



UMFCD-CEDU-R-29-03/12/2024

Approved by the Board of Administration
02.12.2024

Approved by the University Senate
03.12.2024

**ORGANIZATIONAL AND OPERATING REGULATIONS OF THE ACADEMIC
ETHICS AND DEONTOLOGY COMMITTEE OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF MEDICINE AND PHARMACY "CAROL
DAVILA"(UMFCD) IN BUCHAREST**

The UMFC Academic Ethics and Deontology Committee, hereinafter referred to as the Academic Ethics Committee of UMFCD, Bucharest (CEDU), has developed this regulation concerning its proper organization and functioning, in accordance with the provisions of:

- Art. 161–174 of the Higher Education Law no. 199/2023, with subsequent amendments and additions;
- Art. 7 of the Framework Code of University Ethics and Deontology, approved by Government Decision no. 305/2024, published in the Official Gazette no. 327/09.04.2024;
- Order of the Minister of Education no. 6869/2024 for the approval of the Framework Regulation regarding the organization and functioning of university ethics committees, published in the Official Gazette no. 990/03.10.2024.

CHAPTER I

General Provisions

Art. 1 Legal Basis and Independence

(1) The University Ethics and Deontology Committee, CEDU, is an independent structure of UMFCD in Bucharest, which operates on the basis of the law, with duties and competences established by the provisions of Higher Education Law no. 199/2023.

(2) This regulation concerns the organization and functioning of the university ethics committee, hereinafter referred to as the University Ethics and Deontology Committee of UMFCD, with a view to ensuring compliance with the norms of university ethics and deontology, for the purpose of preventing and eliminating acts that may constitute elements or practices lacking ethics.

(3) The mandate of the University Ethics and Deontology Committee is 4 years. The University Ethics and Deontology Committee is established and carries out its activity in accordance with the legal regulations in force.



(4) The Committee acts independently from any other structure or person within UMFCF, drafts its own regulation for organization and functioning, as well as its own working procedures, which are approved by decision of the University Senate.

(5) Within the Committee, a subcommittee dedicated to research ethics operates. It monitors the implementation of research ethics policies in accordance with scientific research ethics regulations, which must cover the following aspects: publication and authorship, respect for the dignity of research participants, compliance with ethical standards for research conducted on human subjects, experiments involving animals, as well as other bioethics norms, research data management, collaboration, conflicts of interest, fraud, ensuring efficient research environments, as well as the prevention of harm in research and innovation.

Art.2 Duties of CEDU

(1) The duties of the University Ethics and Deontology Committee are provided by Art. 163 of Higher Education Law no. 199/2023, with subsequent amendments and additions.

(2) At the beginning of the academic year, the University Ethics Committee informs students about the role and the legal provisions related to university ethics and deontology.

(3) CEDU verifies breaches of the norms of university ethics and deontology provided by the legal provisions in force and by UMFCF's own regulations.

(4) CEDU urgently notifies the UMFCF leadership regarding complaints that fall under criminal law and provides it with all the information it holds regarding those complaints.

(5) In order to analyze and resolve violations of the norms of university ethics and deontology, the University Ethics and Deontology Committee has the right to initiate proceedings ex officio.

(6) CEDU prepares an annual report regarding the state of compliance with university ethics and the ethics of research activities, which is submitted to the Rector and the University Senate and constitutes a public document.

(7) CEDU contributes to the drafting of the Code of University Ethics and Deontology, which is proposed to the University Senate for adoption and inclusion in the University Charter.

(8) CEDU monitors compliance with the UMFCF Code of Ethics.

Art. 3 Structure and Composition of CEDU

(1) The Rector of UMFCF approves, by decision, the composition of the Ethics Committee and the Research Ethics Subcommittee, based on the proposal of the Administrative Council and the approval given by the University Senate. The members of the committee are persons of professional prestige.

(2) The number of members of CEDU is 7, of which 2 are students, and the number of members of the Research Ethics Subcommittee is 5, of which 1 is a doctoral student, in accordance with Art. 2 (2) of the framework regulation (annex to Order 6869/2024).

