How effective is generative AI advice for the academic advancement of faculty?

May May Yeo[1,*], Deborah D. Navedo[2], Patrick J. Casey[3,4] Bernard Tan[5]

[1]Department of Academic Appointments and Development, Duke–NUS Medical School, Singapore

[2]Clinical Perspectives Consultants, USA

[3]Dean's Office, Duke–NUS Medical School, Singapore

[4]Duke University, Durham, North Carolina

[5]Department of Information Systems and Analytics, National University of Singapore

*Corresponding author

E-mail: maymay.yeo@duke-nus.edu.sg (MMY)

Abstract

The SingHealth Duke-NUS Academic Medical Center manages over 2,800 clinical faculty members and processes over 400 appointments and promotions annually. The current Promotion and Tenure documentation includes over 30 documents, making it difficult and time-consuming for faculty to locate specific appointment information. We developed "AskADD" in response to requests for clearer academic career development guidance. This study reports initial alpha testing and subsequent beta testing with 35 faculty members using "AskADD," a novel AI tool developed to help faculty navigate academic career pathways. AskADD aids faculty—including physician-educators, physician-scientists, physician-innovators, and physician-leaders—in navigating academic career paths while increasing transparency and trust in the appointment, promotion, and tenure processes. Our AI-integrated systems, initially tested using low or no-code Microsoft platforms and later developed with a custom GPT, deliver contextualized responses to promotion and tenure queries. Faculty and staff participated in user testing, providing feedback for improvements. Alpha and beta testing conducted with the same group of users indicated that a substantial portion of participants found the tool beneficial, and suggestions were given for further refinement. Our experience contributes to the limited literature on AI-driven faculty advancement in academic medical centers and offers a novel paradigm for academic career support.

Keywords

Academic Medical Center, AI, clinical faculty, physician, trust, feedback

Introduction

The Singapore Health Services and Duke University-National University of Singapore Academic Medical Center (SingHealth Duke-NUS AMC) oversees more than 2,800 clinical faculty members and manages over 400 appointments and promotions annually. Promotion and tenure (P&T) information for the medical school is spread across 30 documents on the school's intranet, which makes it time-consuming for the faculty to locate specific information on academic appointments. During engagement exercises with the school, faculty expressed a need for more comprehensive guidance on academic career advancement**.** Accordingly, the research team proposed a tool to help faculty navigate and explore academic careers. Our tool aimed to reduce the time spent by faculty on searching for P&T information, increase transparency of the P&T policies and processes, and align faculty aspirations with the AMC's mission and vision [1]. Using Microsoft's Power Platform, including the Power Apps and Power Automate applications, and the OpenAI GPT-4o on Microsoft Azure (OpenAI GPT-4o, Redmond, WA, USA) [2,3] procured by the university, we developed an academic policy AI tool to help faculty navigate P&T policies and processes. The tool could serve as a leadership development support resource for clinical program leadership and P&T committees, while reducing the administrative burden on staff by addressing common faculty queries through the chatbot. Faculty and staff were invited to test the tool and provide feedback before its launch, ensuring that it is effective and user-friendly.

Various studies have investigated the application of AI in vocational education career planning, AI mentors to navigate science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) careers; AI in shaping individual career paths across career stages, and AI in health profession education [4–9]. However, to our knowledge, no prior study has investigated the application of generative AI to support faculty candidates at AMCs in navigating policies and procedures related to promotion, tenure, and academic advancement. We aimed to address these gaps through the following two

research questions—can a secure, interactive, online web application that allows faculty members to seek advice on academic advancement be developed, and how effective is generative AI in advising faculty on academic advancement?

This study aimed to develop and test an academic policy AI tool to assist faculty in navigating and understanding the policies and processes for academic appointments, promotions, and tenure at the SingHealth Duke-NUS AMC. We anticipate that when implemented, this tool will save time when searching for promotion and tenure policy information. Additionally, by providing contextualized natural language advice to faculty candidates preparing for promotion, our tool addresses their specific needs and increases their potential for success.

