

Response Form for the Final Performance Review Report*

1. Name of Grantee: Salus University
2. Year of Grant: 2009 Formula Grant

A. For the overall grant, briefly describe your grant oversight process. How will you ensure that future health research grants and projects are completed and required reports (Annual Reports, Final Progress Reports, Audit Reports, etc.) are submitted to the Department in accordance with Grant Agreements? If any of the research projects contained in the grant received an “unfavorable” rating, please describe how you will ensure the Principal Investigator is more closely monitored (or not funded) when conducting future formula funded health research.

This grant performance was rated as “outstanding (1.33)”. To date, all projects at Salus University funded by the PDH CURE Formula grants continuously received the ratings of ‘outstanding’ or ‘favorable’, and not a single of them was ever rated as unfavorable. We will continue the same practice of conducting research and submitting the required reports in a timely manner, and no change is anticipated that would compromise the current oversight practice.

* Please note that for grants ending on or after July 1, 2007, grantees’ Final Performance Review Reports, Response Forms, and Final Progress Reports ***will be made publicly available on the CURE Program’s Web site.***

Project Number: 0990801
Project Title: Mechanisms of Signal Transduction and
Degenerative Diseases in the Retina
Investigator: Dizhoor, Alexander

B. Briefly describe your plans to address each specific weakness and recommendation in Section B using the following format. As you prepare your response please be aware that the Final Performance Review Report, this Response Form, and the Final Progress Report will be made publicly available on the CURE Program's Web site.

Reviewer Comment on Specific Weakness and Recommendation (*Copy and paste from the report the reviewers' comments listed under Section B - Specific Weaknesses and Recommendations*):

Section B. Recommendations

Reviewer 1:

None.

Reviewer 2:

None.

Reviewer 3:

No data have come from this project during the period of funding, which might be considered a weakness. On the other hand, the progress was very good considering how long it takes to make a mouse of this sophistication. Also, the potential for useful information from this mouse is very high. Therefore, it is difficult to truly find a weakness, since the grant was funded specifically for the purpose of making this mouse and not for generating data.

Response (*Describe your plan to address each specific weakness and recommendation to ensure the feedback provided is utilized to improve ongoing or future research efforts*):

We very much appreciate the Reviewer's understanding that only the subsequent long-time research could result in actual publications. We are continuing experiments in this direction and should be able to anticipate publishable outcome in the future development of the project.

C. If the research project received an "unfavorable" rating, please indicate the steps that you intend to take to address the criteria that the project failed to meet and to modify research project oversight so that future projects will not receive "unfavorable" ratings.

Response: Not applicable. This project received an "outstanding (1.33)" rating.

D. Additional comments in response to the Final Performance Review Report (OPTIONAL):

Response: We very much appreciate the thorough professional work of the Reviewers, who provided us with a detailed feedback analysis and made a very favorable and encouraging evaluation of this high-risk pilot project.