

OpenAI

Leveraging ChatGPT for Legislative Correspondents

ChatGPT Enterprise

Introduction

Use ChatGPT Enterprise to turn supplied information into useful first drafts. These 30 chat prompts support official congressional office work. Replace bracketed placeholders and paste the relevant source text before you begin.

For Legislative Correspondent: focus on constituent policy mail, approved response language, correspondence quality, and policy-team support. Adapt assignments to your office; House and Senate titles and responsibilities vary.

Goals

This guide is meant to help:

- Create practical drafts for your daily work.
- Make handoffs and review requirements clear.
- Keep claims traceable to supplied sources.

Guidelines & guardrails

Use ChatGPT in the ChatGPT Enterprise environment responsibly within your organization's approved guidelines. Before using it for work, keep in mind:

- Use only information permitted in your approved workspace; use fictional or de-identified examples for practice.
- Verify facts, dates, citations, and chamber-specific procedures with current sources.
- Keep official work separate from campaign activity. Staff review all outputs before use or release.

Effective prompting

You can use simple English language instructions (or “prompts” & “queries”) in ChatGPT, and the model responds based on those prompts. Better prompts - that are more thoughtful, clear, and articulate - will yield more useful responses. Keep in mind that every good prompt has:

- **Task** - What are you asking ChatGPT to do?
- **Context** - What additional information or documents should it be aware of?
- **Expectations** - How do you expect the final output to be formatted?

Take a simple example:

- Original prompt: "Help me prepare for work."
- Add in task: "Draft a constituent policy response."
- Add in context: "Draft a constituent policy response. For our [House/Senate] office, use [Approved notes] for [Audience]."
- Add in expectation: "Draft a constituent policy response. For our [House/Senate] office, use [Approved notes] for [Audience]. Keep it to one page, with next steps and facts to verify."

Sample prompts

Choose a prompt, replace its brackets, and paste the named notes or source excerpts. State the chamber, audience, deadline, and desired format. Review the draft, then ask for a focused revision. Prompts do not retrieve live information or take external actions.

Role grounding, reviewed September 21, 2026.
Original workflow prompts; office procedures govern actual work.

Senate position descriptions: role responsibilities
.

CRS staff guide (2012): role and title background.

House Resume Bank: House role names.

House Green & Gold: casework and field duties.

OpenAI: using ChatGPT and reviewing results.

Mail Intake

Issue tagging

Best used with: Chat.

Suggest subject tags for [De-identified constituent messages] using [Office issue taxonomy]. Return message ID, proposed tag, and ambiguous items for review. Do not infer demographic characteristics or political affiliation. Use only the supplied information. Flag missing facts and assumptions; identify what a staff reviewer must verify.

Multi-issue message

Best used with: Chat.

Break [De-identified constituent letter] into its distinct questions and requested actions. Map each to [Office portfolio list] and identify which parts need casework routing. Do not answer questions before the responsible staff review. Use only the supplied information. Flag missing facts and assumptions; identify what a staff reviewer must verify.

Mail batch summary

Best used with: Chat.

Summarize themes in [Small de-identified mail sample] for the correspondence manager. Give examples by message ID and flag duplicate form text. Do not represent the sample as district-wide opinion or calculate unsupported percentages. Use only the supplied information. Flag missing facts and assumptions; identify what a staff reviewer must verify.

Mail Intake

Acknowledgment draft

Best used with: Chat.

Draft a courteous 100-word acknowledgment of [Constituent policy question]. Use [Office acknowledgment standard] and avoid suggesting a member position or response deadline not supplied. Leave personal details as placeholders. Use only the supplied information. Flag missing facts and assumptions; identify what a staff reviewer must verify.

Routing clarification

Best used with: Chat.

Draft a short internal question when [Constituent request] does not fit [Office routing guide]. Explain the ambiguity and list the information needed for correct routing. Do not expose unnecessary constituent details. Use only the supplied information. Flag missing facts and assumptions; identify what a staff reviewer must verify.

