AD\_\_\_\_\_

#### Award Number:

W81XWH-10-2-0180

#### TITLE:

Military Interoperable Digital Hospital Testbed (MIDHT)

#### PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:

Richard Wozniak, M.D.

#### CONTRACTING ORGANIZATION:

Conemaugh Valley Memorial Hospital Johnstown, PA 15905

#### REPORT DATE:

October 2013

#### TYPE OF REPORT:

Annual

PREPARED FOR: U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command Fort Detrick, Maryland 21702-5012

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT:

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited

The views, opinions and/or findings contained in this report are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy or decision unless so designated by other documentation.

F					Form Approved
Bublic reporting burden for th	is collection of information is				OMB No. 0704-0188
the data needed, and comple	ting and reviewing this collect	ion of information. Send comments r	egarding this burden estimate o	or any other aspect of the	nis collection of information, including suggestions for
reducing this burden to Depa	rtment of Defense, Washingto	on Headquarters Services, Directorate	for Information Operations and	Reports (0704-0188),	1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington,
display a currently valid OMB	control number. PLEASE D	O NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO T	HE ABOVE ADDRESS.	any penalty for failing to	
1. REPORT DATE (D	D-MM-YYYY)	2. REPORT TYPE		3. D	ATES COVERED (From - To)
October 2013	L	Annual		28	<u>Sept 2012 - 27 Sept 2013</u>
4. TITLE AND SUBTI	TLE			5a.	CONTRACT NUMBER
Military Inte	roperable Dig	ital Hospital Tes	stbed (MIDHT)		
				5b.	GRANT NUMBER
				W8.	1XWH-10-2-0180
				5c.	PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d.	PROJECT NUMBER
Richard Wozni	ak, Joseph Da	do, John Hargreav	ves, Lisa Pasie	erb	
and Thomas Si	munich			5e.	TASK NUMBER
				5f. \	
7. PERFORMING OR	GANIZATION NAME(	S) AND ADDRESS(ES)		8. P	
Conomaugh Val	lou Momorial	Vocnital		IN IN	UMBER
1086 Examinition	rey memorial	портсат			
IUOO FIANKIIN	JEOOF				
Johnstown, PA	15905				
Two il ho	- A				
		LA V NVME(S) VND VDDBESS	(FS)	10	
5. 51 ONSORING / W	SINTOKING AGENCI		(L3)	10.	SI CHOCKMONITOR S ACRONING)
IIS Army Med	ical Research	and			
Matarial Comm	and	and		11	
Materier Comm	AIIU MD 21702				NIMBER(S)
FOIL DELIICK,	MD ZI/UZ				
12 DISTRIBUTION /		FMENT			
121 21011120110117					
Approved for	public releas	e: distribution u	unlimited		
inppioved for	public leicub	c, arberibaeron (			
13. SUPPLEMENTAR	Y NOTES				
14. ABSTRACT					
The MIDHT pro-	ect continues	to implement and	research healt	h informati	on technologies (HIT)
within the Cor	nemaugh Health	System, located i	n Southwestern	Pennsylvar	nia. Core technologies
under investio	ration include	pharmacy robotics	, bar code med	ication adm	inistration (BCMA) and
health informa	tion exchange	via the eHealth B	Exchange. State	ement of wo	ork is being delivered as
expected.	)-				
± ·····					
Significant p	cogress has be	en made on both ar	ms of the proj	ect. Resea	arch activities for Arm 1
have progresse	ed, including a	an initial analysi	s on medication	n errors an	nd completion of
statistical te	esting on nurs:	ing workflow and s	satisfaction.	Conemaugh i	s participating in the 14 <sup>th</sup>
Virtual Lifet	me Electronic	Record pilot nati	onwide via data	a exchange	with the Altoona VA
Medical Center	(Arm 2) Pa	tient correlations	s. system users	and docume	ent exchanges all have
increased thro	nughout the ve	ar. Conemangh was	s the first par	ticipant in	the nation to pass the
new "eHealth F	Exchange" test	ing program (2010)	2011 services)		
15. SUBJECT TERM	<u>s</u>	j program (2010/		-	
Bar Code Medi	- cation Admini	stration (BCMA)	Patient S	afetv	
Health Inform	ation Exchang	e (HIE)	Virtual L	ifetime Ele	ectronic Record (VLER)
16. SECURITY CLAS	SIFICATION OF	- \/	17. LIMITATION	18. NUMBER	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE
CLOURIN OLAO			OF ABSTRACT	OF PAGES	PERSON
a. REPORT	b. ABSTRACT	c. THIS PAGE	ΤT		19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (include
a. REPORT U	<b>b. ABSTRACT</b> U	c. THIS PAGE	U	82	<b>19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER</b> (include area code)
a. REPORT U	<b>b. ABSTRACT</b> U	c. THIS PAGE U	υ	82	<b>19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER</b> (include area code)

Г

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 8-98) Prescribed by ANSI Std. Z39.18 1

# **Table of Contents**

Introduction	. 4
Body	. 5
Key Research & Development Accomplishments	56
Reportable Outcomes	56
Conclusion	56
Appendices	57
References	82

# Introduction

The Military Interoperable Digital Hospital Testbed (MIDHT) is a six-year program of research to develop a real-world testbed environment in Southwestern Pennsylvania. The purpose is to research and evaluate Health Information Exchange (HIE) and health information technology (HIT) and services (HITS) that make health information readily available to consumers and providers. Ideally this will allow for the secure transfer of information between private sector rural providers, federal partners and patients. MIDHT has defined requirements and solutions to optimize healthcare resources for rural communities and identified lessons learned and best practices that benefit both the global Military Health System (MHS) environment and stakeholders in the local region. The Department of Defense (DoD) and Conemaugh Memorial Medical Center (CMMC) have common requirements for HIE, connecting disparate systems and providers and enabling secure provider-provider and provider-consumer e-communications. Minimal evidence is available on what business, clinical and technical solutions can be used to overcome the lack of specialists, infrastructure and geographical barriers associated with the delivery of care in rural communities.

# Arm 1. The Impact of Medication Dispensing/Administration Technology Within a Rural Healthcare System.

In order to improve efficiency and safety of medication dispensing and administration within an inpatient hospital setting, a complementary set of health information technologies have been implemented. A centrally managed pharmacy robotics system implemented in 2011 works in conjunction with bar coded medications administered at the bed side on many units at CMMC and Meyersdale Medical Center (MYMC). Research activities have focused on medication errors, provider workflow, provider satisfaction and financial data.

# Arm 2. Health Information Exchange (HIE) via the Nationwide Health Information Network (NwHIN).

Building upon work completed the previous year, CMMC continued efforts on health information exchange using the eHealth Exchange (formerly NwHIN) standards and specifications. CMMC has been in production with the James E. Van Zandt VA Medical Center in Altoona, PA for one year as part of the 14<sup>th</sup> Virtual Lifetime Electronic Record (VLER) pilot in the United States. CMMC has made tremendous strides in a number of activities, including a CONNECT gateway upgrade, testing certification, training additional providers and increasing the number of correlated patients.

CMMC received a formal contract modification on August 26, 2013. The modification extended the contract at no-cost for one year through October 27, 2014 and also included a revised budget (dated May 2, 2013). CMMC's subcontract with Northrop Grumman will expire on September 30, 2013.

# Body

# Arm 1: The Impact of Medication Dispensing/Administration Technology Within a Rural Healthcare System

Subtask 1.1 Implement pharmacy robotic technology and bar-coded enabled medication administration (BCMA) in an acute hospital system setting.

## Pharmacy Robotics / Bar Code Medication Administration (BCMA)

### MedCarousel2 Implementation - CMMC

CMMC finalized the second MedCarousel dispensing system placement in the centralized pharmacy (see diagram in Appendix 1). CMMC worked with an outside engineering firm to prepare documents that were submitted to the PA Department of Health in January 2013 for approval before physical accommodation work began. The amount of site work required was much less than with first MedCarousel due to the fact that the second unit was not as tall as the first one and would not protrude through the ceiling. Floor support was the main required change.

The second MedCarousel implementation was implemented in the pharmacy on April 8, 2013 (Figure 1. MedCarousel 2.). CMMC streamlined the manual pick processing that occurs when a medication is not able to be stocked in the robot. This also has helped reduce the number of open bulk medication bottles and decrease inventory slightly because of increased efficiency. The second MedCarousel has also helped with the picking processes since of the oral medications are located in the MedCarousel. The barcode system is fully engaged and ensures patient safety each time a medication is removed from the MedCarousel. The second MedCarousel has helped CMMC achieve a better work flow pattern in the drug distribution area.

The additional MedCarousel has also helped with the ordering and restocking of inventory when it arrives within the department from the manufacturer. With barcode scanning, CMMC can ensure that the medication is in its proper place when being restocked. As with the first MedCarousel, PAR levels are setup to help keep inventory levels sufficient to meet patient needs.



Figure 1. MedCarousel 2 in pharmacy.