(3) The following persons may not be part of the University Ethics and Deontology Committee:

- a) those holding the positions of Rector, President of the Senate, Vice-Rector, Dean, Vice-Dean, General Administrative Director, Deputy General Administrative Director, Head of Department, Branch Director, Extension Director, or Director of a research-development, design, or microproduction unit within the higher education institution;
- b) those who have violated the norms of university ethics and deontology.

(4) If a person validated in these committees is in the situation provided for in para. (3) letter a), they have 15 working days to eliminate the incompatibility.

Art. 4 — (1) In order to formulate the proposal regarding the composition of the committee, the Administrative Council of UMFCFCD publicly informs the academic community, and persons interested in holding a position in this committee may submit a written request to the Rector of the higher education institution.

(2) The student representatives in the committee are elected by the students who are members of the Senate of the higher education institution.

(3) At the first meeting of the committee, after its establishment, the members of CEDU elect a president by vote.

(4) Members of the committees who commit acts incompatible with their position are replaced following the same procedure used for their appointment.

(5) If one of the members is revoked or withdraws from the committee, another member shall be appointed within 15 days in accordance with the provisions of para. (1). Withdrawal is made by submitting a request addressed to the Rector. Revocation of members is carried out through a written and reasoned request from the President to the Rector.

(6) Other situations in which committee members may be replaced/revoked include:

- unjustified absence from 2 consecutive CEDU meetings;
- failure to fulfill the obligations and tasks assigned by the CEDU President;
- breach of confidentiality obligations related to the cases under investigation.

(7) By the decision provided in Art. 23 para. (1), a secretary is also appointed for each committee, who is not a member thereof and who keeps records of the committee's documents, ensures communication between the committee and the persons involved in the issues referred to the committee, and drafts the minutes of the committee's working meetings.

(8) The secretary of the committee does not have voting rights.

Art. 5 -Duties of the President of the Ethics Committee:

- a) ensures the operational management and assigns individualized tasks to the members of the Committee, convenes the Committee in ordinary or extraordinary meetings, and proposes the agenda;
- b) chairs the Committee meetings;
- c) registers all complaints;
- d) ensures communication between the members of the Committee;
- e) summons in writing the person under investigation, specifying the subject, place, date, and time of the meeting – Art. 9 para. (1) of the Framework Regulation;
- f) in the event of inability to exercise their function, may delegate their duties to another member of the Committee;
- g) represents the Committee in its relations with the university's governing and functional structures, as well as with third parties.

Art. 6. Duties of the Secretary of the Committee:

- a) forwards complaints in electronic format to the members of the Committee within a maximum of 2 working days from the date of receipt; drafts the minutes/records of the Committee meetings and keeps the related register;
- b) is responsible for the Committee's archive and database and monitors the preservation of all data collected in case files, whether resolved or unresolved;



- c) makes available to the members of the Committee, within a maximum of 48 hours after each meeting, the respective minutes/record in electronic format; the document shall record the list of participating members, the topics discussed, and the decisions adopted, either by consensus or by vote, in the case of decisions adopted by vote;
- d) ensures the publication on the Committee's website and monitors the implementation of the adopted decisions, informing the members regarding their execution.

Art. 7. Functioning of the Committee

(1) The Committee meets whenever necessary, and in the event that complaints are submitted, it shall meet within a maximum of 5 days from their registration.

(2) The convening of CEDU is carried out by the President of CEDU and is communicated by any media means, including email, to the members by the Committee Secretary, the members being obliged to confirm receipt of the notice.

(3) Meetings may take place with the physical presence of all members, online participation, or in a hybrid format (some members physically present, others participating online).

(4) Various persons may participate in the Committee meetings as guests, including the legal advisor of the institution.

(5) Committee meetings may be recorded, provided that there is consent from all participants in the meeting.

(6) The quorum required to discuss any complaint is at least 5 CEDU members, including at least 1 student.

(7) The Committee may not initiate the decision-making process or submit a decision to vote in the absence of the President of the Committee.

(8) If the President of the Committee is unavailable for well-founded, objective reasons, the Committee meeting shall be postponed until the President becomes available. In urgent cases that cannot be postponed, in situations of the President's unavailability or incompatibility, the President shall delegate in writing a substitute from among the voting members. The delegation is valid only for that specific case.

