

## CLOSEOUT FOR CASE M-95120045

On 26 October 1995, OIG was informed<sup>1</sup> of concerns related to a PI's method of reporting information on the Current and Pending Support (CPS) section in NSF proposals. Specifically, a PI at an NSF grantee institution<sup>2</sup> listed his three-year continuing NSF award<sup>3</sup> as a one-year award without listing the subsequent out-year funding as pending or as part of the original award in the proposal's CPS section. In addition, we were informed that an NSF program officer,<sup>4</sup> who had attempted to resolve this matter with the institution, had negative information placed in his personnel file, which would affect his performance evaluation.

We were told that the NSF employee contacted the PI, who told him that he had not known including out-year funding on the CPS section for NSF awards was required. He agreed to resubmit a proposal with a revised CPS section that included the out-year funding as pending. The PI kept his institution informed of his discussions with NSF. This prompted officials at the institution to communicate with the program officer and his supervisor.<sup>5</sup> The institution's officials explained that the manner of reporting the out-year funding for a continuing award by the PI in the CPS section was a procedure that the institution had followed for years with the approval of NSF. The program officer said that he confirmed with his own review of other proposal jackets from the institution that other PIs from the institution had listed information in the CPS section in the same manner. The institution's officials stated their position in a letter to NSF. "[T]he award [was a] continuing grant which ha[d] been approved on scientific/technical merit for approximately 3 years... contingent on the availability of funds."<sup>6</sup> The letter further explained that the PI's new award was listed in the institution's business office as funded for one year only, "as [was] indeed the case." The institution's position was that it did not list, as a practice, the out-year funding in continuing grants because these had not been formally awarded and that this procedure had been standard practice for years "with the explicit and tacit approval of NSF." The letter said that the institution agreed to "modify [its] practices in accordance with NSF guidance . . . ."

The CPS form "is a model format to report all current and pending support for ongoing projects and proposals, including subsequent funding in the case of continuing

<sup>1</sup> The complainant was [REDACTED]

<sup>2</sup> The institution was [REDACTED]

<sup>3</sup> NSF proposal [REDACTED] entitled [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] was submitted by the PI, [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] it was withdrawn and resubmitted with changes to the CPS section as [REDACTED]

<sup>4</sup> See footnote #1.

<sup>5</sup> The complainant's supervisor was [REDACTED]

<sup>6</sup> Letter dated [REDACTED] was to [REDACTED]

## CLOSEOUT FOR CASE M-95120045

grants.”<sup>7</sup> The institution had been following a policy that did not identify the out-year funding on continuing NSF awards. OIG regarded this as an administrative matter and informed the Assistant Director, who agreed to review the matter and take appropriate actions at the institution and within NSF.

With respect to the NSF employee’s concern about his employment record, OIG reviewed his personnel file. We found it contained only standard information and evaluations. No information pertaining to his involvement with the institution about this matter was observed. There was no substance to the complainant’s concerns that his supervisor had placed negative information in his file or used this information to evaluate him unfairly.

This case was closed and no further action will be taken.

cc: Staff Scientist, Attorney, AIG Oversight, IG

---

<sup>7</sup> This information is in the Grant Proposal Guide (NSF 94-2) under section 8, “Current and Pending Support - Proposal Section G,” (page 9).