McKesson has installed the BCMA Analytics feed into Conemaugh's performance management system called HBI. The Decision Support department conducted user training for nurse managers and directors on the use of HBI to interact directly with the BCMA data. This is a very rich analytics tool and once trained, nurse leaders are able to drill into the data to identify specific staff, nurse stations, and medications that require follow-up and possible re-training. Screenshots located in Appendix 2 provide a look and feel of the BCMA highlights via HBI and the different customizable view levels (by unit, by med, by staff, etc.).

#### **Medication Delivery Process - CMMC**

Under the current process, paper envelopes are delivered to nursing units each day. Nursing then must transfer the medications from the envelopes into the plastic bins housed in the computerized med carts. Unused medications are returned back to the pharmacy in the same envelopes. This process has created extra steps for nursing and thus has been identified as an area of dissatisfaction. Additionally, since the envelopes are re-used as a cost saving strategy, the extra handling associated with this process leads to the envelopes becoming damaged. This,

in turn, contributes to dispensing malfunctions from the robot. The Pharmacy department has since worked closely with nursing to pilot a new "exchange bin" method of delivering medications to inpatient units. In this workflow, nursing gets patient-identified plastic bins with the robot-filled medications from the current day. These bins are exchanged with bins from the preceding day for the same patient in the med cart. The expected advantages are: 1. Envelopes never leave the pharmacy so they are much less likely to get mis-handled and damaged (saves cost) 2. Nursing does not have to transfer meds from envelope to bin and then transfer unused meds from bin to envelope (less chance for error). Feedback from the first two pilot units has been positive. During the next quarter, Pharmacy anticipates to recommend full adoption of this process to nursing leadership. We are still working with Rubbermaid to finalize the pricing quote and purchase order.

# **Overall BCMA Deployment - CMMC**

Table 1 demonstrates the number of medication administration attempts, medications given and the total administrations using barcode scanning during the last three months. BCMA utilization continues to run at 95%. As seen in Table 1, the difference between medication administration attempts and the actual medication given may be due to the following reasons, including patient refusal or a vital sign/laboratory parameter exceeding protocol administration range.

Month Medication was Charted	Total Med Admin Attempts	Given	% Given	Barcode Scanned Count	% Barcode Scanned
Apr-13	160,314	134,946	84.2%	127,571	94.5%
May-13	177,850	150,901	84.8%	142,829	94.7%
Jun-13	120,492	102,227	84.8%	97,222	95.1%
Total	458,656	388,074	84.6%	367,622	94.7%

Table 1. BCMA Adoption.

## **Miners BCMA Deployment**

In May, Miners Medical Center's (MIMC) pharmacy medication master file was successfully synchronized with that of Memorial/Meyersdale's. A single medication master file now serves all three Conemaugh hospitals. This was a multi-month effort that completed a key prerequisite to implementing BCMA at Miners. As this task was completed, the MIS Clinical Analysts began the order build process. Meetings were held at the Miners facility with nursing and ancillary staff to design the workflow process. The system build is underway (approximately 50% complete). Upon completion of the build, a thorough system test will take place. Planning and implementation of user training is scheduled to occur in the next quarter. MIS worked with MiMC Nursing Administration to identify super users to facilitate BCMA training and on-site support, similar to the process used for the Memorial implementation. MIS recruited the services of several nursing super users to dedicate time to these tasks. BCMA deployment at Miners has been delayed due to implementation of the McKesson ER12 upgrade and is scheduled for the first quarter of calendar year 2014.

## School of Nursing BCMA Deployment

Conemaugh staff finalized the School of Nursing device needs for student nurses in November 2012. Additional Rubbermaid medication carts were deployed in December 2012 after receipt from vendor. The primary purpose was to improve student exposure to the current BCMA process and enhance the learning experience.

# Subtask 1.2 Research and analyze the resulting technological impact on medication errors, pharmacist productivity, nurse satisfaction/workflow and patient satisfaction.

### Nursing Surveys at CMMC & MYMC

A total of 25 CMMC nurses completed the survey during the reporting period. The survey was closed on October 5, 2012. Final statistical analysis has been completed for the CMMC dataset. The addition of 25 surveys did not change the results and conclusions of the non-pairwise analysis (one-way ANOVA) reported in the 2012 Annual Report.

The pairwise (same person completing survey at multiple time points) analysis is as follows:

A repeated-measures analysis of variance (RM-ANOVA) was completed between Baseline and Post 1 and Baseline and Post 2 periods over the same questions as were analyzed for the oneway ANOVA. The Sidak formula was used to adjust for multiple comparisons. Overall alpha (family-wise) remained at 0.05. These results support the conclusions of non-pairwise analysis. Unfortunately respondent error with creation of the "SUM" ID and a lack of trust by nurses in order to protect their identity prevented a higher sample size.

Time Periods	Question	Later time - baseline	Mean Difference over TIME	p-value	Correction for non- sphericity
Baseline and Post 1, N = 35	Q30	decrease	-1.143	0.008	
	Q04			NS	
	Q05			NS	
	Q06			NS	
	Q07	decrease	-0.788	0.011	Univariate results, Greenhouse-Geisser
	Q13			NS	
	Q15			NS	
	Q18			NS	
Baseline and Post 2, N = 26	Q30			NS	
	Q04	increase	0.846	0.023	Univariate results, Greenhouse-Geisser
	Q05			NS	

Q06			NS	
Q07	decrease	-0.808	0.034	Univariate results, Greenhouse-Geisser
Q13			NS	
Q15	increase	0.192	0.019	Univariate results, Greenhouse-Geisser
Q18			NS	

NS = No Significance

#### Table 2. Repeated- Measures ANOVA.

Q30: Overall, how satisfied are you with the current medication administration system? Answer Choices: 1 = Completely Dissatisfied <> 5 = neither <> 10 = Completely Satisfied

- means, Baseline = 5.63; Post 1 = 4.49
- The results above indicate a statistically significant decrease in satisfaction of BCMA from baseline to post 1.

A 6-point Likert scale was used for the remaining questions under analysis:

1 Strongly Agree3 Slightly Agree5 Moderately Disagree2 Moderately Agree4 Slightly Disagree6 Strongly Disagree

0 NA Not Applicable

*Please refer to the tables below for quantification of the mean score for the following questions by time period.* 

Q04: Because of information available through the current medication administration system I know both the intended actions and side effects of medications I administer.

• The results above indicate a statistically significant improvement of perception of knowledge after implementation of BCMA as compared to baseline.

Q07: The current medication administration system provides me with information to know that a medication order has been checked by a pharmacist before I administer the medication.

• The results above indicate a statistically significant decrease in the perception of the knowledge that the medication order has been checked by a pharmacist before administration by the nurse after implementation of BCMA as compared to baseline.

Q15: The current medication administration system is effective in reducing and preventing medication errors.

 The results above indicate a statistically significant improvement of perception of the effectiveness of BCMA to reduce and prevent medication errors as compared to baseline.

Descrip	otive Statistics	: Baseline( 1) - Pos	st 1 (2)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Q07 1	2.94	1.694	33
Q07 2	2.15	.906	33

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Q04 1	2.73	1.589	26
Q04 3	3.58	1.901	26
Q07 1	3.31	1.436	26
Q07 3	2.50	1.273	26
Q15 1	3.65	1.231	26
Q15 3	3.00	1.497	26

Descriptive Statistics: Baseline/ 1) Post 2/ 3)

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics.

The second POST survey was distributed to nursing staff at MYMC in early January 2013. A total of 17 surveys were completed within four weeks, with two of those surveys not 100% complete so the sample size varies from 15-17 depending on question.

Below are the final results for all three survey distributions at Meyersdale:

Responses to Questions 4-19 and 23-29 were coded 0 - 6, inclusive, with the following meaning:

0 = N/A (not applicable)			
1 = Strongly Agree	4 = Slightly Disagree		
2 = Moderately Agree	5 = Moderately Disagree		
3 = Slightly Agree	6 = Strongly Disagree		

Q30 was coded from 1 - 10 with a between response interval = 1, where:

1 = completely dissatisfied, 5 = neither satisfied/dissatisfied, 10 = completely satisfied

These response scales are ordinal and approximately interval. In order to take advantage of the more powerful parametric tests, the scale has been assumed continuous. As this is an assumption for analysis only, non-parametric tests were also applied to check consistency of the analysis.

The following analyses are between-group, pre vs. post 1 vs. post 2 study time periods, with a family-wise alpha criteria = 0.05. When homogeneity of variances held, the Bonferroni correction was applied for pairwise comparisons; when not, Games-Howell was used. Survey Section 3: Q04-08

Homogeneity of variances (over study time periods) held for all questions.

Only Q04 showed a statistically significant omnibus ANOVA, p-value = 0.024. The pairwise results follow and show significant results between the pre and post 1 periods, p-value = 0.037.