(9) All electronic correspondence of the Committee is carried out using the email address: cedu@umfcd.ro

Art 8 Notification of the Ethics and Deontology Committee

(1) Any person may notify CEDU regarding the commission of an act that may constitute a breach of university ethics and deontology. The notification shall be made in writing or online (to the CEDU email address cedu@umfcd.ro) and shall be registered with the Registry Office of the higher education institution either by the complainant or by the Committee Secretary in the case of online submissions.

(2) All notifications received by the Committee are registered, regardless of whether they are admissible or inadmissible. The registration number of the notification shall be communicated to the petitioners, physically or electronically, at the contact address indicated in the notification.

(3) The identity of the author of the notification shall be kept confidential. At the Registry Office, in the incoming register, under the section "deponent/petitioner," the term "anonymous" shall be recorded. The notification shall be transmitted by the Registry Office to



the Committee Secretary. Incorrectly submitted notifications shall be redirected within a maximum of two working days to the Registry Office.

(4) Anonymous notifications and complaints shall not be taken into consideration.

Art. 9. — (1) Any notification received by the Committee shall be subject to an admissibility check. In order to be admissible, notifications must cumulatively contain the following:

a) the signature of the person submitting the notification;
b) identification data of the person submitting the notification: the name and surname of the natural person or the name of the legal entity, its address, and, where applicable, a correspondence address, which may also be an email address;
c) a reasoned argument regarding the non-compliance with the norms of university ethics and deontology, including concrete examples and the indication of justifying considerations and sources of documentation.

(2) Notifications that do not meet the admissibility criteria provided in para. (1) shall be rejected as inadmissible by the Committee, with justification, and communicated within 5 working days to the address indicated in the notification. A person who has not submitted an admissible notification has the right to resume the procedure in compliance with the provisions of para. (1).

(3) Failure to comply with the provisions regarding the confidentiality of the identity of the author of the notification constitutes a disciplinary offense.

(4) Notifications shall be submitted within a maximum of 180 days from the date of the acts that constitute their subject matter.

(5) By way of exception to the provisions of para. (1), notifications regarding cases of plagiarism may be submitted throughout the entire duration of copyright protection, in accordance with the legislation in force.

Art. 10. Procedure for Investigating Notifications— (1) The Committees shall issue a decision within 45 calendar days from the receipt of the notification, by means of a reasoned decision based on a report, which shall be communicated to the person under investigation and to the person who submitted the notification.

(2) The 45-day period is not a limitation period for the right to analyze the notification.

Art. 11. — (1) Within the investigation procedure, the members of the Committee establish the working method. The person under investigation is informed about the submission of the notification and is requested to provide a written point of view. Where necessary, the reported person is summoned in writing by the President of the Committee, specifying the subject, place, date, and time of the meeting, as well as the method of hearing (in person or online). Notifications may be sent to the institutional addresses of the parties, at their workplace, or to the addresses designated by the parties for correspondence. Refusal to acknowledge receipt or to confirm electronic correspondence cannot delay the investigation and constitutes a breach of the obligation to cooperate with the Ethics Committee.

(2) If, for objective reasons, the reported person cannot attend the hearing, they shall notify CEDU within 24 hours from the notification regarding their unavailability to participate and the reasons underlying it. The notification may be sent to the CEDU email address: cedu@umfd.ro.

(3) CEDU shall continue the investigation of the case even if the person against whom the notification/complaint has been submitted refuses to express a written opinion/position



regarding the evidence/allegations brought to the attention of the Committee or refuses to attend the hearing.

(4) If the person against whom the notification has been made acknowledges the acts imputed to them in the notification, and where no additional evidence is required, the Committee may take a decision based on the notification and the written position of the reported party.

(5) The Committee may additionally summon, for the purpose of investigating the case, any other person considered to have relevant information. Attendance at hearings is mandatory, and unjustified absence may be considered a disciplinary offense for the staff of the higher education institution.

(6) The members of the Committee are obliged to analyze the reported facts objectively and impartially. Any member has the right to ask questions to the persons heard.

