

University Senate Research Committee Meeting  
26 February 2016  
1:00 PM  
156 CL

In Attendance: K. Barlow, D. Curran, S. Dytman, M. Goodhart, G. Huber, M. Kovacs, R. Melhem, P. Morel, M. Redfern, P. Smolinski, M. Spring and J. Tebbets

It was noted that minutes of the January 2015 meeting were sent by email. A request was made for any corrections or comments and none were suggested.

Action Item: The minutes will be sent to Lori Molinaro for posting on the Senate web site.

Prof. Dennis Curran, Bayer Professor and Distinguished Service Professor of Chemistry, was invited to address the Committee on policies related to intellectual property (IP) at the University of Pittsburgh. He provided a written statement that has been included in the Appendix.

D. Curran stated that the IP policy of the University makes a statement about the values of the University and that ownership of IP amounts to control of IP. His comments were directed towards patent IP rather than copyright IP. He stated that traditionally universities claimed that the Bayh-Dole Act granted universities the ownership of IP, however, the Supreme Court decision in *Stanford University v. Roche Molecular Systems, Inc.* did not support university ownership of IP. At the University of Pittsburgh faculty are required to sign a present assignment/acknowledgement form.

D. Curran stated IP is a result of research and that faculty should own IP since faculty are not expressly hired to develop IP. He stated that a university argument for the university ownership of IP is that the university provides faculty support for research. He stated that in his case, all research has been funded through research grants and other external sources. It was commented that this may not be true for all faculty. He stated that the public would be better served if faculty owned IP and could select the entity to which to assign it and that the ownership of IP by company was better than public release of the technology since company ownership provided profit motive to bring the technology to market.

A lively discussion ensued with many committee members asking questions and providing their opinion. One area of potential concern was that Professor Curran assumes that even if faculty own the IP they will provide the University with the first opportunity to license any such invention, and this may not occur especially if the procedures at the University are cumbersome and not carried out in a timely fashion.

A statement was made that grants from some federal agencies may require that the University have ownership of any IP arising from the research.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 pm.

Minutes submitted by: Patrick Smolinski and Penny Morel