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**Project Report Form Instructions**

**Background**

To inform on the progress made by individual projects and to assist in determining the impact of its funding on the achievement of NSTIP strategic goals, KACST requires all awardees to report progress on their grant. There are two reporting stages: interim, which is for awardees completing the first year of the award, and final, which is for awardees at the conclusion of their two year award. To complete this requirement, Principal investigators (PIs) must submit a Project Report Form.

The American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) will manage the review of submitted reports. Each report will be reviewed by one external expert with substantial knowledge of the research area and familiarity with the goals of NSTIP. In many cases the reviewer will have served on the original awarding panel and contributed toward the initial proposal’s consensus review. Each reviewer will have access to the original grant proposal, its AAAS consensus review, any subsequent reports, and their reviews.

**Guidelines**

Completing and submitting a Project Report Form represents a substantial effort. It is expected that several days may be required to complete the Project Report Form so that it contains sufficient detail for review. The PIs are encouraged to take full advantage of the space and format offered by the Interim or Final Project Report Form, which seeks both quantitative and qualitative information to capture the progress, challenges, changes, and future directions of the project. **As this will be the sole source from which reviewers will assess progress, it is critically important for the PIs to include all relevant data and information to allow for an informed review.** In addition, these reports serve as a source of communication to KACST personnel that may inform future programmatic decisions.

Each report is evaluated based on the progress of the research, the impact of the proposed program, the path to success, and the alignment with the NSTIP. A qualitative rating and a corresponding quantitative score are assigned to each project, like so:

* Excellent (25.0 – 30)
* Satisfactory (15.0 – 24.9)
* Poor Progress (3.0 – 14.9)
* Poor due to Insufficient Documentation (3.0 – 14.9)

The ratings reflect the progress of the project as demonstrated in the report, as well as the quality of the report preparation. **A report that does not provide evidence for the mentioned progress is unlikely to receive a high rating (independent of any actual accomplishments), and may be rated as Poor due to Insufficient Documentation.** Claims of progress must be substantiated with the necessary supporting information (e.g., figures, tables, data, references, etc.). Inclusions of web-links pointing to supporting materials are encouraged (e.g., links to syllabi used in courses supported by grant funds, workshop announcements, publications, discussion papers, algorithms, software, simulations, etc.).

Reports receiving a rating of Excellent will be considered accepted and complete.

Reports that are rated as Satisfactory will be conditionally accepted; as appropriate, the PI must prepare a reply to AAAS reviewer comments, and this reply will be evaluated by the STU.

Reports that are rated as Poor Progress are not accepted; these must be revised and provide a reply to AAAS reviewer comments. The revised report must be evaluated by the STU one time only.

Reports that are rated Poor due to Insufficient Documentation are not accepted; these must be revised and provide a reply to AAAS reviewer comments. The revised report must be evaluated by AAAS one time only.

***Resubmitting (revised) progress reports: All progress reports that are revised and resubmitted must include a response letter that addresses the evaluator comments from the previous progress report review.***

Detailed instructions are provided on the Project Report Form. Please address each section to the fullest extent possible. Additional guidelines for each section are indicated here:

*Note: all supporting documents must be appended to the Project Report Form and submitted as one document.*