Policy Response Drafting

Approved-position response

Best used with: Chat.

Draft a 250-word constituent reply on [Issue] using [Approved member position] and [Dated official facts]. Acknowledge the concern, explain the position accurately, and close respectfully. Do not infer agreement with the writer. Use only the supplied information. Flag missing facts and assumptions; identify what a staff reviewer must verify.

Information-only response

Best used with: Chat.

Draft a neutral 200-word reply to [Question about official office activity] using [Approved factual summary]. Explain what is documented and where supplied public resources provide more detail. Add no unsupported promise or position. Use only the supplied information. Flag missing facts and assumptions; identify what a staff reviewer must verify.

Respectful disagreement

Best used with: Chat.

Revise [Draft policy response] to respectfully acknowledge a constituent who disagrees with [Approved member position]. Preserve the substance, remove dismissive wording, and avoid personalized persuasion or assumptions about the constituent. Use only the supplied information. Flag missing facts and assumptions; identify what a staff reviewer must verify.

Policy Response Drafting

Multi-question reply

Best used with: Chat.

Draft a response to [Three constituent questions] using [Approved response excerpts]. Answer each clearly within 350 words. Identify unanswered questions for the LA rather than filling gaps with general knowledge. Use only the supplied information. Flag missing facts and assumptions; identify what a staff reviewer must verify.

Plain-language rewrite

Best used with: Chat.

Rewrite [Approved technical response] for a general audience while retaining its meaning and qualifications. Explain essential terms and keep the result under 250 words. List any sentence requiring policy-team confirmation. Use only the supplied information. Flag missing facts and assumptions; identify what a staff reviewer must verify.

Response Library

Template freshness review

Best used with: Chat.

Review [Response template] against [New approved guidance] and [Dated legislative update]. Flag stale facts, changed wording, and passages needing an LA's review. Return proposed edits with source references. Use only the supplied information. Flag missing facts and assumptions; identify what a staff reviewer must verify.

Response variants

Best used with: Chat.

Create short and standard-length versions of [Approved response]. Keep the member's position and factual qualifications identical in both. Use general constituent language without tailoring political arguments to personal characteristics. Use only the supplied information. Flag missing facts and assumptions; identify what a staff reviewer must verify.

Template indexing

Best used with: Chat.

Design an index entry for [Approved response template] with issue, owner, approval date, source date, and review trigger. Use [Office conventions] and leave unknown fields blank rather than inventing approval history. Use only the supplied information. Flag missing facts and assumptions; identify what a staff reviewer must verify.

Response Library

Superseded language audit

Best used with: Chat.

Compare [Old template] and [Replacement template]. List language to retire and references that need updating in related correspondence. Preserve the replacement's exact policy meaning and identify unresolved contradictions. Use only the supplied information. Flag missing facts and assumptions; identify what a staff reviewer must verify.

Reusable paragraph bank

Best used with: Chat.

Extract reusable factual paragraphs from [Approved letters] for [Issue]. Label each by purpose and source date, keep qualifications attached, and flag context that prevents safe reuse. Do not combine incompatible positions. Use only the supplied information. Flag missing facts and assumptions; identify what a staff reviewer must verify.

Correspondence Quality

Source traceability **Best used with:** Chat.

Map each factual sentence in [Draft reply] to [Supplied source excerpts]. Mark unsupported or outdated statements and propose questions for the LA. Do not manufacture citations or substitute unsupplied facts. Use only the supplied information. Flag missing facts and assumptions; identify what a staff reviewer must verify.

Tone and clarity check **Best used with:** Chat.

Review [Draft constituent reply] for jargon, condescension, evasiveness, and unnecessary length. Return a clean edit plus three substantive concerns. Preserve approved policy language unless clearly marked for review. Use only the supplied information. Flag missing facts and assumptions; identify what a staff reviewer must verify.

Status wording check **Best used with:** Chat.