Materials and methods

Ethical Approval

The National University of Singapore Institutional Review Board approved this study (date of approval: December 19, 2024; NUS-IRB Reference Code: NUS-IRB-2024-121). All participants were provided with an information sheet and completed a participant consent form.

Study design, setting, and period

We performed alpha and beta testing and obtained feedback from participants on a newly developed AI chatbot to help faculty navigate promotion and tenure policies and processes between January and April 2025.

Alpha test

From August 2024 to January 2025, we programmed the university's enterprise Microsoft Power Apps and Power Automate applications to contact the University's enterprise OpenAI GPT-

4o application programming interface and send user prompts to query a Microsoft SharePoint repository containing the school's P&T policy documents. Responses from OpenAI GPT-4o could be viewed by the faculty through Power Apps application (Fig 1). Details of the tool, code and system prompts are provided in Supplementary Appendix S1 online.

Study population, sample size and sampling procedures, data collection, and analysis

We launched the alpha version in mid-January 2025. To provide timely insights, we aimed to recruit a purposive sample of 30 participants [10]. We emailed 105 faculty and staff members of the SingHealth Duke-NUS AMC to participate. Non-faculty and administrative staff members of the hospitals were excluded from the invitation. In total, 36 faculty members and staff (34% response rate) agreed to participate. They represented a diverse range of user groups, including faculty from various tracks, such as educator and research tracks, senior and junior faculty, clinical program leadership, and administrative staff who assisted faculty in P&T processes. We obtained feedback from diverse user groups to help develop a tool that would be relevant and widely accepted [11].

Participants were requested to formulate queries, evaluate responses provided by the tool to them, and provide feedback on functionality and tool user interface via an online form (Supplementary Appendix S2) developed using Qualtrics (Provo, UT). We selected the following factors to assess chatbot user satisfaction: usability, which indicated the relevance and clarity of responses; responsiveness, which indicated the quickness and accessibility of services and timeliness of responses; perceived empathy of the chatbot; and accessibility, wherein users with any browser had complete access to all the information and ability to interact with the chatbot. These factors were selected based on theoretical and empirical evidence supporting their relevance to AI chatbot interactions [12]. The Net Promoter Score [13], a measure of the participant's likelihood of recommending the chatbot to colleagues, was added to complement the assessment by providing an

action-focused indicator of user sentiment. Moreover, consultation with the university's enterprise 'NUS AI-Know' informed the inclusion of an additional factor—comparison with traditional methods, such as administrative staff—to evaluate the chatbot's effectiveness as an alternative to human assistance [14]. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize participants' feedback variables and plot data using Microsoft Power BI (Microsoft Corp.). Finally, we solicited additional feedback via two open-ended questions commonly used within the AMC's faculty development programs: "What specific features of AskADD do you find most effective?" and "What improvements would you suggest in enhancing the effectiveness of AskADD?" Feedback was reviewed and interpreted with a reflective approach to capture participants' intended meanings, then summarized using a flexible thematic analysis framework [15]. Post-empirical or *a posteriori* themes or codes were developed progressively and added to a summary table. In developing the table, we noticed that the themes fitted into the factors of usability, responsiveness, accessibility, empathy, and comparative sources, and we termed them post-empirical or *a priori themes or codes*. Feedback related to two themes or codes was separated accordingly. Although feedback that did not align with existing themes or codes was initially intended to be categorized under "Other Comments," no such feedback emerged during the alpha phase. Alpha testing concluded in the final week of February 2025.