	S		Mean			95% Confide	ence Interval
Dependent Variable S3 Q04: Because of information available through the current medication administration system I know both the intended actions and side effects of medications I administer.	(I) Study Time Period	(J) Study Time Period	Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
S3 Q04: Because of information available	PRE (before BCMA)	Post 1 (BCMA stabilization)	-1.498	.579	.037	-2.93	07
	N,PRE = 19	Post 2 (BCMA)	-1.480	.641	.073	-3.06	.10
through the current medication	Post 1 (BCMA stabilization) N,Post 1 = 26	PRE (before BCMA)	1.498	.579	.037	.07	2.93
know both the intended actions and side effects		Post 2 (BCMA)	.018	.599	1.000	-1.46	1.49
of medications I administer.	Post 2 (BCMA)	PRE (before BCMA)	1.480	.641	.073	10	3.06
	N,Post 2 = 17	Post 1 (BCMA stabilization)	018	.599	1.000	-1.49	1.46

#### **Multiple Comparisons**

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 4. Question 4 Statistical Results.



Figure 2. Graphical Representation of Question 4 Results.

Survey Section 4: Q09-19

Homogeneity of variances (over study time periods) held for all questions except Q12 and Q13.

The following questions showed a statistically significant omnibus ANOVA:

Question	p-value	N,PRE	N,Post 1	N,Post 2
Q10	0.028	19	26	17
Q12	<0.0005	19	26	16
Q13	0.020	18	26	16
Q16	0.025	18	25	17

The pairwise results follow and show significant results between:

Question	p-value	pairwise study time periods
Q10	0.033	PRE and Post 1
Q12	< 0.0005	PRE and Post 1
	0.003	PRE and Post 2
Q13	0.008	PRE and Post 1
	0.048	PRE and Post 2
Q16	0.017	PRE and Post 1

	Multiple Comparisons								
Dependent Variable		(I) Study Time Period	(J) Study Time Period	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Cor Inte Lower Bound	nfidence rval Upper Bound	
S4 O10: The data			Post 1 (BCMA stabilization)	-1.344	.512	.033	-2.60	08	
information available through the current medication administration system is easy to get when I need that		PRE (Defore BCMA)	Post 2 (BCMA)	-1.186	.566	.121	-2.58	21	
	Profession		PRE (before BCMA)	1.344	.512	.033	.08	2.60	
	Bonferroni	Post 1 (BCMA stabilization)	Post 2 (BCMA)	.158	.529	1.000	-1.14	1.46	
		Dest 2 (DOMA)	PRE (before BCMA)	1.186	.566	.121	21	2.58	
information.		Post 2 (BCMA)	Post 1 (BCMA stabilization)	158	.529	1.000	-1.46	1.14	
	Games- Howell			Post 1 (BCMA stabilization)	-2.279	.457	.000	-3.39	-1.17
S4_Q12: The current		PRE (Delore BCMA)	Post 2 (BCMA)	-2.020	.544	.003	-3.38	66	
medication administration		Post 1 (BCMA stabilization)	PRE (before BCMA)	2.279	.457	.000	1.17	3.39	
system neips me to be efficient at medication administration.			Post 2 (BCMA)	.260	.614	.906	-1.25	1.77	
		Post 2 (BCMA)	PRE (before BCMA)	2.020	.544	.003	.66	3.38	
			Post 1 (BCMA stabilization)	260	.614	.906	-1.77	1.25	
	1	PRE (before BCMA)	Post 1 (BCMA stabilization)	-1.453	.456	.008	-2.56	34	
S4_Q13: The current			Post 2 (BCMA)	-1.472	.579	.048	-2.93	01	
system makes it easy to	Games-	Sames-	PRE (before BCMA)	1.453	.456	.008	.34	2.56	
check that I am following	Howell	FOST (BOWA Stabilization)	Post 2 (BCMA)	019	.656	1.000	-1.64	1.60	
the "5 rights" when I administer medications		Post 2 (PCMA)	PRE (before BCMA)	1.472	.579	.048	.01	2.93	
danimeter modeatorio.		FUSI Z (DUIVIA)	Post 1 (BCMA stabilization)	.019	.656	1.000	-1.60	1.64	
		PPE (before BCMA)	Post 1 (BCMA stabilization)	-1.456	.504	.017	-2.68	23	
S4_Q16: The current		FRE (DEIDLE DOWA)	Post 2 (BCMA)	-1.173	.552	.101	-2.53	.19	
medication administration	Games-		PRE (before BCMA)	1.456	.504	.017	.23	2.68	
he nurses who administer	Howell	POSET (BOWA Stabilization)	Post 2 (BCMA)	.282	.575	.876	-1.12	1.69	
medications.		Dect 2 (DCMA)	PRE (before BCMA)	1.173	.552	.101	19	2.53	
		POSIZ (BCMA)	Post 1 (BCMA stabilization)	282	.575	.876	-1.69	1.12	

Table 5. Questions 10, 12, 13 & 16 Statistical Results.



Figure 3. Graphical Representation of Questions 10, 12, 13 & 16 Results.

Survey Section 7: Q23-29

Homogeneity of variances (over study time periods) held for all questions. No questions showed a statistically significant omnibus ANOVA.

Question 30: Overall, how satisfied are you with the current medication administration system?

Homogeneity of variances (over study time periods) held for this question. This question showed a statistically significant omnibus ANOVA, p-value = 0.023 and indicates a trend of increasing dissatisfaction from pre to post time periods. Figure 4 shows the dissatisfaction at MYMC (rural facility) was slightly worse than the flagship hospital, Memorial, with a greater disparity in satisfaction at MYMC. Please note the sample sizes were drastically different.

#### The pairwise results follow:

Dependent Variable		(I) Study Time Period (J) Study Time Period		Mean		-	95% Confidence Interval	
				Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
		PRE (before BCMA) N,PRE = 17       Bonferroni       Post 1 (BCMA stabilization) N,Post 1 = 25       Post 2 (BCMA)	Post 1 (BCMA stabilization)	1.762	.727	056	03	3.56
S_Q30: Overall, how satisfied are you with the current medication administration system?	Bonferroni ?		Post 2 (BCMA)	2 082	.819	.042	.06	4.11
			PRE (before BCMA)	-1.762	.727	056	-3.56	.03
			Post 2 (BCMA)	.320	.755	1 000	-1.55	2.19
			PRE (before BCMA)	-2 082	.819	042	-4.11	06
	President.	N,Post 2 = 15	Post 1 (BCMA stabilization)	320	.755	1 000	-2.19	1.55

Table 6. Question 30 Statistical Results.



Q30: Overall Satsifaction with BCMA



Figure 4. Overall satisfaction with BCMA by hospital over all time periods.

Despite the overall dissatisfaction of the BCMA system, a majority of nurses (71%) agreed in Figure 5 positively that the system was effective in reducing and preventing medication errors. These qualitative results will be considered in regards to the quantitative analysis of error counts/rates.



The current medication administration system is effective in reducing and preventing medication errors.

Figure 5. Nurse opinion on BCMA reducing and preventing medication errors, POST 2.

The survey asked the respondents to input a unique code ("SUM") so that related-samples analysis could be performed over the three time periods, baseline, Post 1, and Post 2. Unfortunately, too few respondents followed the instructions or were employed during all time points. Only six responses were common between baseline and Post 1, seven between baseline and Post 2, and two over all three time periods. This sample size does not meet the generally accepted threshold of ten for analysis to be undertaken.

The electronic survey was communicated internally with staff at MYMC and a link was made available on the MYMC Intranet page in early January 2013 (POST 2). The validated survey instrument by Hurley et al. (see Appendix 3) was identical to the one conducted at the flagship Memorial Medical Center. A total of 17 surveys were completed within four weeks, with two of those not 100% complete. Data was collected at three different time points, PRE (baseline - 2011), POST 1 (3 months POST BCMA – 2012), and POST 2 (8 months POST BCMA). Statistical

analysis was then performed on the combined dataset over all three time periods. Tables 4-6 and Figures 2-4 present the survey results as indicated. Sample sizes are generally as follows but may vary by question; N = 17 (PRE), N = 26 (POST 1) and N = 15 (Post 2).

Please note that the positively sloped trend lines in Figure 2 and 3 indicate increasing dissatisfaction with the BCMA system per the ordinal response scale used in the survey instrument, refer to Appendix 3.

In conclusion, nursing staff at MYMC is less satisfied with the new BCMA system than the previous manual medication administration system. The second post survey results indicate that satisfaction continued to decline, which is surprising because most users and system effectiveness should be past the learning curve phase at this point. On the other hand, these results are not surprising because users are likely a close-knit group located in a small, rural facility and may be resistant to technological advances. As demonstrated by the comments in Table 7, various issues are present and contributing to their dissatisfaction.

Issue	Count
System not user friendly	11
Medication profile errors	6
Barcodes not scanning	4
Dangerous system	4
Communication problems between pharmacy and nursing	3
Medications not easy to find	2
Easier way to check med orders	2
Medication info not contained within application	1
Takes too long to pass medications	1
Timeliness of drugs dispensed	1

Comments added in response to open-ended survey questions during the Post time periods have been summarized in Table 7 below:

Table 7. Summary of Comments Received.