1. **Project Information**
* Project ID, Project Title, Principal Investigator, and Strategic Technology Area should contain the same information that was included in the funded proposal.
* The Project Period should reflect the start month/year and end month/year of the entire project (e.g., most will be approximately two years).
* The Reporting Period is the specific portion of the project contained in the Project Report Form.
* The important **Project Summary** narrative should take full advantage of the word allocation (300 words for Interim Reports and 500 words for Final Reports). This section should contain a discussion of what has occurred since the start of the project. Do not include the summary provided in the original proposal.
* Also in the Project Summary, please clearly articulate:
	1. Evidence that the project is meeting or has met the strategic technology goal(s) described in the funded proposal
	2. The explicit impact and importance of the project to Saudi Arabia.
1. **Project Progress/Accomplishments**
* In addition to reporting progress percentages in the main table, further elaboration on the results (including graphs, data, tables etc.) is required in the subsequent comment box, where 1,000 (Interim Report) or 2,000 words (Final Report) are allocated.
* Full references to abstracts from international conferences and papers published in international journals and web-links to scientific journal papers and conference abstracts should be provided.
* If additional material is required to assess the progress, but is not able to be included because of format limitations, a web-link to the research team website should be provided, pointing to the developed material (algorithm, database, etc.).
* Challenges encountered while trying to accomplish the tasks (for example, delays in obtaining equipment, turnover in personnel, or recent scientific discoveries that affected your research program) and how you overcame them should be clearly mentioned and explained.
* Implemented changes should be sufficiently described to allow a detailed technical review.
1. **Personnel Involvement**
* This section is meant to evaluate the contribution of all the team members. Every participant should be named and her/his title provided (PI, consultant, MS or PhD student, undergraduate student, administrative assistant etc.).
* Use the ‘Contributions’ column to provide enough detail to understand the level of responsibilities and activities for each person, referring to the specific Objectives, Phases, or Tasks they were involved in.
* Student theses resulting from the work associated with this project should be mentioned in the Project Progress section.
* The change of status of graduating students should be indicated in the text box after the main table.
1. **Research Outputs**
* The report should provide sufficient details to allow for an external verification of the different deliverables.
* References and identifiers for the deliverables indicated in the table (i.e. patents, reports, official policy briefs, maps, papers, etc.) should be provided.
* Material in preparation should be identified as such, described, and be made available through a web-link when appropriate.

1. **Broader Impacts of the Project**
* This section should provide all the evidence supporting the claims of broader impacts.
* Links to course notes, syllabi, or academic catalogs should be included when a course has been developed as part of the proposed research.
* List of new equipment with detailed specifications along with the current and potential users should be provided.
* Publications or structures resulting from collaborations (e.g. with other laboratories, departments, institutions and/or policy makers) should be referenced.
* Specific information should be provided about additional external funding resulting from the project.
1. **Budget**
* The budget table should be fully completed for both Interim and Final Project Reports.
* The available comment box should include:
	1. A list and description of purchased large pieces of equipment (>10,000 SR);
	2. A description and location for all core or shared research facilities that have been used;
	3. An explanation for differences between budgeted and expended amounts;
	4. Additional information that is important for an external understanding of project finances, but may not be captured in the table.

Rating Categories for Technical Report

| **#** | **Rating** | **Scoring** | **Implications** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Excellent  | 25.0 – 30 points  | * Report is accepted.
* In case of final report: project is potentially closed.
 |
| 2 | Satisfactory | 15.0 - 24.9 points | * Report is accepted conditionally.
* PI replies to AAAS’ comments, as appropriate.
* STU evaluates PI’ replies to AAAS’ comments.
* STU’s recommendation is notified to MAARIFAH general secretariat.
* In case of final report: project is potentially closed, according to STU recommendation.
 |
| 3 | Poor progress[[1]](#footnote-1) | 3.0 - 14.9 points  | * Report is not accepted and should be revised according to the comments of AAAS.
* All revised reports MUST be coded by (R) and MUST contain separate reply to the comments of AAAS.
* Revised report MUST be evaluated through STU for one time ONLY.
* Decision on non accepted reports for the second time will be subject to the provisions of the governing roles of MAARIFAH.
 |
| 4 | Poor due to Insufficient documentation[[2]](#footnote-2)  | 3.0 - 14.9 points  | * Report is not accepted and should be revised according to the comments of AAAS.
* Revised report MUST be submitted within one year for evaluation by AAAS one more time ONLY.
* All revised reports MUST be coded by (R) and MUST contain separate reply to the comments of AAAS.
* Decision on non-accepted reports for the second time will be subject to the provisions of the governing roles of MAARIFAH.
 |

1. Poor progress implies that the research progress and results were poor. One or more objectives may have not been achieved and no satisfactory explanation was provided by the PI, or the project may have deviated from its original implementation plan and no satisfactory rational for the deviation was provided by the PI.  [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Poor - Insufficient documentation implies that the report did not contain important documentation like replies to peer review comments for revised reports, project outcomes for final report, budget information, etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)