AI Researchers
Embedding Responsible AI in Research

AI READINESS TOOLKIT

UC2-01 Use case 2: Structured drafting and reporting

From notes to a structured project report

An AI-assisted drafting workshop for project reporting

AT A GLANCE

A 60-minute workshop in which researchers turn verified project notes and reporting requirements into a structured report outline. Participants ask AI for alternative structures, draft selected administrative sections and then test every statement against the evidence. The workshop separates what AI can organise from what only the project team can claim. Authorship, claims and intellectual contribution stay with the researchers.

TYPE
Workshop

FORMAT
PDF

CONTRIBUTING PARTNER
University of Lodz

WHO IT IS FOR
Researchers and project teams preparing reports and deliverables

FRAMEWORK BARRIERS
Know-how, Protecting expertise, Trust in AI, This task

HUMAN-ONLY BOUNDARY

Authorship, claims and intellectual contribution stay human. AI supports structure, not substance.

Co-funded by the European Union

Co-funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author or authors only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the Foundation for the Development of the Education System. Neither the European Union nor the entity providing the grant can be held responsible for them.

An AI-Assisted Drafting Workshop

WORKSHOP PURPOSE

Project reporting requires researchers to transform information collected throughout a project into a coherent document that follows specific reporting requirements. In practice, this information is rarely available in a single, structured form. Researchers often work with meeting notes, activity records, project documentation, emails, draft texts, data summaries and reporting templates. Turning these fragmented inputs into a clear report can be time-consuming, particularly when the same information needs to be reorganised for different reporting requirements or audiences.

Generative AI can provide useful support in this process. It can help researchers organise fragmented information, identify possible structures, improve the clarity of existing text, identify repetition and prepare an initial draft. At the same time, generative AI can introduce substantial risks into project reporting. AI-generated text may contain unsupported claims, incorrect numbers, invented information or interpretations that go beyond the available evidence. Because such statements are often expressed in fluent and professional language, they can be difficult to identify without deliberate verification.

This workshop presents a practical approach to using generative AI for project reporting while maintaining human responsibility for evidence, interpretation and the final document. Rather than treating AI as an author of the report, the workshop presents AI as a supporting tool within a controlled reporting process. Participants work through a fictional project-reporting scenario and progressively move from project notes and reporting requirements to an AI-assisted report structure and the critical evaluation of AI-generated text.

The workshop therefore focuses not only on what generative AI can do, but also on where human judgement must remain central.

Workshop structure

PART	TIME	ACTIVITY	MAIN OUTCOME
1	10 min	Introduction: What should AI do?	Understanding of AI opportunities and risks
2	10 min	Case: What do we actually know?	Distinction between evidence, interpretation and uncertainty
3	10 min	AI-assisted structuring	Evaluation of AI-generated report structures
4	20 min	Verification challenge	Identification and correction of unsupported AI-generated claims
5	10 min	Reflection and key principles	Practical principles for responsible AI-assisted reporting

Part 1. Introduction: What should AI do?

TIME: 10 MINUTES

The opening section establishes the context for the workshop and introduces the central question: which parts of project reporting can appropriately be supported by generative AI, and which should remain under the direct responsibility of the researcher?

Participants are invited to consider the different ways in which they might use AI when preparing a project report. Typical applications include organising information, developing an outline, improving readability, shortening text, identifying repetition, identifying apparent gaps or preparing an initial draft.

These applications illustrate that generative AI can be particularly useful for the organisational and linguistic dimensions of reporting. AI can help transform unstructured information into a possible structure, compare alternative ways of presenting the same verified information, and improve the clarity of an existing draft.

However, the ability to generate fluent text does not mean that AI should be responsible for deciding what the project evidence means. The distinction between assistance and responsibility is therefore introduced at the beginning of the workshop.

AI CAN ASSIST WITH

> organising information;
>
> suggesting possible report structures;
>
> improving clarity and readability;
>
> reducing repetition;
>
> transforming existing information into an initial draft;
>
> identifying apparent gaps or inconsistencies.

