

## CLOSEOUT FOR M-92070030

On July 14, 1992, OIG received allegations of misconduct in science from an attorney, [REDACTED] on behalf of the complainant, [REDACTED], a graduate student in the [REDACTED] (the institution), [REDACTED]

The complainant alleged that the subject, [REDACTED] in the same department, as the complainant's advisor, had 1) used the complainant's original idea and work from her project proposal for her Ph.D. qualifying exam as his NSF funded proposal without her permission; 2) made false statements to her concerning her role in his funded proposal; 3) sexually harassed her; 4) retaliated against her because she resisted his advances and complained about his sexual harassment; 5) included improper and misleading information as a part of his NSF funded proposal; and 6) misused NSF funds. The subject's NSF award [REDACTED] partially supported the complainant's research.

OIG was informed by the complainant's attorney that the complainant had already brought one of her allegations to the institution's attention. This was the allegation that the subject had made false statements to her concerning her future support under his NSF award as a graduate student and later as a post-doctoral fellow. The complainant claimed that both were promised, but that the subject refused to include her on his NSF proposal budget as a post-doctoral fellow.

We proceeded with our inquiry into the allegations, in particular into whether there was any evidence that the alleged sexual harassment and retaliation were associated with scientific activities in such a way that they might be misconduct in science. In order to do so, we needed additional information. We requested copies of the complainant's Ph.D. thesis and the project proposal she presented with her Ph.D. qualifying exam. In addition, we requested copies of any evidence that related to the false statements in the subject's NSF proposal and any other documents (including drafts) that pertained to the remaining allegations. OIG received no response.

When OIG later contacted the complainant's attorney requesting the information necessary to evaluate the complainant's allegations as well as a status report on the grievance filed with the Department of Education, we were informed that the attorney no longer represented the complainant. Further, the attorney indicated that she had not communicated with the complainant for over a year.

## **CLOSEOUT FOR M-92070030**

OIG wrote to the complainant requesting information to assist us with our evaluation of her allegations. OIG received no response.

Over a two-year period, neither the complainant nor the complainant's attorney provided OIG with any information that would permit a thorough evaluation of the allegations. Without her information, resolution of this matter would require a broad and undirected search that is beyond the resources of OIG.

This case was closed for lack of information that showed the allegations had substance.

cc: Senior Scientist, Deputy AIG-Oversight, AIG-Oversight, IG