(7) If the complainant or the reported party requests the exclusion of a member of the Committee from the examination and analysis of the notification due to a conflict of interest, that member shall be allowed or required to withdraw from the investigation of the notification/complaint, depending on the validity of the request. The Committee shall decide by vote, without the concerned member, on the request for exclusion.

If the request is approved, that member shall not participate in the analysis of the case or vote. In cases of incompatibility or conflict of interest, any member of the Ethics Committee may submit a request for recusal.

(8) It is prohibited to express, within or outside the university environment, any opinion regarding the guilt of the person under investigation prior to the final resolution establishing the existence of the misconduct.

(9) Notifications regarding plagiarism shall be analyzed by the Research Ethics Subcommittee in relation to the legal conditions in force at the time of drafting the doctoral thesis that formed the basis for the awarding of the doctoral title and diploma, without re-evaluating the scientific substance of the doctoral thesis.

Art. 12. — (1) The reported person has the right to know the full content of the case file. The content of the file is communicated to the person summoned before the Committee by its Secretary, based on signature.

(2) For their defense, the reported person has the right to request, in writing, or to submit additional documents and information, as well as to propose witnesses, either before the meeting or during the meeting to which they were summoned.

(3) The Committee, by vote, may admit or reject the request formulated under para. (2).

(4) Persons heard during the investigation who provide verbal statements before the Committee, which are transcribed by the Secretary of the Committee and signed by them on each page (physically or electronically), shall be duly informed in advance of the date and place/method of online access to the meeting, their participation being mandatory.

(5) Witnesses shall answer the questions of the Committee, and after the hearing, they shall leave the meeting and shall not have the right to intervene in any way during the proceedings.

(6) If, following the hearing of the reported person/complainant/witnesses, it becomes necessary to supplement the case file with new evidence, the Committee may postpone the analysis of the notification to another meeting, taking measures to complete the file.

(7) Each person involved in the case, regardless of their capacity (complainant, reported person, witness, or others), shall be informed that making false statements constitutes a criminal offense under Art. 326 of the Criminal Code.



Art. 13. Decision-Making Procedure — (1) The procedure for analyzing the notification is finalized by adopting a decision of admission or rejection concerning the merits of the notification, reasoned in fact and in law.

(2) The members of the Committee withdraw for deliberation and for the adoption of the decision at the moment when the President declares the debates closed.

(3) In making its decision, the Committee takes into account the documents in the case file, the nature and severity of the act, the circumstances in which the act was committed, and the prior conduct of the person concerned.

(4) Each member of the Committee proposes one of the sanctions provided by the legislation in force.

(5) Any decision of the Ethics and Deontology Committee is adopted through the voting mechanism of the members with voting rights.

(6) CEDU decisions are adopted by a simple majority of votes or by unanimity.

a) CEDU decisions are adopted by the vote of the simple majority of the members present at the meeting.

The simple majority is defined as half plus one of the votes of those present. If the resulting number is not an integer, it is rounded up; thus, the required simple majorities are as follows (number of votes/number of members present at the meeting): 3/5, 4/6, 5/7.

b) Decisions are adopted by unanimity if they are voted by all members present at the meeting, with the decision explicitly stating that unanimity has been achieved.

(7) Divergent opinions expressed by the members of the Committee are documented in the Committee's records and in the decision.

(8) The minutes of the Committee are signed by all members present. The signing may be carried out both physically and electronically.

(9) The decision of the Committee, signed by the President, represents an administrative act and must explicitly include in its text the facts that led to the sanctioning of the person concerned, the legal basis, as well as the considerations for which the University Ethics Committee dismissed the arguments put forward by the author of the notification. The decision must be drafted on the date of its issuance.

(10) After the decision is adopted, the case file is submitted for review to the legal advisor of the higher education institution. Legal responsibility for the decisions and the activity of the Committee lies with UMFCD.

(11) CEDU decisions are communicated to the parties, physically or electronically, at the address chosen by them, within 10 days from the approval by the legal advisor. Based on CEDU decisions, UMFCD applies sanctions to teaching staff, auxiliary teaching staff, and research personnel, including those holding management positions, as well as to students, doctoral candidates, or master's students.

