AI Researchers
Embedding Responsible AI in Research

AI READINESS TOOLKIT

UC2-03 Use case 2: Structured drafting and reporting

Responsible AI prompt template for grant and project reporting

A practical prompt-and-verification template for project documentation

AT A GLANCE

A reusable template for using AI on grant applications and project reports without handing over claims, evidence or intellectual contribution. It takes the user from preparing verified information, through a structured prompt, to reviewing the output and recording how AI was used. Checklists and worked prompts make each step quick to apply. It suits researchers, project managers and research support staff.

TYPE
Template

FORMAT
PDF

CONTRIBUTING PARTNER
University of Lodz

WHO IT IS FOR
Researchers, project managers and research support staff

FRAMEWORK BARRIERS
Know-how, The rules, Trust in AI

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.

Use this template to define the task, protect information, work from verified evidence, draft with clear constraints, and verify the final output.

> **Workflow:** Define → Protect → Verify evidence → Draft → Review → Decide → Approve

1. Before you use AI

Before entering information into an AI tool, define the task and check what information can safely be used.

1.1 DEFINE YOUR TASK

WHAT ARE YOU PREPARING?	WHO IS THE INTENDED AUDIENCE?	WHAT SHOULD AI HELP YOU DO?
☐ Grant proposal section	☐ Funding agency	☐ Create an outline
☐ Periodic project report	☐ Project consortium	☐ Reorganise an existing draft
☐ Project deliverable	☐ Institutional management	☐ Improve clarity/readability
☐ Administrative report	☐ Scientific audience	☐ Shorten a section
☐ Progress update	☐ General public	☐ Identify repetition
☐ Dissemination report	☐ Policy makers	☐ Identify missing information
☐ Executive summary	☐ Other: _____	☐ Adapt verified information for another audience
☐ Other: _____		☐ Convert requirements into a structured draft
		☐ Other: _____

1.2 IDENTIFY THE INFORMATION YOU CAN PROVIDE

ONLY PROVIDE INFORMATION THAT YOU ARE AUTHORISED TO USE WITH THE SELECTED AI SYSTEM.	INFORMATION THAT MAY REQUIRE ADDITIONAL PROTECTION
Publicly available project information	Personal data
Published research findings	Confidential participant information
Approved project descriptions	Unpublished sensitive findings
Official reporting requirements	Confidential project documents
Previously approved text	Commercially sensitive information
Non-sensitive project indicators	Passwords/access credentials
Publicly available references/sources	Proprietary information
Material explicitly cleared for the selected AI environment	Material subject to consortium confidentiality arrangements
	Sensitive information about partners/beneficiaries

STOP rule: If confidentiality, data classification, contractual restrictions, funder/project rules or approval of the selected AI environment are unclear, do not upload the material. Use public, anonymised, aggregated, synthetic or otherwise approved information instead.

2. Prepare your verified information

AI should work primarily with information that you have already checked.

2.1 PROJECT INFORMATION

FIELD	ENTRY	FIELD	ENTRY
Project name / acronym		**Reporting period**	
Reporting requirement / section		**Required headings**	
Required length		**Required terminology / indicators**	

2.2 VERIFIED SOURCES

List only sources the AI is allowed to use. If a source has not been verified, do not treat information derived from it as established fact.

SOURCE / VERSION	WHAT IT CONTAINS / SUPPORTS	VERIFIED?	APPROVED FOR AI?
		Yes / No	Yes / No
		Yes / No	Yes / No
		Yes / No	Yes / No

3. Check evidence level and implementation status

Before drafting, confirm what the available evidence actually supports. A common reporting risk is evidence escalation: AI turns a lower-level project fact into a stronger claim.

CATEGORY	MEANING	EXAMPLE
EVIDENCE AVAILABLE		DO NOT AUTOMATICALLY CLAIM
Activity	A task, event or implementation action.	Three stakeholder workshops were organised.
Result	A concrete result produced or demonstrably achieved.	A training programme was developed and validated.
Impact	A broader effect extending beyond the immediate result.	Institutional capacity increased.

Evidence ladder: ACTIVITY → RESULT → IMPACT. Moving from one level to the next requires evidence.

A workshop was delivered	Participants improved their competences.
A toolkit was developed	The toolkit changed professional practice.
Stakeholders participated	Stakeholders were highly engaged.

Implementation status: planned / in progress / completed / pending verification. AI must not silently change planned → completed or pending → confirmed.

4. Responsible AI Prompt

Copy and adapt the following prompt for your task.

ROLE	**YOU ARE A WRITING AND STRUCTURING ASSISTANT SUPPORTING A RESEARCHER IN PREPARING GRANT AND PROJECT DOCUMENTATION.**
TASK	Help me prepare the requested section using only the verified information and sources provided below.
DOCUMENT PURPOSE	[INSERT PURPOSE]
TARGET AUDIENCE	[INSERT AUDIENCE]
REQUIRED STRUCTURE	[INSERT HEADINGS / REQUIREMENTS]
VERIFIED INFORMATION / SOURCES	[INSERT VERIFIED INFORMATION AND APPROVED SOURCES]
OUTPUT REQUIREMENTS	[INSERT LENGTH, TONE, TERMINOLOGY AND SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS]

RESPONSIBLE AI RULES

1. Do not invent facts, figures, results, project activities, references, quotations, indicators or achievements.

2. Do not introduce information that is not contained in the provided material or supported by an explicitly identified source.