Alpha test feedback and custom generative pre-trained transformer (GPT) development in beta test

The university launched its enterprise "NUS AI-Know" platform in October 2024 and enabled the creation of custom GPTs sharing within its community in January 2025. Accordingly, we developed a custom GPT using NUS AI-Know. During the process, we incorporated participants' feedback from the alpha test for improvement and adopted OpenAI's prompt engineering strategies to enhance the results [16] (Supplementary Appendix S3). Beta testing was conducted from March to April 2025. The same group of faculty and staff was invited to submit queries, assess the tool's

128 responses, and provide feedback as previously described. All users except one responded, yielding
129 35 responses. To facilitate feedback comparison between both phases, we eliminated feedback from
130 the alpha test that lacked corresponding beta test feedback.

131 In accordance with the university's information technology data privacy policies, prompts in
132 the tool were anonymized, and retained for auditing for 30 days. Users in beta were able to turn on
133 "Private Mode" so conversations would not be saved. User prompts and usage statistics in both phases
134 were not recorded by the research team. We launched the tool when we were satisfied with the
135 accuracy of its responses and its functionality. Figure 2 summarizes the developmental steps.

136 Results

137 Participant characteristics

138 There were 35 participants in both alpha and beta tests; more than half of them were men
139 (57%). The participants predominantly comprised medical staff (60%), which corresponded with
140 clinical faculty composition within our academic medical center. Furthermore, 40% of participants
141 were in the clinical track, 26% were senior faculty, and 26% were engaged in school or institutional
142 leadership (Table 1).

143 Findings from alpha testing

144 Users felt AskADD provided relevant and clear responses and was effective in saving users'
145 time compared with searching the school's intranet (Fig 3: Questions 1, 2 and 4 Alpha). Users also
146 positively rated its responsiveness (Fig 3: Question 9 Alpha).

147 32 users reported needing to rephrase queries, including 2 needing to rephrase often (Fig 3,
148 Question 3 – Alpha). Between 23% and 40% indicated that there was room for improvement in the
149 overall user experience (Fig 3, Questions 11 and 12 – Alpha). 66% of users rated the tool a 7 or 8 on

150 a scale from 0 (not at all likely to recommend) to 10 (extremely likely to recommend) (Fig 3, Question
151 "How likely are you to recommend AskADD to other colleagues?" – Alpha). These respondents were
152 considered "passively satisfied" and indicated they would not actively recommend the tool to
153 colleagues, as doing so might risk their professional credibility (11, p.4).

154 Additional feedback is presented in Appendix S4. Users felt that the chatbot would be
155 improved by providing links to policy documents to enable users to verify information and explore
156 further. It also had to improve handling of detailed follow-up advice, such as providing contact
157 information to relevant departments. The chatbot should also include information on academic
158 development and human resource information to accommodate a wider and related range of user
159 needs.

160 Findings from beta testing and comparison with alpha test results

161 Users reported that the custom GPT significantly reduced the time required to locate
162 information. It was perceived as easy to interact with and responsive. Most participants reported that
163 the tool was more effective than asking administrative staff for navigating academic policies. The Net
164 Promoter Score increased from 12% in the alpha to 42% in the beta version.

165 **Usability**

166 The number of participants who felt AskADD's responses were very relevant increased from
167 10 in alpha to 17 in beta phase (Fig 3, Question 1). Those who rated the responses as very clear rose
168 from 9 to 19 (Fig 3, Question 2). The number of users often had to rephrase their questions dropped
169 to 0 (Fig 3, Question 3).

170 The number of users who reported that AskADD reduced the time required to locate the
171 school's P&T policies by more than 15 min increased from 11 to 19 (Fig 3, Question 4). However,

172 the number of users who reported that AskADD reduced the time required to locate the school's P&T
173 policies by less than 5 min remained the same.

174 The number of participants who agreed that AskADD made it easier to navigate and
175 understand policy documents increased from 33 to 34 and from 29 to 33, respectively (Fig. 3,
176 Questions 5 and 6). All 35 users in beta phase felt that AskADD was able to resolve their queries
177 (Fig. 3, Question 7).

178 **Responsiveness**

179 Users in the beta reported similar turnaround times as those in the alpha phase (Fig. 3,
180 Question 8). The number of users who found it easy to contact AskADD increased by 1 in beta phase
181 to 31 (Fig. 3, Question 9).