#### Physician eMAR Survey - CMMC

Given the low sample size (n=9) from the first announcement, a second announcement of the survey was sent to CMMC physicians, residents and physician assistants in late November 2012. A modest response was received during the first quarter, which included 30 new surveys. The current sample size of 39 represents 8% of the medical and resident staff. Below are descriptive results for a few key questions; statistical analysis is pending.









Figure 7. Access to eMAR module.



The new eMAR module has improved my decision-making and efficiency becausel can now electronically access if/when ordered medications were administered/from various locations.

Figure 8. Improved decision-making via eMAR.



Adverse drug events have reduced because of the bar coding technology andadditional nursing safeguard warnings/alerts in place to reduce medication errors.

Figure 9. Physician perspective on reduction in adverse drug events.

### Interim Medication Error Analysis - CMMC

The research team completed intensive review of all CMMC medication events as reported in the Quantros SRM event/incident reporting system. Researchers reviewed over 1,100 written incident summaries in detail and logically determined the impact on the MIDHT study using the nature of the error and when (phase) it occurred ("Applicability"). The PRE-BCMA time period is November 2010 – October 2011. The POST-BCMA time period is from November 2011 – January 2013. The additional three months was needed because of the phased BCMA deployment schedule at CMMC. All errors that occurred within a unit/department that has not deployed BCMA technology were removed from the dataset.

The influence of the MIDHT intervention on medication errors from before implementation, PRE, versus after implementation, POST, was investigated using the Pearson Chi-squared test. Fisher's Exact Test was employed as required, e.g. when the count of any cell in the crosstab being analyzed was less than 5. The ordinal variable, Study Time Period, was treated as the independent variable (IV). It has only two levels, PRE and POST, both which contain 12 months of data for each clinical unit. The statistical testing was applied in a stepwise manner relative to the variables treated as dependent. The dependent variables are as follows:

Variable Name	Variable Type	Levels
Error Disposition	nominal	Near Miss
		Actual
MIDHT	nominal	Voc
Applicability	HUITIIIa	res
		No
PHASE	ordinal	ORDER (1 <sup>st</sup> )
		PROFILE (2 <sup>nd</sup> )
		DISPENSE (3 <sup>rd</sup> )
		ADMINISTRATION (4 <sup>th</sup> )
		Other
Core Problem	nominal	Please see Table 10 for a
(Med. Error) Type	noninal	detailed listing

Table 8. Variable Name Description.

The stepwise analysis began with testing each of the dependent variables separately. The results were:

Crosstab	Chi- squared, χ2	df	Sample size, N	<b>p-value,</b> asymp. sig. (2-sided)	
Error Disposition * Study Time Period	18.43	1	1,101	< .001	а
MIDHT Applicable * Study Time Period	4.86	1	1,101	.027	а
PHASE * Study Time Period	11.39	1	1,101	.023	
Core Problem (Error) Type	180.77	21	1,101	< .001	
* Study Time Period					

a. Continuity correction applied

#### Table 9. Crosstab inferential results.

Sidak's correction for multiple testing was applied which reduced the testwise alpha criterion to 0.017. This correction is slightly conservative in that no correlation is assumed to exist among the variables. A correlation analysis of (between) the dependent variables revealed an average correlation of 0.1, which rises slightly to 0.3 if only the statistically significant correlations are averaged. Including the 0.3 correlation into the calculation of Sidak's correction yields a testwise alpha criterion to 0.019 and corresponding critical z-value for 2 sided testing: >= 2.3407 (critical z-value for 1 sided testing: >= 2.0695). Therefore, only Error Disposition \* Study Time Period and Core Problem (Error) Type \* Study Time Period crosstabs have a statistically significant result.

Core Problem (Med Error) Type
Bar Coding/Scanning Error
Charting Error
Drug Delay
Drug Location Issue
Drug Not Ordered
Drug Omitted
Drug Protocol/Policy Not Followed
Incorrectly Stamped Order Sheet
IV Related Issue
Medication Reconciliation Issue
Order Issue
Patient Not Compliant
Pharmacy Profile Error
Pyxis Issue
Wrong Dose
Wrong Drug
Wrong Frequency
Wrong Label
Wrong Patient
Wrong Quantity
Wrong Route

Table 10. Medication Error Type Listing.

These interim results indicate that Error Disposition and Study Time Period are not statistically independent over the entire dataset of medication errors; therefore differences in error disposition are related to the difference in Study Time Period. Standardized residuals of the crosstab revealed that cells of the levels of Near Miss for both Pre and Post contributed to the significant chi-square result. Collectively, this implies that the total of Near Miss errors (whether MIDHT Applicable or not) increased from PRE to POST. The standardized residuals for Actual errors indicate no contribution to the chi-square significance, which implies no statistically significant difference between time periods. Given this the statistically significant result for the crosstab of Error Disposition \* Study Time Period, a more detailed analysis was performed on a stratified crosstab of Error Disposition by MIDHT Applicability versus Study Time Period. No statistical significance was found for MIDHT Applicability on either level of Error Disposition.

The interim results indicate that the distribution of Core Problem (Error) Type differs over Study Time Period. The standardized residuals reveal the following variables contribute to that difference:

	Implication regarding change from PRE to POST
Drug Delay	decrease
Order Issue	increase
Incorrectly Stamped Order Sheet	increase

Note that the implications drawn from the Core Problem (Error) Type \* Study Time Period chi-squared analysis are with caution because:

- 10 cells (22.7%) of the 22 by 2 crosstab have an expected count less than 5
- 14 cells have an observed count < 5
- 14 cells have an observed count < 10

Table 11. Standardized residual results.



Figure 10. Medication Error Type by Period.

Common errors, such as wrong patient, wrong drug, and wrong dose all had a somewhat neutral change from PRE to POST. Either the frequency of each medication error type is so low that no significant change is detected or the error can be attributed to human error and therefore not affected between time periods. The culture of reporting errors had changed in the POST period, which complicates this analysis.

The medication administration process is not simply the act of administering medication, but rather complex processes involving multiple steps from numerous disciplines, departments, and users. Errors can appear at one, some, or even all stages between the medication order process (prescription) through the actual administration of the medication and/or possible adverse events. Though a specific error may occur prior to a patient receiving the medication, most errors are noted only once the medication is incorrectly administered at the bedside.

Despite the fact that BCMA strives to assure the "five rights" of medication administration – right patient, right route, right drug, right dose, and right time, most studies however have investigated the effect of BCMA on the rate of severity of the errors or the effect of the BCMA on the duration of administering medication.

Medication errors can vary depending on the differing levels of care per hospital floor. A recent literature review study <sup>1</sup>(Hassink, 2012) reports average baseline error frequency rates from 5.8-25.3% (1.6-27.8% if error times were excluded). Wrong time errors are generally considered to be less severe. Typical reports after BCMA implementation include a 30-50% reduction in medication errors, but only when time errors are excluded. For this interim data analysis medication errors are only listed as counts, rather than error rates. The final study report will include more detailed and more comparable analyses on rates.

The severity of drug errors will also be addressed in the final study report. Some studies have reported a nearly 50% reduction in risks post BCMA implementation <sup>2 3 4</sup>(Poon, 2010; Franklin, 2007; Morris, 2009). Error disposition (i.e. near miss or actual miss) per time periods, nursing unit, and other appropriate delineations may lead to subsequent conclusions about BCMA implementation. Initial discussions were rooted in the possibility that reporting frequency of actual vs near miss may differ (e.g. near miss may be reported less frequently to save time; or near miss errors may be reported more POST BCMA implementation because nurses were disgruntled/dissatisfied with the technology and/or disruptions to their traditional workflow, PRE implementation). The final study report will include more detailed and comparable analyses on error severity.

Most medication error research however has been completed in small units and thus for comparative purposes that final data analyses may examine the impact of BCMA on specifically identified nursing units at CMMC. Differences between nursing units must be considered because of nurse-to-patient ratio, as well as hospital census differentials.

Work-arounds performed by nursing staff must be acknowledged as a contributing factor on the medication error rates. The following table demonstrates manual override statistics from CMMC for July through September 2013. Though these reporting statistics are not available during the study time period, researchers will utilize this data to make inferences to the impact on medication errors by clinical unit.

McK Adoption HARx Analytics Medication Administration							
July - September, 2013 (3-month Average) N= 8,525 medications given							
Schedule	% w	Drug Warning	% w Drug	Quantity	% w		
Override	Schedule	Override Count	Warning	Override	Quantity		
Count	Override		Override	Count	Override		
83	2.96	79	2.86	39	0.62		

 Table 12. CMMC manual overrides by type (3-month average).

Considerations for future research are to see if medication errors could be segregated based on origination (i.e if drug dispensed from the robot vs the MedCarousel vs. manual picks results in any differences in the number, type etc. of medication errors). No past studies investigated user compliance in the BCMA system (ie. work-arounds with the BCMA system). Such may need to be re-evaluated over time since as system familiarity evolves, so could the work-arounds. Longer-term follow-up studies (> 2 years) are needed both for the aforementioned reason and also for examination of the degree and time post implementation.

