

CLOSEOUT OF M-91080035

This case was brought to OIG attention by the NSF Program Director for the [REDACTED] Program (the complainant) via memorandum dated August 23, 1991. During a [REDACTED] site visit to [REDACTED] University (the subject), the complainant learned that an instrument funded [REDACTED], for multi-user research through his program via Award No. [REDACTED] had already been transferred to [REDACTED] University for use by one of the four Co-PI's on the grant who left [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] to join the faculty at [REDACTED]. The instrument had been requested for the joint use of four faculty members (four Co-PI's) at [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] University's proposal for this grant was submitted under the guidelines specified for the [REDACTED] Program. The proposal was reviewed in accordance with the criteria established for proposals submitted pursuant to this program, which among other things, included the positive impact the instrument would have on [REDACTED] research capabilities and the concomitant educational opportunities that would be generated through the multi-user equipment. Our review disclosed that (1) the faculty member joining [REDACTED] University had resigned his position at [REDACTED] one month before NSF awarded its grant but did not inform NSF; (2) the grantee university had purchased the multi-user instrument almost four months before the effective date of NSF's award, which exceeds the allowed 90-day advance purchase period; (3) the grantee university transferred the same instrument to its former faculty member's new university one month after purchase, which violates the shared-use condition; and (4) the grantee university was seeking approval from NSF to transfer its departmental instrument after the actual transfer had occurred rather than before transfer.

Since the conditions of NSF's multi-user research instrumentation program were not met, the NSF Division [REDACTED] requested and received from [REDACTED] University complete reimbursement of NSF funds involved in this award in the amount of [REDACTED]. This case was reported in OIG Semiannual Report No. 6 (page 23). We now consider this matter closed.

Concurrence:

James J. Zwolenik 9/11/92  
James J. Zwolenik  
Assistant Inspector General  
for Oversight

Philip L. Sunshine 9/11/92  
Philip L. Sunshine  
Counsel to Inspector General

cc: Inspector General

91-35