

University Senate Research Committee Meeting
4 April 2018
1:00 PM
156 CL

In Attendance: A. DiPalma, K. Fike, G. Huber, R. Melham, P. Morel, R. Rutenbar, D. Salcido, S. Sant, P. Smolinski, A. Spenceley, M. Spring, T. Songer

Visitor Agreement

M. Spring told the committee that he had presented the Visitor Agreement to the Faculty Assembly, and that it was approved. He pointed out, however, that the Agreement did not include a description of the Visitor Policy, which is that visitors coming to the University for more than two weeks or who may be working in a lab must sign the agreement. While this is articulated on the draft website, he suggested that the Office of Export Control put together a brief document that describes the conditions under which a Visitor Agreement is required. This would not need to be voted on again, but should be on file. R. Rutenbar also noted that additional changes were made to the agreement based on discussions at the Council of Deans concerning the definition of “lab”, which will now include any area in which the Visitor might have access to University IP. The Agreement has not yet been presented to Senate Council because of these issues.

Drone Policy

R. Rutenbar stated that drones are becoming more common on campus and being used for recreation, education and research. Because of their increasing use at the University, guidelines for use and educational outreach to users are needed and at the University regulation will be under the Office of Export Control.

A. DiPalma stated the topic of drones or unmanned aircraft systems (UAS) had come up at the Office of Export Control two years ago and the Office has started benchmarking the policy and regulation of use at other universities such as Virginia Tech, Georgia Tech, Oregon State, the University of Maryland among others.

A. DiPalma said the Office is considering four aspects related to drone use: 1. FAA and state and local regulations, 2. safety, 3. privacy and 4. export control.

Prior to the meeting, A. DiPalma circulated to the Committee a draft of University guidelines for drone use (attached) and a draft of the application for drone use at the University (attached). A. DiPalma proceeded to review the various items in the draft of the University guidelines. Some of the main points are related to FAA regulations related to size, commercial vs. recreational use and safety.

M. Spring asked while there are the general safety concerns on campus, are there any specific research concerns? R. Rutenbar stated that there are safety concerns, but these are probably not at the level requiring an IRB-like approval process.

A.DiPalma stated that the plan is to form a review committee for drone use which will review applications and this will involve a person from public safety. R. Rutenbar stated the guidelines for regional campus use will be different than Pittsburgh Campus use because of the different geographies.

R. Melham asked if it is expected that University approval and FAA approval for use will be done in series or in parallel. A. DiPalma said that the University application committee will have people familiar with FAA guidelines and could provide advice on the FAA application.

S. Sant asked what are the current uses of drones on campus? A. DiPalma stated there is drone use related to education, research, club/recreation and also sports and marketing.

The next meeting will be May 2 – 1-3 PM in CL 156

The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 pm.

Minutes submitted by Patrick Smolinski and Penny Morel.