182 **Accessibility**

183 All except 1 user in the beta phase agreed that AskADD had an easy-to-use interface, up from
184 33 in the alpha phase (Fig. 3, Question 10).

185 **Empathy**

186 Three additional users were impressed by AskADD's responses in the beta phase (Fig. 3,
187 Question 11). The number of users who enjoyed chatting with the tool increased by 8 to 29 (beta).
188 Those who did not enjoy the experience dropped to 6 in the beta phase (Fig. 3, Question 12).

189 **Comparing AskADD with other sources of policy information**

190 The number of users who felt AskADD was much more effective than traditional sources
191 increased by 5 to 13 in the beta phase (Fig. 3, Question 13). Although the majority considered
192 AskADD a positive alternative for accessing academic policy information, 5 users in both phases felt
193 it was similarly or less effective than other sources.

Net Promoter Score and additional feedback

The proportion of promoters increased from 23% in the alpha phase to 51% in the beta phase. Passives decreased from 66% to 40%.

Figure 3 highlights two questions with the most notable improvement from alpha to beta: the tool's ability to resolve queries (Fig. 3, Question 7) and perceived empathy (Fig. 3, Question 12), with gains of 7 and 8 users respectively.

We explored the additional feedback to the two open-ended questions in the beta phase (Supplementary Appendix S4) to identify changes that could have contributed to the above outcomes. Features users found most effective included time-savings—*"Quick answers, don't need to trawl website for info"*; relevant answers—*"Able to ask real questions and get directed in the right direction"*, hyperlinks to source documents: *"Excellent as is, especially updated version with links to the source references"*, and introduction prompts—*"Useful prompts to start a conversation"*. Users also requested streamlining access through the institutional network. There were also suggestions to provide document and application support, such as enabling users to upload documents for AskADD to provide personalized advice on academic rank and gap assessment. Where it could not provide an adequate answer, AskADD should be able to provide specific contact information. Users also suggested the appearance and speed of answers could be improved. The research team discussed and implemented the features where functionalities were available into the system before deployment.

Additional findings from the tool development process

During the development of the alpha version, the team conducted approximately 60 iterations to enable hyperlinking to source documents stored in the SharePoint repository. In approximately 70% of cases, the Azure AI GPT-4o correctly returned file name formats, allowing the Power Automate application flow to retrieve and link the required documents seamlessly for user access.

However, in the remaining 30% of runs, inconsistencies in the file name formatting generated by Azure AI GPT-4o disrupted the Power Automate application's functionality—due to the latter's reliance on standardised formatting—resulting in non-functional hyperlinks delivered via Power Apps. This limitation reduced the alpha version's usefulness, which was addressed in the beta version through backend programming by the AI development team. Finally, on 20 iterations each of questioning both chatbots before launch, the alpha version required an average of 10 s, while beta was slightly faster at an average of 8 s. The team would explore using Azure AI GPT-4.1 launched in April 2025 when it was available to staff. [18]

As accuracy and reliability of the tool were of primary importance for trust and acceptance in the chatbot [17], the temperature, a parameter that controls randomness of AI-generated responses, was set at 0 and 0.3 in the alpha and beta versions, respectively [19]. A temperature of 0 produces consistent and predictable responses, while higher values (closer to 1) yield more variable and creative outputs [20]. This ensured deterministic responses: when information was available, it was provided; when unavailable, AskADD clearly indicated that the requested information was not in its repository.