THE RESEARCHER REMAINS RESPONSIBLE FOR

> deciding what constitutes relevant evidence;
>
> interpreting project results and progress;
>
> verifying facts, figures and dates;
>
> assessing the significance of project developments;
>
> deciding what can legitimately be claimed;
>
> approving the final report.

This distinction is important because many reporting tasks contain both technical and interpretive elements. For example, AI may be able to transform project notes into a fluent description of progress, but it cannot independently determine whether the evidence is sufficient to claim that the project is "on track", that an objective has been achieved or that a particular activity has had a positive impact.

The first principle introduced in the workshop is therefore:

AI can support the preparation of a project report, but it should not be treated as the source of project facts or as the final decision-maker about what those facts mean.

Part 2. Case: What do we actually know?

TIME: 10 MINUTES

The second part introduces a fictional project-reporting scenario. The scenario is deliberately designed to contain a mixture of straightforward factual information, information requiring interpretation and information that remains uncertain. Using a fictional case allows participants to experiment with generative AI without entering confidential, personal or commercially sensitive project information into an AI system.

GREENLAB PROJECT

Project title: GreenLab: Digital Tools for Sustainable Research Collaboration

Project duration:
January 2026 – December 2027

Project objective: To develop and test digital tools supporting collaboration between university researchers and small organisations working on environmental innovation. The project involves three universities and twelve external organisations. At the end of the first reporting period, the project coordinator is required to prepare a section entitled:

Progress towards project objectives and activities undertaken during the reporting period

The reporting template requires the section to address six elements:

> activities completed;
>
> progress towards objectives;
>
> partner cooperation;
>
> outputs;
>
> problems or deviations;
>
> next steps.

PROJECT NOTES

The project team has collected the following notes during the reporting period:

> The kick-off meeting was held in February 2026.
>
> Four online partner meetings were held between March and June.
>
> Two workshops were organised for participating organisations.
>
> Nine of the twelve external organisations participated in at least one workshop.
>
> Three universities nominated project representatives.
>
> An initial version of the digital collaboration platform prototype was developed.
>
> The prototype was originally expected in May but was completed in June.
>
> Workshop materials were prepared.
>
> Internal project communication guidelines were drafted.
>
> A communication campaign was discussed but has not yet been launched.
>
> User testing was originally planned for July.
>
> The team currently plans to conduct user testing in September, but this change still requires confirmation.
>
> One external organisation has not participated in project meetings since April.
>
> The reason for the organisation's absence has not yet been formally established.
>
> The project team meets monthly.
>
> The university partners are responsible for research and evaluation activities.
>
> External organisations provide feedback on the prototype.
>
> A scientific article has been planned but has not yet been submitted.

Participants analyse the notes and identify the difference between information that can be reported directly, information that represents an interpretation and information that requires additional verification.

For example:

VERIFIED FACT

"The prototype was completed in June."

This statement directly reflects the project notes.

INTERPRETATION

"The project is progressing well."

This may or may not be a reasonable conclusion, but it cannot be established from the notes alone. It requires an assessment of the wider project situation.

INFORMATION REQUIRING VERIFICATION

"The project remains on track to achieve its objectives."

Part 3. AI-assisted structuring

TIME: 10 MINUTES

The third part demonstrates how generative AI can be used to support the structuring of a report without asking it to generate the report itself.

Participants use any generative AI system that is permitted for the activity and enter the following prompt:

You are supporting a researcher preparing a project progress report.

Based only on the reporting requirements and project notes provided below, propose three possible structures for the section:

"Progress towards project objectives and activities undertaken during the reporting period."

The purpose of the activity is not to identify a single "correct" AI-generated structure. Instead, participants compare the alternatives and assess their usefulness against the original reporting requirements.

The evaluation should consider whether each structure:

> reflects all required elements;
>
> clearly distinguishes completed activities from future activities;
>
> gives sufficient attention to problems and deviations;
>
> separates outputs from activities;
>
> provides an appropriate place for progress towards objectives;
>
> introduces any assumptions that are not supported by the reporting template or project notes.

Participants then identify which structure they would use and what, if anything, they would change.

Part 4. Verification challenge

TIME: 20 MINUTES

The fourth part focuses on the most important responsible-AI skill in this use case: verification of AI-generated reporting content.

