



# New Dynamics

AI at work

# Practical AI prompting for HR

Write bounded prompts, verify outputs and use reusable patterns without exposing unnecessary employee information.

[Practical guidance](#) · [Worked examples](#) · [Printable worksheet](#)

New Dynamics Editorial Team  
Published 15 September 2026

[www.new-dynamics.com](http://www.new-dynamics.com)  
[contact@new-dynamics.com](mailto:contact@new-dynamics.com)

## Inside this guide

|                                        |   |
|----------------------------------------|---|
| Start with an approved task and source | 3 |
| Build a prompt that can be checked     | 3 |
| Three reusable prompt patterns         | 3 |
| Worked example: a misleading summary   | 4 |
| Prompt and review worksheet            | 4 |
| Keep the human decision visible        | 4 |
| Put the guide into practice            | 4 |
| Frequently asked questions             | 6 |
| Review the first cycle                 | 6 |
| About New Dynamics                     | 6 |
| Your working worksheet                 | 8 |

Read in order for the full approach, or use the linked contents to find a section. The final worksheet gives you space to record decisions and next steps.

Write bounded prompts, verify outputs and use reusable patterns without exposing unnecessary employee information. This practical guide to AI prompts for HR brings together a step-by-step approach, illustrative examples, a reusable worksheet and answers to common questions. Start with the section closest to your current challenge, then use the working session to turn the guidance into a clear next action.

## Start with an approved task and source

A useful prompt describes the task, relevant context, approved source material and expected output. Better wording cannot make an unsuitable use safe or an unreliable source accurate. Confirm the tool and information rules before entering workplace data.

Use fictional or appropriately approved material when practising. Removing names from a detailed account may still leave a person identifiable. Never include passwords, access tokens or unnecessary personal information in a prompt.

## Build a prompt that can be checked

State the task in a sentence, define the audience and supply the facts the output may use. Ask for a structure that helps review, such as a draft followed by unresolved questions. Tell the assistant to identify missing information rather than inventing it.

For example: “Draft a 150-word internal announcement for managers using only the approved facts below. Include the effective date, required action and support contact. Do not add eligibility rules. List any missing information after the draft.” The reviewer still checks every material statement.

## Three reusable prompt patterns

**Prepare a discussion:** “Using these approved, fictional project notes, list three questions a manager could ask to clarify progress and blockers. Separate source observations from questions. Do not assess the employee or infer motivation.”

**Improve readability:** “Rewrite this approved process explanation in plain language. Preserve every condition and deadline. Flag any sentence whose meaning is unclear rather than resolving it yourself.”

**Compare documents:** “Compare these two approved policy drafts. List changed wording by section and identify questions for the policy owner. Do not decide which version is legally correct.”

Each pattern supports a bounded task. None makes the output authoritative or removes the need for a capable reviewer.

## Worked example: a misleading summary

Illustrative scenario: project notes say that a delivery date changed after an external dependency failed. An assistant summarises this as the employee missing a commitment.

The reviewer returns to the source, restores the dependency context and removes the unsupported conclusion. They revise the prompt to preserve changes in scope and dates, then test it on another case. The improvement is verified through examples rather than assumed from a more detailed instruction.

## Prompt and review worksheet

- **Task:** What specific output is needed and for whom?
- **Sources:** Which approved facts can the assistant use?
- **Boundaries:** What should it exclude or leave unresolved?
- **Format:** What structure makes checking easier?
- **Checks:** Which claims, numbers, dates and links must be verified?
- **Failure case:** What example would reveal an important weakness?
- **Decision:** Is the output usable, correctable or unsuitable?

Record effective prompt versions with the workflow they support. A prompt that works for one document type may fail when the source or audience changes.

## Keep the human decision visible

Do not repeatedly prompt until the model produces the conclusion you hoped for. If the evidence is conflicting or incomplete, preserve that uncertainty for the responsible person.

Use an independent source check for important facts and calculations. Keep final approval in the ordinary process. The [AI literacy guide](#) provides a practice format, and the [AI governance guide](#) explains how to record ownership and changes around a deployed use case.

## Put the guide into practice

Set aside a working session with the people who own this process and one or two people who experience it. Use a fictional or appropriately authorised case, so the discussion can be specific without sharing unnecessary personal information. The purpose is to leave with a usable decision or document, not just agreement that the topic matters.