Discussion

This study aimed to pilot an academic policy AI tool to parse P&T policies and to understand if it was effective in advising faculty in an AMC on academic advancement. While we were able to create a tool using AI-enhanced Microsoft Power Platform in the alpha phase, the features and functionality needed improvement, several of which could not be implemented through the platform. Users requested the chatbot to improve its ability to interpret initial queries to reduce the need for rephrasing. Although the tool was effective in saving users' time compared to seeking human assistance, users required links to policy documents to verify and explore further, and to provide contacts to dedicated support personnel if it was unable to answer queries. These requirements—to

verify supporting documents and to reach dedicated personnel highlight the critical role of trust in acceptance and adoption of artificial intelligence.[21] Users also required the scope of the tool to be broadened to include academic development pathways and human resources information. This enabled advice from a single source in place of searching in different chatbots for what users felt were related scopes – academic and human resource development. This finding adds to existing literature on professional development strategies to drive employees' integration of artificial intelligence to achieve organizational goals. [22]

The custom GPT included several functionalities requested from the alpha tests: hyperlinks to policy documents, introduction to the chatbot and prompt questions to start conversations, improved system prompt guided by OpenAI, departmental contacts, and additional repository documents, including the AMC's public websites to deliver holistic knowledge and answers to users. Thus, beta users felt the answers were relevant, clearer and required less querying effort. The percentage of promoters more than doubled, with large improvements in the tool's ability to resolve queries and its perceived empathy. Improvements in the system prompt strategy in the beta version likely contributed to a more engaging user experience and enhanced human–computer interaction.

In relation to research question 2, users found the custom GPT helpful for addressing general queries, appreciating its round-the-clock availability in supporting their academic advancement preparation. However, users preferred personalized answers, such as if the tool could provide feedback and gap assessment upon evaluating their curriculum vitae and the academic level they intended to progress to. Such feedback resonates with discussions on chatbots as onboarding and career guides and providing real-time skills-gap analysis.[23] The team recorded the feedback for consideration and potential implementation in a future version.

Limitations

The successful development of this tool was made possible by a team with diverse expertise, including professionals in Power Apps Platform development, artificial intelligence, academic promotion and tenure processes within an AMC, and mixed-methods research. We used results from the same group of 35 participants in both the alpha and beta testing phases. This enabled direct comparison of user feedback between phases and strengthened the validity and credibility of the findings.

Nonetheless, this study was based on platforms and tools that are available to and shareable among university staff. While this facilitates scalability within the institution, the chatbot uses Microsoft and university-specific infrastructure that may not be replicable in institutions lacking equivalent enterprise systems. Finally, due to the need for timely insights and operational constraints, we recruited a purposive sample of 35 participants, which included representatives from clinical, tenure, research and education tracks faculty, administrative staff, program and institutional leaders, and other health professions. More in-depth findings could have been identified in a larger-scale study.

Conclusion

We developed and demonstrated a secure, interactive tool that provided contextualized advice on institutional-specific promotion and tenure policies to faculty members. Additionally, our study revealed that users valued a chatbot that provides accurate, clear, and contextually relevant responses, with minimal need for query rephrasing. Users preferred seamless access to policy documents, direct contacts for unresolved queries, and a comprehensive platform that includes academic advancement and related human resource information in addition to P&T policies. While users valued a tool that could be accessed at all times for contextualized answers on academic policies, they felt the tool

would be more effective if the answers were personalized through user input of personal information for advancement advice.

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first chatbot specifically designed to support faculty advancement at an AMC. Although tools, such as custom GPTs, are already procured for enterprise use at the university, we applied them innovatively to reduce the time faculty members spend searching for P&T policy information and to increase their potential for success. Future studies may introduce personalized academic advisory features taking into consideration data privacy and ethical implications, explore scalability across diverse institutional settings, evaluating impact on faculty advancement through longitudinal studies, and investigating long-term outcomes of faculty engagement and satisfaction with AI-driven advisory tools.