## Nursing Time and Motion Final Results – CMMC & MYMC

The primary goal of the BCMA/eMAR implementation was to increase patient safety – hopefully not at the expense of procedural efficiency. A time and motion tool was employed to capture data capable of providing insight into changes of that efficiency for nursing (and pharmacy).

Study team personnel physically shadowed the clinician (RN or LPN) during multiple contiguous four-hour blocks of time during their work shift before (PRE) and after (POST) BCMA/eMAR implementation. Prior to shadowing, the study team met with the clinicians to confirm the completeness and accuracy of the activities listed on the time and motion tool, the activity (AID) index, as sufficient representations of the corresponding actual workday activities. Effort was made to obtain a representative data sample by varying the clinician, the hospital floor (e.g. patient type and load), and time of day of the observation. As used, the time and motion tool consisted of 35 unique activities (AIDs). The implementation of BCMA/eMAR was expected to alter nursing procedures particularly at the task (activity) level. Some tasks would be unaffected, some would be expanded in scope while others would be reduced, and a few would be eliminated. These procedural adjustments introduced variation from PRE to POST into some AIDs. The confounding influence of this variation was managed first through the defining of the AIDs so as to minimize the replacements from PRE to POST shadowing, and second by the categorization of the AIDs into work processes. The presumption being that the magnitude of any change at the AID level would not be so large as to change the process category of that activity. For analysis, each AID was placed into one of ten processes (PIDs); these processes represent collections of activities of related function, see Table 13. Nurse Shadowing: Process (PID) Details<sup>1</sup>.

Every time study personnel observed and recorded an activity, it represented an instance of that AID. When the observed task was not represented by a predefined AID, that instance was recorded using the 'other' AID. The time and motion tool recorded the elapsed time per each instance of an AID. The sum of the duration (time) of all the instances of AIDs yielded a total observation time per time period. Similarly, the sum of the time per instance of the AIDs assigned to a PID yielded the total time per PID. The total time of shadowing PRE and POST for each location was nearly equal (Table 13). A normalization procedure was therefore applied to allow for legitimate direct comparisons of the data between time periods (by location – CMMC and MYMC). The total time for each location by time period (PRE and POST) was calculated and used to normalize (rescale) the data. The

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> After further discussion, AID 19 was moved from PID 3 to 2; AID 20 from PID 3 to 11

elapsed time for each instance of AID was divided by the total time for each location. The normalized data was then multiplied by 100 to yield the outcome variable of analysis, dTime\_normd\_pct.

		per	Location a	nu mile re	nou		
		ммс		MYMC			
Time Period	hh mm ss	seconds	Observations	hh mm ss	seconds	Observations	
PRE	105:22:10	379,330	26	3:55:00	14,100	1	
POST	104:53:31	377,611	26	4:15:58	15,358	1	
difference between time periods	0:28:39			0:20:58			

Total Time
per Location and Time Period

Note: seconds have been provided to ease the conversion of percentages and normalized data found in the text into units of time

This derived variable represents the percent of total time (per location per time period) for each instance of AID.

The between time period analysis, PRE vs. POST, for each location was applied on the following levels of stratification:

- 1. process (PID) and
  - a. BCMA/eMAR (and related) activities
- 2. individual activity (AID)
- 3. intra-location geography by PID

A PID is a stratification of the data by aggregating every instance of specific AIDs of relatedfunction. Most PIDs contain multiple AIDs.

The BCMA/eMAR level of analysis focuses on a subset of AIDs of PID 1; specifically AIDs 4, 5, 14, and 24. This level of analysis was necessary since AIDs 4, 5, and 14 were directly impacted (replaced) by AID 24 (BCMA/eMAR, POST only). In fact, the data showed that AIDs 4, 5, and 14 were not used during the POST shadowing and therefore effectively eliminated. The tasks represented were now being accomplished by the BCMA/eMAR systems. Therefore, this analysis compared the aggregation of 4, 5, and 14 in the PRE with all instances of AID 24 (POST).

Table 13. Nurse Shadowing Total Time

Activity ID (AID)	Process ID (PID)	Process Description	Individual Activity Description	Process ID
1			Passing medications	1
2			Hang IV fluids	1
3			Retrieve meds from Pyxis, bins, or tube	1
4			Compare physical med to paper MAR	1
5	4	MED	Confirm "Five Rights"	1
7	<u> </u>	administration	Passing IM/Subq meds	1
8			Passing transdermal meds	1
9			Stock or Retrieve from MED cart	1
14			Transcibe med orders - paper MAR	1
24			eMAR	1
11			SCANning	2
19			review lab/rad results - computer	2
21	2	computer	Admissions	2
22	—	charting	Discharges	2
23			Standard	2
51		notiont related	Pt assessment-e.g. vitals	3
52	3	activities	Physician Rounding-listening	3
53		dottivitioo	Pt assistance-e g. meals	3
64	_	tolking in person	Colleague/Staff for Pt.	4
66	4	to::>	verbal report-out with nurses	4
71	_	toni	Patient/Family	4
76	<u>5</u>	MED-related in	terruptions ONLY	5
73	6	woiting	waiting for MED cart	6
74	0	waiting	waiting for Pxyis access	6
72	<u>7</u>	walking in	side	7
79			Patient (patient family)	8
80			Doctor	8
81	8	Phone	Nurse	8
82	<u> </u>		Pharmacy	8
85			misc.	8
20			fax, copy	11
55	Q	Paper	check or write PAPER charts	11
56	3		review lab/rad results - PAPER	11
70			Nurse's note for charting later	11
62	<u>10</u>	personal time-Any		10

Table 14. Nurse Shadowing: Process (PID) Details .

The AID analysis level is the aggregation of every instance of each AID used to create the PIDs. Intra-location geography is a stratification by unit within CMMC, namely:

- A9 = Ashman/Rose Pavilion, floor 9, Ashman section
- R10 = Ashman/Rose Pavilion, floor 10, Rose section
- GS5 = Good Samaritan Building, floor 5
- MS7 = Medical Surgical 7

These floors were chosen as a representative sample of CMMC based upon physical layout and patient composition. Given the size of MYMC (20-bed rural hospital), the intra-location geography concept is not applicable.

ANOVA analyses, between time period (PRE vs. POST), was accomplished for each location (CMMC and MYMC) separately. Applying an ANOVA analysis to dTime\_normd\_pct provides the

most effective manner in which to simultaneously account for both intrinsic characteristics of this dataset, sum of time and frequency, that influence the quantification of efficiency (productivity) and gross system changes. Analysis of the mean of dTime\_normd\_pct accounts for both components and provides directly comparable results across time periods. A family-wise alpha = 0.05 was set as the criteria for statistical significance.

The statistically significant finding on the BCMA/eMAR level implies that the implementation is being utilized as intended. Also, since no PID individually and only one AID individually, which likely would not be influenced by BCMA implementation, showed statistical significance, the results imply that the implementation of bar coded medication administration did not positively or negatively impact the efficiency of the nursing workflow at CMMC as analyzed. Please refer to Figure 11 and Tables 19 and 20 (Appendix 4) for details.



#### Figure 11. Nurse Shadowing: Summary of Percentages, CMMC

Note: Cumulative percent does not reach 100% because the "Other" PID is not graphed since these activities are not germane to the analyses.

PRE vs POST			PID	n, <sub>PRE</sub>	n, <sub>POST</sub>	p-value	Change of the mean <sub>POST</sub> relative to that of the PRE										
PIDs, individually				No s	tatistica	l significa	nce was found.										
BCMA/eMAR			1 (subset of)	432	681	< 0.0005	Increase										
						40	1	475	512	0.013	Increase						
		Ag	2	124	182	0.005	Decrease										
Intra-	by PID	GS5	No statistical significance was found.														
geography		PID	PID	PID	PID	PID	PID	PID	PID	PID	PID	MCT	4	269	264	0.045	Decrease
Beography			IVIS7	7	229	284	0.027	Decrease									
		R10	1	270	342	0.009	Increase										
AIDs, individually AID 3		1	238	179	< 0.0005	Decrease											

#### Table 15. Summary of Statistical Findings - CMMC

Also, for CMMC, analyses were conducted on average daily census (ADC), case mix index (CMI) and between intra-location geography. PRE was compared with POST. Given the sample size for the PRE time period, Mann-Whitney test was used. No statistical significance was found overall for the analysis by time period. The data set was stratified by intra-location geography and repeated. No statistical significance was found. The between intra-location geography ANOVA produced a significant contrast only between A9 and GS5 (p-value = 0.029) indicating that these two floors differ from each other on dTime\_normd\_pct. No evidence was found to imply that this result impacted the conclusions drawn overall.

#### MYMC:

Statistical significance was found for two groupings, 'MED administration' and 'Talking inperson', but no individual activities. Statistical significance was found for BCMA/eMAR level as well, implying that the implementation is being successfully utilized as intended. The findings must be viewed with caution since the data contains observations from only one clinician for one four-hour time period, which is insufficient to be a representative sample; an unavoidable consequence of the typically low patient census at this location. If the significance would hold for a more representative sample, the implication could be that BCMA has some influence at MYMC. Please refer to Figure 12 and Tables 21 and 22 (Appendix 4) for details.