## Prepare the case

Choose an approved drafting task and gather the facts the output may use. Define the audience, purpose and a format that is easy to review. Remove unnecessary information. Before writing the prompt, decide what the reviewer would need to check and which questions should remain unanswered if the source is incomplete.

Write the starting assumptions down before discussing solutions. If the group disagrees on what happened, identify the information needed to resolve that difference rather than building a plan on an untested story.

## Work through the decision

Write a prompt with a specific task, source boundary and expected structure. Run it on fictional material and compare the result with the source. Record the kinds of mistakes rather than judging only how polished the text sounds. Change one part of the prompt at a time so the effect is easier to assess.

Ask each participant to explain the proposed decision in their own words. Differences in interpretation often reveal an unclear criterion, a missing responsibility or an instruction that will be difficult to follow.

## Test an exception

Add a conflicting date, an unsupported claim or an instruction inside the source document. Check whether the output preserves uncertainty and whether the surrounding application maintains its rules. A prompt cannot guarantee security, factual correctness or appropriate access. Escalate limitations that require a workflow or technical control.

Record what changes in this situation and what remains the same. An exception should lead to a clear next step, with an owner, rather than an informal workaround that nobody can explain later.

## Agree the handoff

Save the useful prompt with its intended task, input rules and review checklist. Give users examples of both acceptable output and a failure. The handoff should not suggest that a tested prompt is permanently reliable across every model, source type or audience.

Finish by confirming the owner, the next action and the date when the result will be reviewed. Give the person receiving the work enough context to continue without repeating the whole discussion.

## Frequently asked questions

### Is a longer prompt always better?

No. Additional detail helps when it clarifies the task, source, constraints or output format. Repetition and conflicting instructions can make the request harder to interpret and maintain. Start with a clear bounded instruction, test it on representative examples and add detail only when it addresses an observed problem. Review the result regardless of prompt length.

### Can a prompt prevent hallucinations?

A prompt can ask the model to use supplied sources and acknowledge missing information, but it cannot guarantee factual correctness. Verify material claims against authoritative information and design the workflow so unsupported answers are caught before use. If a task cannot be reviewed reliably, a better prompt alone is not enough to justify deploying it.

### Should we share a library of HR prompts?

A maintained library can help people use approved patterns consistently. Each prompt should state its purpose, permitted information, expected output and review steps. Assign an owner and record changes. Avoid publishing prompts that imply approval for sensitive uses the organisation has not evaluated. A useful library is a set of supported workflows, not a collection of clever instructions without context.

## Review the first cycle

Compare prompt versions on the same cases and include difficult inputs. Keep changes that improve the task without hiding uncertainty or increasing review burden. Recheck the pattern after a material model or workflow change. Retire prompts whose purpose or information boundary is no longer valid.

Keep a brief record of what was tried, what participants found useful and what needs to change. Compare the result with the original problem rather than judging success only by completion. If the process created extra work without improving clarity, quality or support, simplify it and test again. Share the agreed change with the people who will use it, and name the person responsible for keeping the guidance current.

## About New Dynamics

[New Dynamics](#) connects goals, feedback, recognition and reviews around the way organisations work. This guide is published by the New Dynamics Editorial Team as part of our practical library for HR leaders, managers and People teams.

Use the examples and worksheets to structure your own discussions and adapt them to your organisation. Illustrative scenarios are not customer case studies. Policy and employment

guidance needs appropriate local review before adoption.

For questions about this guide, corrections or a conversation about your performance management process, email [contact@new-dynamics.com](mailto:contact@new-dynamics.com). Explore the complete [guide library](#) for related resources.

## Your working worksheet

Use the prompts from this guide to prepare one real conversation or decision. Keep personal or sensitive information in your organisation's approved records. This page is for your own working notes.

**Task:** What specific output is needed and for whom?

---

---

---

**Sources:** Which approved facts can the assistant use?

---

---

---

**Boundaries:** What should it exclude or leave unresolved?

---

---

---

**Format:** What structure makes checking easier?

---

---

---

**Checks:** Which claims, numbers, dates and links must be verified?

---

---

---

**Failure case:** What example would reveal an important weakness?

---

---

---

**Decision:** Is the output usable, correctable or unsuitable?

---

---

---

Discuss your next step with New Dynamics: [contact@new-dynamics.com](mailto:contact@new-dynamics.com)