References

1. Yeo, M. M., Lim, H., Kumar, A. & Thompson, A. W. Calculator for predicting the probability of faculty promotion in an academic medical centre. *BMJ. Lead*. **8,** 203-207 (2023).
2. Microsoft. *Power Apps – Build Apps with AI*. https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/power-platform/products/power-apps (2025)
3. Microsoft Azure. *OpenAI Service*. https://azure.microsoft.com/en-gb/products/ai-services/openai-service/ (2025)
4. Rosyadi, M. I., Kustiawan, I., Tetehfio, E. O. & Joshua, Q.The role of AI In vocational education: a systematic literature review. *J. Vocat. Educ. Stud.* **6,** 244-263 (2023).
5. Duan, J. & Wu, S. Beyond traditional pathways: leveraging generative AI for dynamic career planning in vocational education. *Int. J. New Dev. Educ.* **6,** 24-31 (2024).
6. Bankins, S., Jooss, S., Restubog, S. L. D., Marrone, M., Ocampo, A. C. & Shoss, M. Navigating career stages in the age of artificial intelligence: a systematic interdisciplinary review and agenda for future research. *J. Vocat. Behav.* **153,** 104011 (2024).
7. Chang, C. N., Hui, J., Justus-Smith, C. & Wang, T. W. Navigating STEM careers with AI mentors: a new IDP journey. *Front. Artif. Intell.* **7,** 1461137 (2024).
8. Mehta, N., Nielsen, C., Zack, A., Christensen, T. & Isaacson, J. H. Creating custom GPTs for faculty development: an example using the Johari Window and Crucial Conversation frameworks for providing feedback to struggling students. *Med. Teach.* 1-3 (2025).
9. Masters, K. et al. Twelve tips on creating and using custom GPTs to enhance health professions education. *Med. Teach.* 46, 752-756 (2024).

10. Zickar, M. J. & Keith, M. G. Innovations in sampling: improving the appropriateness and quality of samples in organizational research. *Annu. Rev. Organ. Psychol. Organ. Behav.* **10,** 315–337 (2023).

11. Camacho, M., Perramon, J., Puig-Bosch, X., Dang, V. N., Díaz, O. & Lekadir, K. Stakeholder engagement: the path to trustworthy AI in healthcare in *Trustworthy AI in Medical Imaging* (ed. Lorenzi M. & Zuluaga M. A.) 471-495 (2025).

12. Vu, H. T. M., Lai, V. T. H., Tran, H. Q., Ghozaly, S., Khishigjargal, U. & Enkh-Amgalan, S. Exploring the impact of AI chatbots on customer satisfaction. *Int. J. Creat. Innov. Res. All Stud.* **4,** 62-69 (2022).

13. Reichheld, FF. The one number you need to grow. *Harv. Bus. Rev.* **81,** 124 (2004).

14. Mittelstädt, J.M., Maier, J., Goerke, P. et al. Large language models can outperform humans in social situational judgments. *Sci. Rep.* **14**, 27449 (2024).

15. Swain, J. A hybrid approach to thematic analysis in qualitative research: using a practical example in *Sage Research Methods Cases Part 2*. (SAGE Publications Ltd, United Kingdom) 2018.

16. OpenAI. *Prompt engineering - Enhance results with prompt engineering strategies.* https://platform.openai.com/docs/guides/prompt-engineering (2025).

17. Kaur, D., Uslu, S., Rittichier, K. J. & Durresi, A. Trustworthy artificial intelligence: a review. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 55 (2023).

18. OpenAI. *Introducing GPT-4.1 in the API.* https://openai.com/index/gpt-4-1/ (2025)

19 Davis, J., Van Bulck, L., Durieux, B. N. & Lindvall, C. The temperature feature of ChatGPT: modifying creativity for clinical research. *JMIR Hum. Factors.* **11,** 1-4 (2024).

20. Marion S. How to use OpenAI GPT models temperature https://gptforwork.com/guides/openai-gpt-ai-temperature (2024).

21. Nazaretsky, T., Ariely, M., Cukurova, M. & Alexandron, G. Teachers' trust in AI-powered educational technology and a professional development program to improve it. *Br. J. Educ. Technol.* **53**, 914–931 (2022).

22. Billiot, T. Continuous learning and advancing technologies: a framework for professional development and training in artificial intelligence. *Dev. Learn. Organ.* **37**, 28–31 (2023).