#### Figure 12. Nurse Shadowing: Summary of Percentages, MYMC

Note: Cumulative percent does not reach 100% because the "Other" PID is not graphed since these activities are not germane to the analyses.

PRE vs POST	PID	n, <sub>PRE</sub>	n, <sub>POST</sub>	p-value	Change of the mean <sub>POST</sub> relative to that of the PRE
PIDs,	1	35	22	0.001	Increase
individually	4	16	28	0.03	Decrease
BCMA/eMAR	1 (subset of)	24	12	< 0.0005	Increase
Intra-location geography			No	ot Applical	ble
AIDs, individually	No statistical significance was found.				



# Pharmacy Time and Motion Study - CMMC

The research team completed time and motion observations of pharmacists and technicians starting the week of April 22<sup>nd</sup>. This data collection occurred after the implementation of the second MedCarousel. A total of 12 observations were performed to match baseline data collection, including the same day(s)/time(s) of the week and similar time of year (seasonality). Each subject was shadowed for a 4-hour period as detailed in the table below.

Date	Time	Position
April 22, 2013	7:00 - 11:00 AM	Pharmacist
April 23, 2013	9:00 PM - 1:00 AM	Pharmacist
April 24, 2013	8:30 AM - 12:30 PM	Technician
April 29, 2013	12:00 - 4:00 PM	Pharmacist
April 30, 2013	9:00 PM - 1:00 AM	Technician
May 2, 2013	2:30 - 6:30 PM	Pharmacist
May 8, 2013	10:00 AM - 2:00 PM	Technician
May 13, 2013	11:00 AM - 3:00 PM	Technician
May 15, 2013	3:00 - 7:00 PM	Technician
May 17, 2013	8:30 AM-12:30 PM	Technician
May 20, 2013	7:00-11:00 AM	Technician
May 24, 2013	7:00-11:00 AM	Technician

Table 17. Pharmacy Time & Motion Schedule.

The following chart displays descriptive results per process grouping.



Figure 13. Percent of Total Time by Process (PRE VS. POST).



Figure 14. Total Time per Process (PRE VS. POST).

The infusion of bar code technology into the pharmacy at CMMC had significant impact on staff, processes, and the overall atmosphere of the department. Upon preliminary examination of the data collected in 2011 (PRE) compared with data collected in 2013 (POST), multiple workflow process alterations have been noted. Information regarding patient census, staffing levels, process changes, etc will be considered for the final study report.

An expected benefit of automation is the consolidation of inventory in known locations to staff. Pharmacy technicians spent nearly the same amount of time filling medication orders between the PRE and POST time periods. This can be considered a positive result of the new technology, as the automation of processes did not increase the time for drug dispensation. However, efficiency gains were not quantitatively realized for this process. (Discussion as to the possible reasons for this result will be examined during the more in-depth data analyses.) The results do show a decrease in the amount of time spent crediting inventory; likely due to the automation process now employed to complete this task and/or the distribution of the prescribed quantity and type of drug(s) dispensed to the floor.

A reduction in phone calls and in handling paper (Fax, Print, Copy, Notating) has been shown during the POST period. This implies fewer calls from the floor (e.g. nurse) were received questioning the status of ordered medications as well as less hand-off communications (i.e. paper handling). A reduction in physical walking has also been realized, implying technicians are spending less time traversing to fill medication orders and is also demonstrative of the overarching role of the robotic technology – to fill patient prescription orders via automation.

The increase in personal time (e.g. meal break) during the POST assessment can be seen as a positive outcome from the perspective of employee satisfaction and perhaps increased task completion efficiency, as pharmacists and technicians are seemingly able to more consistently take scheduled breaks during shifts.

Initial examination of the data also revealed the following:

- A small decrease in time spent for order entry. This is expected because this process
  was not primarily impacted by technology upgrades or automation. Computerized
  physician order entry (CPOE), currently being piloted by a small group of CMMC
  physicians (not included in MIDHT scope) was anticipated to increase efficiencies, but
  was rarely observed during workflow shadowing.
- A small increase in time spent checking medications. This result is surprising because procedurally only 10% of medications dispensed from the robot are checked by a pharmacist (POST) whereas 100% of all medications manually filled by technicians were reviewed in the PRE period.

### School of Nursing Bar Code Medication Administration (BCMA) Survey

An abbreviated BCMA baseline survey was distributed to all nursing students on December 3, 2012. A strong response was received (n=102) before the survey was closed on December 14, 2012. Survey respondents that followed instructions received a token incentive for completing a valid survey. Five respondents stated in written comments that they would like improved access to medication carts for training purposes.

A total of 87 Conemaugh nursing students completed the POST BCMA survey during April and May of 2013, which included a good balance between 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> year students. The following select questions suggest a positive change in access to the system after additional medication carts were made available and a favorable opinion of the BCMA system on improving patient safety.

# Q5 Current status:







Figure 16. Access to medication carts – POST.

Comparison of mean statistics between PRE (Sometimes – 2.75) and POST (Very Often – 3.21) results suggest a positive change occurred through the purchase of additional medication carts for the School of Nursing. Ultimately, a favorable training experience was created through improved access to the BCMA system.



Figure 17. Impact on preventing medication errors.

Nursing students did not suggest any real change in patient safety deduced from the same median and mode for both time periods (Strongly Agree). Overall, they believe the BCMA system is effective is preventing medication errors but additional system usage did not change their opinion.





Overall satisfaction did not change over time with a median of 9.0 for both PRE and POST data sets. Nursing students have a favorable opinion of the BCMA system and likely cannot compare historically to the manual medication administration system previously used at Conemaugh.

# Arm 2: Health Information Exchange (HIE) via the Nationwide Health Information Network (NwHIN)

Subtask 2.1 Deploy a limited production, NHIN standards-based HIE focusing on the bidirectional exchange of electronic medical records between CHS and the Military Health System. CHS information to include data domains residing in acute care and ambulatory settings.

## **Conemaugh Activities**

The initial Virtual Lifetime Electronic Record (VLER) mass mailing was sent to 355 veterans on October 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup>. For the first quarter, 42% of patients decided to participate in the program. The mailing included a joint letter (see Appendix 5), two consent forms and marketing materials. Conemaugh handled all administration aspects of the mailing.

Once a Veteran returns completed consent forms, MIDHT staff "opt-in" that specific patient through the CONNECT Consumer Preferences Profile (CPP). VA forms are provided to them on a weekly basis as needed. Patient correlations are checked frequently to determine status of linkages.

Once a correlation is made between Conemaugh and the VA, MIDHT staff adds chart alert within the Allscripts electronic health record to notify providers of the event. This process was implemented in mid-November.



Figure 19. Allscripts Chart Alert.

Conemaugh staff completed refresher training with Portage Health Center on October 31, 2012 and Ebandjeff Health Center on November 14, 2012. New system users are added to the OpenDS directory service as needed and MIDHT staff also adds them to the "NwHIN Users Group" on a regular basis so they can access the CONNECT application via Care Portal.

An initial meeting was held with Dr. Lieb and St. Benedict staff on December 11, 2012, in which the VA Exchange project was detailed. The meeting went well and they were excited to participate. Invitations to known shared patients (n=62) were mailed on December 26, 2012.

Conemaugh staff assisted Northrop Grumman Corporation (NGC) during the month of December with the MIDHT server move to Chester, VA, including MPI, CAL, VPN and Care Portal configuration changes. Conemaugh worked with HealtheWay to update the UDDI registry with new GO-LIVE endpoints. The Conemaugh gateway had a downtime of 1.5 business days.

Conemaugh participated in VA testing activities on December 5, 2012. VA completed an adapter upgrade and we confirmed that the service was operational and that numerous C32 changes were reflected through xml examination.

Project team identified an issue where medication data (from Allscripts) for some patients was not being populated in the CAL response and therefore the C32 clinical document. Issue was resolved on March 27, 2013 and verified accurate through testing.

Conemaugh has been working with Sunquest Information Systems, Inc. to discuss an ondemand HL7 v2 interface for hospital-based lab results. A quote was prepared for client review. The addition of lab results to the Conemaugh C32 has been requested by Altoona VAMC stakeholders and will support coordination of care and quality initiatives. Conemaugh had been working with Sunquest Information Systems, Inc. to stand up an on-demand HL7 v2 interface for hospital-based lab results. A purchase order was executed on April 24th and sent to the vendor. Conemaugh has been frustrated by the lack of movement by Sunquest on this project. A project schedule was finally provided to CMMC on August 7, 2013, based upon availability of Sunquest resources. The project was expected to begin in early September but has been further delayed by the vendor.