Participants are presented with a deliberately flawed paragraph generated from the GREENLAB project information:

During the first reporting period, the GREENLAB project successfully completed all planned initial activities. The project team held regular meetings with all twelve external organisations and successfully developed the first version of the digital collaboration platform. The prototype was completed on schedule in June and received positive feedback from participating organisations. These achievements demonstrate that the project is progressing according to plan and is expected to achieve its objectives. User testing will begin in September following the successful completion of the development phase.

The paragraph is deliberately plausible. It uses formal project-reporting language and contains statements that sound reasonable. However, several claims are not supported by the original project notes. Participants identify the problematic statements and compare them against the source information.

The examples of unsupported or inaccurate statements (for facilitator only)

> "successfully completed all planned initial activities"

This statement is not supported. The communication campaign had not yet been launched, and some planned activities remained outstanding.

> "with all twelve external organisations"

This is factually incorrect. Nine of the twelve external organisations participated in at least one workshop.

> "successfully developed"

The word "successfully" introduces an evaluation. The notes confirm that a prototype was developed, but they do not establish whether its development was successful.

> "completed on schedule in June"

This is incorrect. The prototype was originally expected in May and was completed in June.

> "received positive feedback from participating organisations"

No evidence of positive feedback is contained in the project notes.

> "progressing according to plan"

This is an interpretation that is not established by the available information. The project experienced a delay and the revised testing schedule still requires confirmation.

> "is expected to achieve its objectives"

This is an unsupported prediction. The available information does not provide sufficient evidence to make this assessment.

> "User testing will begin in September"

The September date is currently planned but still requires confirmation. It should therefore not be presented as a confirmed activity.

CORRECTED VERSION

A more responsible version, based strictly on the available information, could read:

During the first reporting period, the GREENLAB project initiated several planned activities. A kick-off meeting was held in February 2026, followed by four online partner meetings between March and June. Two workshops were organised, with nine of the twelve external organisations participating in at least one workshop. Three universities nominated project representatives. The project team also developed an initial version of the digital collaboration platform prototype, which was completed in June, one month later than originally planned. Workshop materials were prepared and internal project communication guidelines were drafted. The planned communication campaign had not yet been launched during the reporting period. User testing is currently planned for September, subject to confirmation of the revised timetable.

The corrected version is deliberately more cautious. It does not attempt to make the project appear more successful than the available evidence demonstrates. It distinguishes completed activities from future plans, preserves the reported delay and explicitly retains uncertainty around the revised testing timetable.

Part 5. Reflection and key principles

TIME: 10 MINUTES

The final part consolidates the lessons from the case and connects them to participants' own reporting practices. Participants reflect on two questions:

> AI is useful in project reporting when...
>
> I would not delegate to AI...

The purpose is to encourage participants to formulate their own boundaries for AI use rather than relying only on general statements about "using AI responsibly".

The workshop concludes with five practical principles formulated by the participants.

About this resource

TITLE	From notes to a structured project report
TOOLKIT REFERENCE	UC2-01, use case 2: Structured drafting and reporting
DEVELOPED BY	University of Lodz
SUGGESTED CITATION	AI Researchers (2026). From notes to a structured project report. AI Readiness Toolkit, UC2-01. University of Lodz. airesearchers.eu
QUALITY ASSURANCE	Reviewed by the AI Researchers consortium for quality, categorisation and alignment with the AI Engagement Framework. External peer review by senior academics is under way, and the item may be updated as a result.
VERSION	1.0, November 2026
PROJECT	AI Researchers: Embedding Responsible AI in Research. Erasmus+ Cooperation Partnership in Higher Education, KA220-HED-66835D2B. October 2025 to March 2028.
CONSORTIUM	University of Lodz (coordinator), FEP University of Porto, UPF Barcelona School of Management, ACEEU, NIPI (OPI PIB), European E-learning Institute and Momentum Marketing Services

Co-funded by the European Union

Co-funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author or authors only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the Foundation for the Development of the Education System. Neither the European Union nor the entity providing the grant can be held responsible for them.

AI Researchers
Embedding Responsible AI in Research