

CLOSEOUT FOR M-95030012

On 13 March 1995, [REDACTED] program officer in the [REDACTED] in the [REDACTED], informed OIG of "non-technical" concerns with information in an NSF proposal. The proposal, [REDACTED], entitled [REDACTED] was submitted by the subject, [REDACTED] a faculty member in [REDACTED] (the institution). The complainant, [REDACTED], as the primary NSF panel reviewer, summarized the panel's concern that the subject listed a grant from [REDACTED] (private foundation grant) in the "Facilities, Equipment and Other Resources" section instead of in the proposal's "Current and Pending Support" (CPS) section. The subject's inclusion of the private foundation grant in a section other than the CPS section was considered inappropriate and misleading: inappropriate, because it required reviewers to assemble information contained in the proposal about existing awards, all of which should have been included by the subject in the CPS section; and misleading, because the CPS section showed the subject's total-time commitment on other existing awards without including the private foundation grant. Further, the panel was concerned that the total-time commitment as shown by the subject on existing awards in the CPS section was unclear and appeared to exceed 100 percent. The program officer wanted OIG to determine if the subject had done anything improper.

OIG noted that the private foundation grant, as described by the subject in the proposal, focused on resource development at the institution rather than on the subject's personal research activities. OIG also noted that the subject's method of describing his time commitment on current awards in the CPS section was confusing. However, OIG determined that both matters were program issues, and not, at the level found here, issues of misconduct. OIG suggested that the program officer discuss the panel's concerns with the subject.

The program officer, who contacted the subject, told OIG that the subject received no financial support from the private foundation grant because it was strictly for resource development at the institution. In addition, the subject agreed to use a different method to describe his time commitment in his CPS section in future proposal submissions.

OIG concluded that the issues in this case were appropriately resolved by the program. This inquiry was closed and no further action will be taken.

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