23. Korzynski, P., Kim, S. & Egan, T. Bridging human resource development processes through generative artificial intelligence. *Hum. Resour. Dev. Q.* **35**, 247–256 (2024).

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to thank the National University of Singapore Digital Enablement, Artificial Intelligence, and the Office of Data and Intelligence teams. We are grateful to Mr. Peng Wei, Mr. Tan Keok Tay, Mr. Manish Sridhar, Mr. Ku Wee Kiat, Mr. Irving Kwok, and Mr. Voycevestern

Peh Jia Wei for their support and invaluable contributions. We also wish to thank Ms. Kelly Cheang and Ms. Tricia Wong of the Appointments and Development Department of Duke-NUS Medical School for their assistance with research.

Author contributions

M.M.Y: Conceptualization, data curation, investigation, formal analysis, writing - original draft, review and editing. D.D.N. and P.J.C.: Formal analysis, writing - review and editing. B.T.: Supervision, formal analysis, writing - review and editing, validation.

Competing interests

M.M.Y., D.D.N. and B.T. each individually declare no financial or non-financial competing interests. P.J.C. is a director on the board of the public company Legend Biotech but declares no financial or non-financial competing interests.

Data availability

All data generated and analyzed during this study are included in this published article and its Supplementary information files.

Figure legends

Fig 1. Using the university's Enterprise Microsoft Power Platform and OpenAI GPT-4o on Microsoft Azure to generate natural language advice for faculty. Microsoft Power Apps and Power Automate applications are programmed to contact Azure OpenAI GPT-4o to query Microsoft SharePoint repository containing policy documents. Responses from OpenAI GPT-4o can be viewed by users through Power Apps application.

Fig 2. Steps in the development and implementation of a custom GPT to answer faculty questions on academic advancement. A flowchart illustrating an AI-integrated system, initially tested using low or

no-code Microsoft applications and later developed with a custom GPT to deliver contextualized responses to users. This systematic approach ensures the GPT provides accurate and contextually relevant advice to support faculty advancement.

Fig 3. User feedback. User feedback comparisons denote overall improvement in the results of the beta over the alpha version.

Tables

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of participants at SingHealth Duke-NUS Academic Medical Center (AMC) who participated in AskADD alpha and beta testing, 2025.

Supplementary information

Appendix S1

Appendix S2

Appendix S3

Appendix S4

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of participants at SingHealth Duke-NUS Academic Medical Center (AMC) who participated in AskADD alpha and beta testing, 2025.

Category	*Demographics (n=35)*	*Number*	*Percentage (%)*
Professional group	Administration	5	14
	Allied Health Professional	1	3
	Dental	3	9
	Medical	21	60
	Nurse	1	3
	Research	4	11
Faculty track *Where applicable*	Clinical	14	40
	Educator	5	14
	Practice	1	3
	Research	6	17
	Tenure	4	11
	Not applicable, i.e., administrative	5	14
Role	Administrative Staff	4	11
	Clinical Program Leadership	8	23
	School or Institutional Leadership	9	26
	Junior Faculty	5	14
	Senior Faculty	9	26
Sex	Female	15	43
	Male	20	57


Microsoft Power Apps
Environment for rapid App development
Microsoft Sharepoint
P&T policies repository
Microsoft Power Automate
Connect and integrate
Contextualized Answers!
OpenAI GPT-4o on Microsoft Azure
Cloud search, natural language tasks, etc.

Figure 1


Alpha test
• 36 participants
• Analyzed user feedback
• Built in improvements from Alpha test
AI-Enhanced Power App
Custom GPT
Beta test
• Participants from Alpha test
• Analyzed user feedback
• Built in improvements from Beta test
Launch tool in academic medical center
• Additional improvements are to be incorporated in future phases when functionalities are available
Custom GPT

Figure 2













Number of Users Who Felt AskADD Performed Better in Beta than in Alpha and Why

















Figure 3