(12) If the Committee finds that there is no breach of university ethics or that the breach is minor, and the nature of the issue allows or requires amicable settlement between the parties, this solution shall be proposed to the parties, with this being noted in the content of the decision and the final case report.

(13) Sanctions are enforced by decision of the Rector.



Art. 14. — Decisions of the committees shall be published on the website of the higher education institution, in compliance with legislation regarding personal data, by anonymizing, as appropriate:

- a) the person who submitted the notification;
- b) the reported person, if they submit an explicit request for anonymization.

Art. 15. Appeals against decisions of admission or rejection may be submitted within 30 days from their communication and may be lodged, depending on the subject matter, with:

- a) the National Commission for Ethics of University Management;
- b) the National Council for the Attestation of University Titles, Diplomas and Certificates;
- c) the National Council for Ethics of Scientific Research, Technological Development and Innovation.

Art. 16. — (1) If the CEDU decision is not appealed within the period provided in Art. 15, it becomes mandatory for compliance by the person under investigation and by UMFCD.

(2) Within 30 days from the date on which the decision of the University Ethics Committee becomes final and binding, it shall be implemented at the level of UMFCD. This shall be communicated to the parties involved.

(3) If the Committee finds the existence of plagiarism in a doctoral thesis, the provisions of Art. 172 para. (8)–(11) of Higher Education Law no. 199/2023, with subsequent amendments and additions, shall apply, as appropriate.

Art 17. Violations and Sanctions

(1) Violations of the norms of ethics and deontology in teaching and university research activities are as follows:

a) fabrication of results or data and presenting them as experimental data, as data obtained through calculations or computer-based numerical simulations, or as data or results obtained through analytical calculations or deductive reasoning;

b) falsification of experimental data, data obtained through calculations or computer-based numerical simulations, or data or results obtained through analytical calculations or deductive reasoning;

c) deliberate hindering, obstruction, or sabotage of the teaching or research activity of other persons, including by unjustifiably blocking access to spaces intended for university research, by damaging, destroying, or manipulating experimental equipment, apparatus, documents, computer programs, electronic data, organic or inorganic substances, or living matter necessary for other persons to carry out, perform, or complete teaching or research activities;

d) commercialization or gratuitous transfer to a third party of a scientific work for the purpose of facilitating the falsification of authorship;

e) attempting to pass an examination by offering a bribe or by exerting pressure intra-muros or extra-muros, regardless of the means by which this is carried out;

f) violation of the legal regime of conflicts of interest and incompatibilities provided in the UMFCD Code of Ethics and Deontology and failure to

- disclose situations of conflict of interest or incompatibility in evaluation activities;
- g) failure to respect confidentiality in evaluation;
 - h) discrimination, within evaluations, based on criteria provided in Art. 2 para. (1) of Government Ordinance no. 137/2000 on the prevention and sanctioning of all forms of discrimination, republished, with subsequent amendments and additions;
 - i) fraud in evaluation;
 - j) plagiarism and self-plagiarism;
 - k) failure to comply with legal provisions and procedures regarding university ethics and deontology, as provided in the framework code and in the Code of Ethics and University Deontology, which is part of the Charter of the University of Medicine and Pharmacy in Bucharest, as applicable, including failure to implement sanctions established by the Committee, by CNATDCU, or, as the case may be, by CNEMU;
 - l) affecting the integrity of the evaluation process by failing to comply with the evaluation methods provided in the course syllabus, as well as by a teaching staff member examining a person who is their spouse or a relative up to the third degree, without prior notification of the faculty leadership in order to identify possible solutions that ensure the integrity of the evaluation.
- (2)** Violations of the norms of ethics and deontology in scientific communication, publication, dissemination, and popularization activities are as follows:
- a) including a person in the list of authors of a scientific publication without their consent;
 - b) unauthorized publication or dissemination of results, hypotheses, theories, or scientific methods that have not been published by the authors;
 - c) introducing false information in grant or funding applications, in habilitation files, or in applications for teaching or research positions;
 - d) failure to indicate all sources used;
 - e) omission of persons involved in the research or creation activity, thereby preventing them from benefiting from all rights deriving from it;
 - f) omission of the acknowledgment of funding sources of research projects in all results arising from those projects.
- (3)** Violations of the norms of ethics and deontology in the exercise of duties related to management positions include:
- a) violation of the legal regime of public accountability;
 - b) abusive use of the position to obtain authorship or co-authorship of publications of subordinate persons;
 - c) abuse of authority to obtain salaries, remuneration, or other material benefits from research-development projects led or coordinated by subordinate persons;
 - d) abuse of authority to obtain authorship or co-authorship of publications of subordinate persons or to obtain salaries, remuneration, or other material benefits for spouses, relatives by affinity, or relatives up to the third degree inclusive;

