CLOSEOUT FOR M96040011

This case came to OIG on April 9, 1996, when we received a letter and supporting materials from Mr. [redacted] (the complainant). The complainant alleged that Dr. [redacted] of [redacted] (the subject) had committed misconduct in science by failing to cite the complainant's M.S. thesis as the source of ideas and techniques that the subject used in several publications. The complainant stated that his own work benefited from NSF support. The complainant had previously submitted his complaint to the subject's university, whereupon a high level university official[1] sent him a written response explaining why, in the university's view, the complaint lacked merit.

The subject's only NSF award[2] supported a workshop. OIG examined the proposal that resulted in this award and determined that it appropriately credits the complainant's work. We also examined the workshop's final report. It was written by the subject's co-PI. This report does not discuss ideas or techniques similar to those for which the complainant claims credit and does not cite the complainant's work. There is no allegation that the co-PI committed misconduct by failing to cite the complainant's work or that the subject committed misconduct in his declined NSF proposals.

We concluded that the subject's alleged misconduct in science did not occur in the course of proposing, carrying out, or reporting results from activities connected to NSF proposals or awards in which the subject participated and, as a result, fell outside our jurisdiction.

A scientist knowledgeable about the research of the subject and the complainant[3] contacted OIG to express his agreement with the complainant's allegations of misconduct in science and to allege that the subject's university handled grant funds improperly. The scientist indicated that he was unsure whether there were NSF funds involved in the incidents with which he was familiar. He described one such incident, which took place six years ago. The scientist was unable to supply OIG investigators

---

[1] The official, Dr. [redacted], Dean of the School of [redacted] at the university, states in his letter that the university's president asked him to respond to the complainant's letter.

[2] The award was [redacted], entitled [redacted]" The co-PI was Dr. [redacted] of [redacted]

[3] The scientist was Dr. [redacted] of [redacted]

with evidence that supported his allegations of financial improprieties or that indicated that these allegations had any relationship to NSF. In the absence of such evidence and in view of the time elapsed since the one incident that the scientist described, OIG investigators decided that further investigation was not warranted.

This inquiry is closed and no further action will be taken on this case.

cc: Deputy Assistant Inspector General, Oversight; Assistant Inspector General Oversight, IG