-Ensure that staff members and vendors are well informed about the official authorities vested in researchers at

understood, so the function of checking misconduct doesn't work effectively.	Kumamoto University. -Inform vendors that the discovery of any fraud or dishonesty will result in penalties, such as the suspension of their business with the university. - To make the checking function effective, check if there is any gaps between rules and the actual situation, and revise the rules as appropriate whenever necessary.
-Staff members have little awareness about compliance and research ethics. -There is a research environment that is closed in nature or that hinders internal checks.	- Conduct compliance education and awareness-raising activities through awareness surveys and other methods aimed at raising awareness of compliance and research ethics among staff members and others. -Require staff members to submit written oaths.

3. Response to research misconduct concerning research activities and activities for proper management and control of research funds

Factors leading to research misconduct	Research misconduct prevention program
-The timing of budget implementation tends to concentrate in certain periods.	-Periodically investigate the status of research budget implementation, send the information to researchers, and ask them whether there are any unsettled transactions. *1 -Disseminate information on the research fund carry-over system via web pages, briefing sessions, and other means. * 2
-The fund source is not specified at the point of ordering.	- To accurately understand the budget implementation status, provide guidance and call attention through briefing sessions etc. to ensure that the fund source be specified at the point of ordering. * 3
-There is no adequate control of transaction records, and of vendor selection and information.	-Conduct periodical analyses of transaction records, including that of staff members who placed orders, vendors, laboratories items purchased, and transaction frequencies. * 4 -Confirm transaction records with respective vendors.
-Receiving inspections have become a mere formality.	-Provide appropriate guidance to inspection personnel about the purpose and methods of inspections whenever necessary so they will not perform the job as a mere formality.
-There is no adequate control of goods purchased.	-Carry out physical inspections by random sampling for goods worth 100,000 yen or more, and high value goods worth less than that value but which can be sold for money (PCs, tablet computers, digital cameras, video cameras, TVs, recording equipment, and cash vouchers). * 5
-There are no adequate inspections for special types of service contracts.	-For special types of service contracts, confirm with vendors by such means as interviews on a random sampling basis, as necessary.
-Due to a lack of strict control	-Ensure compliance with the rule that their working hours are

over the work of employees hired using research funds, there is little information on their actual working hours.	under the control of researchers who employ them and the staff members in charge of administration. -Investigate the status of work of employees hired using research funds, as necessary. * 6
-Fact checks regarding business trips are not adequate.	-Keep all those concerned well informed about rules on business trip applications and reporting. * 7 -Confirm with the business trip destination site, as necessary. * 8

4. Promotion of information dissemination and sharing

Factors leading to research misconduct	Research misconduct prevention program
-Rules are enforced based on wrong interpretations due to inadequate dissemination and sharing of information.	-Post information on the university's approaches to preventing research misconduct on the university website to make it accessible anytime, and keep it updated as required. -Disseminate information on help desks via web pages, briefing sessions, and other means. -Summarize inquiries and questions from staff members received by the help desks, and share them on the staff-member-only website.

5. Monitoring

Factors leading to research misconduct	Research misconduct prevention program
-Due to a lack of effective monitoring, the possibility of fraudulent use of research funds remains undiminished.	-The Audit Office should conduct risk-based auditing concerning research funding fraud, and work to enhance and strengthen organizational checking functions. -The Monitoring Office should cooperate with trustees, auditors, and the Fair Research Promotion Committee to conduct effective audits. - Disseminate information of internal audit outcomes, such as by sharing information with relevant divisions, and utilize the outcomes in compliance education, raising awareness, etc., to ensure that similar risks do not arise.

Note:

For items marked with an asterisk (*) in the research misconduct prevention program, implement the misconduct prevention program under the supervision of the Chief Compliance Officer, referring to the separate “List of Suggested Research Misconduct Prevention Measures (Examples).”