- e) obstruction of the activity of the Committee or of a subcommittee for analysis and drafting during the investigation of violations of university ethics and deontology;
 - f) failure to comply with legal provisions and procedures regarding university ethics and deontology provided in the law and in the Code of Ethics and University Deontology, which is part of the Charter of the “Carol Davila” University of Medicine and Pharmacy in Bucharest, as applicable, including failure to implement sanctions established by the Committee, by CNATDCU, or, as the case may be, by CNEMU.
- (4).** Violations of the norms of ethics and deontology regarding respect for the human being and human dignity are as follows:
- a) violations affecting the protection of the rights of the direct beneficiaries of the right to education, such as:
 - i. requesting or accepting by a teaching staff member of favors of any kind, gifts, or other material benefits from students;
 - ii. the performance by a teaching staff member of paid activities for the benefit of certain students outside the institutional framework;
 - iii. conditioning students’ participation in any form of examination on the purchase of bibliographic materials;
 - iv. the performance by a student of unpaid activities for the benefit of a teaching staff member, their spouse, or a relative up to the third degree.
 - b) violations that undermine the dignity of the direct beneficiaries of the right to education and the prestige of the profession, such as:
 - i. xenophobia, radicalization, and hate speech;
 - ii. discrimination among members of the academic community based on age, ethnicity, sex (including sexual harassment), gender, class, disability, social origin, political or religious orientation, sexual orientation, or other types of discrimination (including workplace moral harassment), except for measures of discrimination in the form of “positive actions” provided by law;
 - iii. physical violence, the use of offensive language, or abuse of authority against a member of the academic community;
 - iv. personal attacks, intimidation, threats, humiliation, blackmail, or defamatory statements against other members of the academic community;
 - v. repeated submission of manifestly unfounded complaints or notifications against a colleague.
 - c) violations that affect the recognition of the profession, responsibility, and trust conferred by society, as well as disregard for internal obligations deriving from this trust, including carrying out activities that damage the image of UMFCDD, through propaganda and actions of institutional destabilization, disinformation campaigns in the media, or other activities that may affect the fulfillment of the institution’s mission.

Art. 18. Violations of the norms of ethics and deontology applicable to students, doctoral students, postdoctoral researchers, or other categories of learners are as follows:

- a) violations of the norms of ethics and deontology applicable to students, doctoral students, postdoctoral researchers, or other categories of learners as provided in Art. 21 of the UMFCD Code of Ethics and Professional Deontology;
- b) affecting the integrity of the evaluation process by the use, by the evaluated persons, of materials used in the evaluation process that were not produced by them, or the use of the same materials for different evaluations, as well as failure to disclose a kinship relationship up to the third degree inclusive with the evaluating teaching staff member;
- c) failure to comply with the obligations provided in the Regulation on the Professional Activity of Students, in the Code of Rights and Obligations of the Student approved by Order of the Minister of Education no. 4,394/2024, and in the Code of Rights and Obligations of the Student within UMFCD.

Art. 19. The sanctions that may be applied to teaching and research staff, as well as to auxiliary teaching and research staff, including personnel holding management positions, for violations of the norms of university ethics and deontology, are as follows:

- a) written warning;
- b) withdrawal and/or correction of all works published in violation of the norms of university ethics and deontology;
- c) removal from the management position;
- d) prohibition, for a determined period, of access to funding from competitive public funds;
- e) suspension, for a determined period of time between one and five years, of the right to apply for a competition for a higher position or a management position or to act as a member of selection committees;
- f) dismissal from the teaching or research position.