Response by Veterans to the VLER mailing invitations continues to be strong. Table 18 summarizes various efforts during the quarter to increase the number of authorizations (i.e. patients opted in), including patients of CPG St. Benedict and a "Final Notice" mailing to patients (occurred in mid-February) of the initial pilot group. John Hargreaves met with four Conemaugh primary care practices during the month of March to discuss the purpose of VLER and HIE. System training was also completed with staff, showing them how to request documents from the VA. New CONNECT accounts were created in conjunction with user setup. We also have approached "shared patients" that do not have a primary care provider (PCP), patients with VA PCP's and patients with an independent PCP.
Item	# of veterans contacted	# of veterans that responded	# of veterans correlated
CPG St. Benedict	63	40 (63%)	39
CPG East Hills	74	43 (58%)	43
CPG Portage	140	46 (33%)	46
CPG Ebandjeff/Park Hill	119	53 (45%)	53
CPG Berkley Hills	55	35 (64%)	35
No PCP	463	101 (22%)	99
CPG Highlands	49	19 (39%)	18
CPG Dr. Pote	23	12 (52%)	12
CPG Dr. Gvozden	50	15 (30%)	14
CPG Drs. Massoud and Sirsikar	72	22 (31%)	22
CPG Dr. Johns	67	19 (28%)	18
VA Providers	58	14 (24%)	14
Dr. Munzer	32	13 (41%)	12
Dr. Trostle	18	4 (22%)	4
Other Independent Practices <sup>+</sup>	400	31 (8%)	4
Face to face	43	43 (100%)	43
TOTAL DURING YEAR	1,726	510 (28%)	476
GRAND TOTAL	1,743	526	492

† Invitations sent in September 2013

Table 18. Patient Authorizations and Correlations.

The difference in the number of veterans that responded and are correlated is not due to patient discovery failures but rather issues with VLER authorizations (e.g. not signed/dated, not completed) and the time delay for both organizations to "Opt-In" patients into their system. A small percentage of invitations have been "returned to sender" for various reasons, including those regarding deceased patients and address changes.

John Hargreaves, Project Manager, met with three physician practices to discuss VLER and health information exchange, including two independent practices (Dr. Trostle/Dr. Zeidan). Dr. Zeidan is a specialist and does not have shared patients identified in the list.

### eHealth Exchange Participant Testing

In order to be fully compliant with eHealth Exchange requirements after implementing a CONNECT 3.3.1.3 gateway, Conemaugh participated in the new eHealth Exchange testing program. After working six weeks with the testing body (The Certification Commission for Health Information Technology<sup>®</sup>) and support contractor for the Developers Integration Lab (Aegis), Conemaugh was the first participant in the nation to pass the 2010 Smoke Test Cases, 2011 Smoke Test Cases, and 2011 Security Test Cases on September 4, 2013 (see Appendix 6). Conemaugh was also the first VLER partner to complete the transition to 2011 services.

### **CAL and Document Assembler Code Donation**

In partnership with NGC, Conemaugh completed a code donation to the FHA/CONNECT team on October 11, 2012 and November 20, 2012. The second donation was requested in order to reduce the number of CheckStyle and PMD violations in order for the build to complete successfully. As of the end of the period, the CONNECT team has not integrated the Conemaugh code donations into the source code tree. Despite this delay, the binary files and instructions were made available to the community on October 18, 2012, at the following url:

https://developer.connectopensource.org/display/CONNECTR33/Dynamic+Document+Generat ion

The code donations were also reviewed by John Hargreaves and Allen Barger during the CONNECT Code-A-Thon on November 7-8, 2012.

### **Subcontractor Transition**

Conemaugh's subcontract with Northrop Grumman will expire on September 30, 2013. Conemaugh has competitively selected CGI Federal, Inc. as the new vendor to support Conemaugh's eHealth Exchange production environment on an as needed basis. We also received proposals from Northrop Grumman, Cogon Systems and MEDfx. The time and material agreement is being drafted and should be executed the first week of October.

Before Northrop Grumman's contract expired, MIDHT equipment was moved to the hospital data center in Johnstown, PA on September 23, 2013. A minimal two-day downtime occurred while the servers were put into operation in the new location with appropriate networking gear and Internet service. Follow-up testing was completed to ensure the production UDDI change was successful.

### **Allscripts Clinical Analytics**

The Allscripts Clinical Analytics application was remotely demonstrated for MIDHT team, CPG, and MIS staff on September 23, 2013. All MIDHT-related questions raised were addressed during the demonstration or via follow-up email communications from Allscripts. Current plan is to contract in October and install in early February 2014 as soon as Allscripts v11.4.1 upgrade is operational.

### Northrop Grumman Subcontractor Support

The following activities are selected highlights completed by Northrop Grumman during the year.

### Cycle 4 development:

- Increased the max\_allowed\_packet size in MySQL to allow for large BLOBs to be saved to the audit repository table.
- Modified the VA style sheet so that the date values in the Lab Results section are formatted and the header of each C32 section contains information about the patient (name, date of birth).
- Moved the location of the Lab Results comments in the VA style sheet from the last column in the Lab Results table to a new row that directly follows the current entry in order to reduce document size.
- Added functionality to the VA style sheet that allows the user to dynamically change the font size of the C32 content.
- Monitored patient correlations and communicated updates to Conemaugh
- Generated bi-weekly audit logs and delivered to Conemaugh
- Appended "(INCLUDES LAB RESULTS)" to the end of the "34133-9 Summarization of Episode Note" entry in the CONNECT Universal Client GUI's Select Document Types drop-down box.
- Determined that a display issue with the Problem date values was the result of the XML that is returned from the VA.
- On January 17, 2013, the new ENTRUST Certificate (valid for one year) was successfully installed
- Hid the CONNECT Universal Client GUI's service time query components (VA currently experiencing an issue with proper handling) and added the Document Query response's serviceStartTime value to the Document Query results table
- No longer populating the CHS C32 Allergy Event Type with the CAL response value.
   Instead, set the Allergy Event Type to the valid Snomed Code value of "Propensity to adverse reactions (disorder)"
- Inspected the Sig, Order Expiration, Provider, and Dispense Date fields in the Medications section of the CHS C32 for missing values
- Determined the CAL Medications response does not contain pharmacy information
- Made the following changes in production to the Medications section of the Conemaugh
   C32 document per request from VA:
  - Populated the substanceAdministration text tags with only the medication Sig value
  - Put the section text <content> tags in the same order as the corresponding SubstanceAdministration entries

- Changed the ID attribute of each section <content> tag to be the medication Sig value instead of the name of the medication
- Always display "N/A" for service time in the Document Search Results table for C32 documents that are returned to the CONNECT Universal Client GUI
- Corrected the spelling of what's supposed to be the word "Document" in the first column of the Document Search Results table.
- Created user accounts in OpenDS and updated passwords as requested.
- When requested, queried the MIDHT Audit Repository to confirm the Retrieve Document actions of certain VA users.
- In response to the Healtheway eHealth Exchange support staff assuming administrative control for the UDDI domain registrar services, connectivity from the production Conemaugh gateway to the production eHealth Exchange UDDI was tested on July 8, 2013.
- Prevented the CONNECT Universal Client GUI's Logout button and User's Manual link from disappearing when a user selected a date from the Patient Search tab's calendar control.
- Provided Conemaugh documentation regarding how to efficiently create audit log files and the correlations tables in Excel format.
- Provided Conemaugh a list of all the "projects" that have been changed or added to support Lab Results.
- Provided Conemaugh with documentation regarding how new MIDHT users are added to OpenDS.
- Provided Conemaugh with instructions on how to determine which Conemaugh documents are provided to the VA.
- Helped Conemaugh troubleshoot an issue with their updated UDDI registry entries.

### TATRC Partners and Open Source Community Outreach

- NGC became a regular participant in the eHealth Exchange Spec Factory all-hands weekly teleconference.
- NGC continued to participate in the bi-weekly CONNECT Sprint Review and Planning Session meetings.
- COGON Systems reached out to Allen Barger for help with validating the C62 document that they had been sending to the VA. Allen helped COGON validate their C62 document by performing the following actions:
  - Compared the COGON C62 document to a valid Conemaugh C62 document and suggested revisions

- Loaded the COGON C62 document into the CAL emulator, and then rendered it using the CONNECT Universal Client GUI.
- On July 1, 2013, Allen Barger met with staff members from Regenstrief and provided them with guidance and lessons learned regarding C62 document development.
- On July 22, 2013, Allen Barger participated in the Healtheway Testing Program Update.
- On July 25, 2013, Allen Barger dialed-in to the Healtheway Testing Brief.
- At the suggestion of Conemaugh, Allen Barger reached out to members of FHA to discuss the default Availability Status value in CONNECT.