Compare references to [Bill] in [Draft response] with [Dated official action record]. Correct only what the record supports; flag ambiguous stages. Include the as-of date in reviewer notes. Use only the supplied information. Flag missing facts and assumptions; identify what a staff reviewer must verify.

Correspondence Quality

Personalization boundary check

Best used with: Chat.

Review [De-identified draft response] for mismatched names, irrelevant template remnants, and assumptions about the writer. Suggest neutral corrections. Preserve bracket placeholders and avoid adding personal details. Use only the supplied information. Flag missing facts and assumptions; identify what a staff reviewer must verify.

Final review checklist

Best used with: Chat.

Build a reusable pre-send checklist from [Office correspondence standards]. Cover recipient fields, issue match, approved position, current facts, and reviewer sign-off. Keep it to ten checks without claiming the checklist authorizes sending. Use only the supplied information. Flag missing facts and assumptions; identify what a staff reviewer must verify.

Policy-Team Support

Research question handoff

Best used with: Chat.

Turn [Unanswered constituent questions] into a concise request to the LA. Group factual questions, requested member positions, and missing source material. Include anonymized examples and desired response format. Use only the supplied information. Flag missing facts and assumptions; identify what a staff reviewer must verify.

Hearing note digest

Best used with: Chat.

Summarize [Supplied hearing notes] for the legislative team in 250 words. Identify statements relevant to [Mail topic], unresolved questions, and items that may require template updates. Preserve attribution. Use only the supplied information. Flag missing facts and assumptions; identify what a staff reviewer must verify.

Meeting prep support

Best used with: Chat.

Prepare a one-page background outline for [Constituent group meeting] from [Approved notes]. Include stated concerns, supplied office history, and questions for the LA. Do not infer the group's broader membership views. Use only the supplied information. Flag missing facts and assumptions; identify what a staff reviewer must verify.

Policy-Team Support

Constituent question log

Best used with: Chat.

Convert [De-identified messages] into a question log with issue, precise question, existing template match, and escalation need. Use [Office categories]; preserve nuanced questions rather than collapsing them into sentiment labels. Use only the supplied information. Flag missing facts and assumptions; identify what a staff reviewer must verify.

Policy update summary

Best used with: Chat.

Turn [LA-approved issue update] into a 200-word internal note for correspondence staff. Explain which response language changes, which remains usable, and what requires review. Keep tentative guidance clearly labeled. Use only the supplied information. Flag missing facts and assumptions; identify what a staff reviewer must verify.

Queue and Handover

Backlog review template

Best used with: Chat.

Design a correspondence backlog review table using [Office workflow]. Include received date, issue, draft status, reviewer, and next action. Do not prioritize constituents by viewpoint or personal characteristics. Use only the supplied information. Flag missing facts and assumptions; identify what a staff reviewer must verify.

Review request email

Best used with: Chat.

Draft a concise email asking [Policy reviewer role] to review [Response draft]. State the issue, exact questions, source dates, and supplied deadline. Do not imply approval from silence. Use only the supplied information. Flag missing facts and assumptions; identify what a staff reviewer must verify.

Incomplete response handoff

Best used with: Chat.

Prepare a handoff note for [Unfinished letter] using [Draft], [Sources], and [Open questions]. Separate completed work from unresolved policy questions and identify the next reviewer. Use only the supplied information. Flag missing facts and assumptions; identify what a staff reviewer must verify.

Queue and Handover

Busy-period coverage

Best used with: Chat.

Draft a coverage checklist for [Correspondence team absence] using [Pending queue summary]. Include approved templates, reviewer contacts by role, and unresolved items. Do not change staff assignments or expose constituent records. Use only the supplied information. Flag missing facts and assumptions; identify what a staff reviewer must verify.

Weekly correspondence digest

Best used with: Chat.

Create a 300-word internal digest from [Aggregate mail notes]. Cover recurring subjects, template updates, and review bottlenecks. Distinguish observed messages from broader public opinion and avoid unsupported volume claims. Use only the supplied information. Flag missing facts and assumptions; identify what a staff reviewer must verify.