Art. 20. The sanctions that may be applied to administrative staff for violations of university ethics are as follows:

- a) written warning;
- b) removal from the management position;
- c) suspension, for a determined period of time between one and five years, of the right to apply for a competition for a higher position or a management position;
- d) dismissal from the position

Art. 21. The sanctions provided for violations of the norms of university ethics and deontology, applicable to students, doctoral students, postdoctoral researchers, and other categories of learners, are as follows:

- a) written warning;
- b) annulment of evaluation results;
- c) expulsion;
- d) other sanctions provided by the legislation in force.

Art. 22. The sanctions established shall be determined based on the documents in the case file, the nature and severity of the act, the circumstances in which the act was committed, and the prior conduct of the person concerned.

Art. 23. (1) The submission by a student, doctoral student, or master's student, in fulfillment of their academic obligations, of a copied or falsified work shall be sanctioned with expulsion.

(2) The submission by a student, doctoral student, or master's student, during the final examination of studies, of a copied or falsified work shall be sanctioned with expulsion, without the right to re-enroll at UMFCB.

(3) If the Committee finds the existence of plagiarism in a doctoral thesis, the provisions of Art. 172 para. (8)–(11) of Higher Education Law no. 199/2023 shall apply, as appropriate.

Research Ethics Subcommittee

Art. 24. (1) Within the University Ethics Committee, a subcommittee dedicated to scientific research ethics operates.

(2) The Research Ethics Subcommittee monitors the implementation of research ethics policies, in accordance with the provisions of Art. 162 para. (3) of Higher Education Law no. 199/2023 and institutional regulations, covering the following aspects related to good conduct in research and development:

- a) supervision of compliance with ethical principles in scientific research conducted on human subjects and experimental animals, and promotion of scientific research in this spirit;
- b) protection of the rights, safety, and well-being of study participants and assurance to the public regarding this protection, in particular by issuing an opinion on the study protocol, the qualifications of investigators and the adequacy of facilities, as well as on the methods and documents used to inform study participants in order to obtain their informed consent;
- c) approval, based on the regulations in force, of projects, studies, and procedures involving human subjects and/or experimental animals;
- d) publication and authorship;
- e) research data management,
- f) collaboration and conflicts of interest,
- g) fraud;
- h) ensuring efficient research environments;
- i) prevention of harm in research and innovation.

(3) The Subcommittee operates in accordance with internal legislation, as well as with the provisions of the UMFCB Charter in Bucharest, taking into account the provisions of the European Charter for Researchers and acknowledging the provisions of the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity.

Art. 25. (1) Scientific research ethics is a complex set of principles, values, and moral rules that guide the conduct of researchers at all stages of the research process, from design and data collection to interpretation and dissemination of results.

(2) The principles governing scientific research ethics, intended to guide individuals, institutions, and organizations in their work, as well as in addressing the challenges of practice, ethics, and intellectual creation inherent in research, are based on:

- a) reliability in ensuring the quality of research, reflected in design, methodology, analysis, and use of resources;
- b) honesty in developing, conducting, reviewing, reporting, and communicating research in a transparent, fair, complete, and unbiased manner;
- c) respect for colleagues, research participants, research subjects, society, ecosystems, cultural heritage, and the environment;
- d) responsibility for research, from idea to publication, for its management and organization, for training, supervision, and guidance, as well as for its broader societal impact.

(3) Research and development activities must be carried out with respect for human beings and human dignity and must prevent or minimize the suffering of animals used for scientific purposes.

(4) Good conduct in research and development must take into account the protection and restoration of the natural environment and ecological balance, ensuring protection against potential harm caused by science and technology.

Art. 26. (1) The Research Ethics Subcommittee consists of 5 voting members, one of whom is a doctoral student. The Subcommittee shall elect a coordinator by vote.

(2) The members of the Research Ethics Subcommittee are appointed by the Rector of UMFCB in Bucharest based on the proposal of the Administrative Council and the approval of the University Senate. The members are persons of professional prestige who have not violated the norms of university ethics and deontology.