3. If information is missing, unclear or contradictory, identify the issue rather than guessing.

4. Clearly distinguish between information provided by me and suggestions made by you.

5. Do not create unsupported causal, evaluative or scientific claims, or move from Activity → Result → Impact without supporting evidence.

6. Do not fabricate references or citations. If a reference cannot be verified, flag it for human review.

7. Preserve the original meaning, dates, figures, qualifications, uncertainty and implementation status. Do not turn planned activities into completed activities.

8. Do not exaggerate project achievements, results or impacts, or describe something as successful, effective or significant without evidence.

9. Follow the requested structure, terminology, tone and length.

10. Do not replace the researcher's intellectual judgement or contribution.

11. Mark statements that require human verification using [VERIFY].

12. If the task requires information that has not been provided, explain what additional information is needed.

4.1 TASK-SPECIFIC PROMPTS

TASK	ADD THIS INSTRUCTION
Outline	Convert the reporting requirements into a clear and logical outline. Use only the information provided. Indicate what belongs in each section and identify missing information. Do not add substantive claims.
Reorganise	Reorganise the text to improve structure, flow and alignment with reporting requirements. Preserve substantive information. Do not add new facts, results, references or interpretations. Mark unsupported or unclear claims [VERIFY].
First draft	Draft the section using only supplied verified information. Preserve planned/in-progress/completed/pending status and the Activity-Result-Impact distinction.
Shorten	Reduce the length while preserving factual meaning, important qualifications, evidence and necessary context. Remove repetition, but do not introduce new claims or strengthen existing ones.
Gap check	Identify missing sections/evidence, unclear or contradictory statements, unsupported claims, dates/numbers requiring verification and references requiring verification. Do not fill the gaps yourself.
Adapt audience	Adapt the verified information for [AUDIENCE]. Improve accessibility, structure and clarity while preserving factual meaning, certainty and evidential strength.

5. Review the AI output

Use the following three-step review process before accepting any AI-generated or AI-reformulated text.

STEP 1 — CHECK FACTUAL ACCURACY

- PROJECT NAMES AND ACRONYMS
- DATES AND REPORTING PERIODS
- PROJECT ACTIVITIES, RESULTS, DELIVERABLES AND MILESTONES
- REFERENCES AND CITATIONS
- NAMES OF ORGANISATIONS AND PARTNERS
- NUMERICAL INDICATORS, PERCENTAGES AND STATISTICS
- SCIENTIFIC CLAIMS

STEP 2 — CHECK INTERPRETATION

- DOES THE TEXT ACCURATELY REPRESENT WHAT HAPPENED?
- HAS CORRELATION BEEN PRESENTED AS CAUSATION?
- HAS PLANNED BEEN CONFUSED WITH COMPLETED?
- HAS THE WORDING EXAGGERATED PROJECT IMPACT?
- HAS AI MADE A STRONGER CLAIM THAN THE EVIDENCE SUPPORTS?
- HAS AN ACTIVITY BEEN PRESENTED AS A RESULT OR ACHIEVEMENT?
- HAS UNCERTAINTY OR A LIMITATION BEEN REMOVED?

STEP 3 — CHECK SOURCE INTEGRITY

- FOR EVERY IMPORTANT CLAIM, ASK: WHERE DID THIS INFORMATION COME FROM?
- VERIFIED SCIENTIFIC SOURCE
- OTHER VERIFIED SOURCE
- PROVIDED PROJECT DOCUMENTATION
- OFFICIAL PROJECT SOURCE
- CANNOT BE ESTABLISHED → [VERIFY]

5.1 MAKE A HUMAN DECISION

DECISION	USE WHEN
ACCEPT	Supported by evidence, accurate and suitable.

DECISION	USE WHEN
ADAPT	Useful, but wording, scope, precision or certainty must be corrected.
REJECT	Unsupported, inaccurate, misleading or introduces information not in the evidence.
VERIFY	Potentially usable, but further evidence, confirmation or human judgement is required.

6. Human Verification Checklist

AREA	BEFORE SUBMITTING, CONFIRM
Accuracy	☐ I have checked all factual claims generated or reformulated by AI. ☐ I have verified all important numbers, dates and indicators. ☐ I have checked names of people, organisations, projects and partners. ☐ I have verified all references and citations. ☐ I have confirmed that project activities and achievements are represented accurately. ☐ I have confirmed that planned, in-progress, completed and pending activities are labelled correctly. ☐ I have checked that activities have not been presented as results, and results have not been presented as impacts without supporting evidence.
Responsible AI use	☐ I have not allowed AI to invent missing information. ☐ I have removed unsupported claims. ☐ I have reviewed all statements marked [VERIFY]. ☐ I have checked whether confidential or personal information was entered into the AI system. ☐ I have complied with applicable institutional and project rules for AI use.
Researcher responsibility	☐ I have reviewed the complete final version myself. ☐ The final text reflects my professional and/or scientific judgement. ☐ I understand and accept responsibility for the submitted content. ☐ I have made all necessary revisions after reviewing the AI-generated output.

7. Optional AI-use record

FIELD	ENTRY	FIELD	ENTRY
AI tool / environment		Purpose of use	
Material provided		Human verification performed	
Policy / rules checked		Responsible person	

Final responsibility cannot be delegated. The researcher or project team remains accountable for all submitted content.

About this resource

TITLE	Responsible AI prompt template for grant and project reporting
TOOLKIT REFERENCE	UC2-03, use case 2: Structured drafting and reporting
DEVELOPED BY	University of Lodz
SUGGESTED CITATION	AI Researchers (2026). Responsible AI prompt template for grant and project reporting. AI Readiness Toolkit, UC2-03. 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