(3) In situations of conflict of interest or incompatibility, a member of the Subcommittee must declare such conflict or incompatibility and refrain from evaluating the respective research project proposal. In such cases, the coordinator shall request the President of CEDU to propose another member to complete the Subcommittee for the evaluation of that proposal.

(4) A person loses their status as a member of the Research Ethics Subcommittee in the following situations:

- a) failure to actively participate in the Subcommittee's activities;
- b) failure to declare a conflict of interest/incompatibility during the evaluation of a research activity;
- c) unlawful use of confidential information obtained during the evaluation of research activities;
- d) upon request.

(5) A vacant position shall require the appointment of another member following the same procedure as provided in para. (2).

Art. 27. (1) The Research Ethics Subcommittee operates as an independent evaluator of research activities carried out by the academic community of UMFCB in Bucharest, upon request. The request shall be made in writing or online and registered with the UMFCB Registry Office in Bucharest, using the standard form available on the Committee's website (Annex 2), together with a declaration on the investigator's own responsibility regarding compliance with good research conduct (Annex 3).

(2) The duties of the Research Ethics Subcommittee are as follows:

- a) o issue ethical approvals for research activities, upon request from members of the UMFCD academic community, following ethical evaluation;
- b) to monitor research activities under implementation in terms of compliance with scientific research ethics standards, upon request.

Art. 28. (1) The types of research for which ethical approval may be requested are:

- a) non-interventional clinical studies;
- b) studies/research involving human subjects that meet one or more of the following conditions:
 - i. access to personal information through questionnaires, interviews, or other forms of data collection;
 - ii. secondary use of data (use of data collected for purposes other than research), if identification or health-related data of the subjects are involved;
 - iii. case studies where, based on the observation of a series of subjects, extrapolation or generalization of collected data is performed, and there is an intention to publish the results;
- c) studies/research involving vulnerable subjects, namely persons who are not capable of making fully informed and rational decisions for themselves and/or lack the capacity to pursue and protect their own interests;
- d) studies involving the use of laboratory animals for scientific purposes.

(2) The types of research for which evaluation may be requested are:

- a) studies/research that have obtained ethical approval and are subject to continuous evaluation throughout the duration of research activities;
- b) studies/research that have obtained ethical approval and have undergone modifications during their execution, such that the subsequent situation differs from what was declared in the initial application (and/or in the continuous evaluation form, where applicable).

Art. 29. (1) Ethical approval is granted upon request by researchers in the following cases:

- a) if the research involves activities of the type listed in Art. 28 that entail significant ethical risks;
- b) if researchers anticipate that funders and/or publications targeted for disseminating research results will explicitly require ethical approval.

(2) Requests for approval shall be submitted in writing to the Registry Office before the start of research activities and shall also be sent in scanned format to the email address etica.cercetare@umfcd.ro. The application form is annexed to this regulation (Annexes 5a, b)

Art. 30. (1) Members of the Subcommittee shall receive the request for evaluation within 7 days from its submission. The Subcommittee shall meet and issue a decision within 21 days from the date of registration of the request.

(2) Subcommittee meetings may be organized and conducted online, by decision of the coordinator.

(3) If the research activities subject to evaluation are in fields for which the Research Ethics Subcommittee or the Ethics Committee as a whole lacks expertise, the advisory opinion of experts from UMFCD in Bucharest or from outside the institution shall be requested.

(4) The reasoned decision of the Subcommittee regarding the research activity shall be communicated in writing to the applicant and may be (Annex 6a, b):

- a. APPROVED, without comments;



- b. APPROVED, with comments, if corrections are required;
 - c. REJECTED.
- (5) The decision shall be adopted by a simple majority vote of the Subcommittee members.
- (6) The Subcommittee may decide to revoke the approval if it was granted with comments and the required corrections have not been made. The Subcommittee may also revoke the approval if the person responsible for the research activity fails to report subsequent modifications within 30 days from their occurrence.
- (7) If the applicant disagrees with the decision of the Research Ethics Subcommittee, they may appeal it within 30 days from communication to the National Council for Ethics of Scientific Research, Technological Development and Innovation.