### Transition to CONNECT v3.3.1.3

- Created and distributed a transition plan that documents the tasks that are required to move the MIDHT code base from CONNECT v3.1 to CONNECT v3.3.x.
- Created a Subversion trunk to hold version documentation that is pertinent to the installation & configuration of the MIDHT code on CONNECT v3.3.1.3.
- Evaluated versions of OpenDS that are suitable for deployment with the Java install that is required by CONNECT v3.3.1.3.
- Updated the MIDHT code base to work with the CONNECT v.3.3.1.3 Core Libraries.
- Provided TATRC the CONNECTUniversalClientGUI binaries for use with CONNECT v3.3.1.3
- Created and deployed a common Java library for the CONNECT Universal Client GUI and the Consumer Preferences Profile GUI. The library eliminates the need to have the same files stored in both the CONNECT Universal Client GUI and Consumer Preferences Profile web applications.
- Created and deployed an updated Initiate adapter for use with CONNECT v3.3. The updated adapter eliminates an extra web service call and facilitates the use of the CONNECT build script to compile the adapter's code.
- Updated the AdpaterCommonDataLayerEJB, AdapterDocumentAssemblyProxyEJB, DocumentAssemblyManagerEJB, DocumentManagerEJB, NHINAdapterServicesEJB, and TemplateManagerEJB projects to accommodate the CONNECTCoreLib changes in CONNECT v3.3.1.3.
- Resolved the CONNECT Universal Client GUI issue that caused patient id's to be persisted across GUI sessions and included in the SAML header of future transactions.
- Sample C32 and C62 documents were produced from the transitioned MIDHT code and sent to Conemaugh for review.

- The CONNECT v3.3.1.3 Entity Doc Query, Adapter Doc Query, and NwHIN Doc Query requests and responses were compared to their CONNECT v3.1 counterparts.
- The CONNECT v3.3.1.3 C32 and C62 documents were compared to their CONNECT v3.1 counterparts.
- The CONNECT v3.3.1.3 document repository, audit repository, and patient correlation tables were compared to their CONNECT v3.1 counterparts.
- Work began on transitioning the CONNECT v3.3.1.3 code from Allen Barger's development machine to the MIDHT-PREPROD33 server.
- A CONNECT bug may be responsible for wrongly populating the Issuer and Issuer Format SAML Assertion values in the Audit Log and Adapter Document Query web service requests.
- Work was completed on creating a document that outlines how to install and configure the MIDHT code stack, built from CONNECT v3.3.1.3, on a Windows-based server.
- The following changes were made to the MIDHT CONNECT v3.3.1.3 code base:
  - Properly formatted the Date of Birth (DOB) and telephone number values in the Patient Discovery request
  - Added an "XDSDocumentEntryType" slot, used to request both stable and ondemand documents from eHealth Exchange participants, to the Document Query request
  - Changed the value of the "returnComposedObjects" attribute, located in the Document Query request, from "false" to "true"
  - Changed the Issuer SAML header value to be compliant with the NwHIN Authorization Framework and Oasis SAML specifications.
- Delivered a document to Conemaugh that outlines how to install and configure the MIDHT code stack, built from CONNECT v3.3.1.3, on a Windows-based server.
- The following changes were made to the MIDHT CONNECT v3.3.1.3 code base:
  - Set the Initiate min score to 99 for both internal and external patient lookups
  - Prevented the CONNECT Universal Client GUI from caching the internal Initiate min score after a patient lookup is performed in the GUI
  - For every MIDHT document that is saved to the document repository, populate the document's AvailabilityStatus repository field with "Available" instead of "Active"
  - For DQ requests that originate from the CONNECT Universal Client GUI, include a \$XDSDocumentEntryType slot in the request if the targeted community supports the 2011 eHealth Exchange specifications.

- To more easily identify incoming 2010 DR requests, the print-lines in the v2.0 Document Retrieve Implementation class were appended with a 2010 designation
- Enabled complete builds of the CONNECT code stack by updating the AdapterFrameworkIntTest project to work with architectural changes that were made to the Dynamic Document Assembler code
- Increased the Document Query web service Proxy timeout threshold.
- The migration of the CONNECT v3.3.1.3 MIDHT code base from the MIDHT-PREPROD33 server to the MIDHT-GOLIVE server was completed on September 19, 2013.

### **MIDHT Data Center Configuration and Maintenance**

- Conemaugh granted permission to NGC to relocate the MIDHT equipment to a data center located in Chester, VA. The NGC facility in Johnstown, PA permanently closed on December 17, 2012.
- Essential MIDHT equipment was relocated to the Chester, VA datacenter during the weekend of December 14, 2012.

### VA Partner and eHealth Exchange Testing

- On November 13, 2012, VA test cases were executed to monitor C32 changes that were made in support of VA's Adapter Maintenance Release 5.0.1. During the testing process, several Conemaugh initiated Patient Discovery, Document Query and Document Retrieve requests were sent to the VA test system and the returned responses were examined for accuracy.
- Northrop Grumman examined the VA C32 module content, which was produced during Adapter 5.0.1 validation testing, for accuracy and reported the findings to Conemaugh.
- The DIL certificates were successfully retrieved from Aegis and installed on the MIDHT-PREPROD33 server.
- On July 31, 2013, Allen Barger attended the eHealth Exchange Participant Testing Webinar.
- The uddiConnectionInfo\_CONNECT33\_41.xml file, which is used to direct the CHS gateway to the DIL endpoints, was successfully installed on the MIDHT-PREPROD33 server.
- On July 25, 2013, Allen Barger met with John Hargreaves to review the CONNECT testing documentation and the DIL setup and administration instructions.
- At the request of the VA, Document Query tests were conducted for test patient NWHINONE on July 8, 15, and 17, 2013. The test results were extracted from Conemaugh's server log and sent to the VA for review.

- Helped determine if a NullPointerException, which prevented the DIL from sending requests to the Conemaugh test gateway, was originating from the DIL or Conemaugh's gateway.
- On August 1, 2013, Allen Barger attended a Conemaugh Test Gateway Kick-off meeting, which was organized by the VA.
- During a teleconference on August 13, 2013, Allen Barger discussed eHealth Exchange testing document metadata values with John Hargreaves from Conemaugh and Heather Geier from CCHIT.
- Northrop Grumman helped Conemaugh interpret a DIL error message regarding a missing patient id, and determined that a non-breaking space appended to the end of the patient id was the cause of the error.
- After eHealth Exchange validation testing concluded, the certificates, domain.xml file, and uddiConnectionInfo.xml file on the MIDHT-PREPROD33 server were configured for validation testing with the VA.
- On September 11-12, 2013, Allen Barger participated in the validation testing sessions that took place between Conemaugh and the VA.

### **CONNECT Code-a-Thon Participation**

- Allen Barger attended the CONNECT Code-a-Thon, held at Marymount University on November 7-8, 2012, in support of the MIDHT project.
- Allen Barger actively participated in discussions regarding the CONNECT code donation process and the Dynamic Document Generation plug-in code donated by Conemaugh.

### Lab Result Integration

- On February 13, 2013, Allen Barger and Emily Reynolds attended a meeting with Conemaugh to discuss the addition of Lab Results to the MIDHT C32 document.
- Using sample messages provided by Conemaugh, NG successfully parsed HL7 v2.2 Lab Result messages using the open-source HL7 Application Programming Interface (HAPI) library to HLV v3.
- Assisted Conemaugh with identifying the data objects that comprise a HL7 v2.2 message.
- Coding efforts have produced a C32 document containing a Lab Results section that is populated with static Laboratory Observation data. As changes are made to the Lab Results section of the C32 document, the document's adherence to the CDA/CCD-based specifications are routinely validated using the NIST testing web site.
- In order to determine if the Lab Results Integration code needed to be modified to handle multiple Lab Orders and Results messages, the Northrop Grumman MIDHT team

requested additional sample Lab messages from Conemaugh. The sample messages were received by the Northrop Grumman MIDHT team on April 8, 2013.

- In anticipation of the Conemaugh Labs interface requiring HL7 ORM message based requests, Northrop Grumman and Conemaugh researched the content and structure of the ORM message type. However, it has since been determined that the Conemaugh interface will require ORU message based requests.
- The Document Assembler code was successfully modified to accommodate the parsing and interpretation of messages containing multiple Lab Orders and multiple Lab Results (for a given Lab Order).
- The CHS style sheet was augmented with a Lab Results section, which contains a Date/Time field, a Result Type field, a Result Value field, a Reference Range field, an Interpretation field, a Result Status field, and a Source field. A revised CHS C32 document containing Lab Results was delivered to Conemaugh on April 3, 2013 for review.
- Code was implemented to allow the represented organization for each Lab result to dynamically change based on the hospital code value in the MSH section of the ORU\_R01 message.

# Subtask 2.2 Provide technical and documentation assistance on DoD-managed Virtual Lifetime Electronic Record (VLER) efforts.

\*\*\*\*\*\*No specific tasking has been identified by TATRC\*\*\*\*\*\*

# Subtask 2.3 Investigate productizing a Patient Consent module using established standards, such as TP20/XACML.

Conemaugh and NGC agreed to participate in the Jericho/UT-Austin DS4P Pilot in July 2012 by serving as a test CONNECT gateway on a simulated eHealth Exchange. Due to contracts and funding issues with others, the pilot began work in April 2013. More information can be found here about the pilot: <u>http://wiki.siframework.org/Data+Segmentation+for+Privacy+Homepage</u>

This pilot explores 12 electronic exchange scenarios and eight types of data transactions. To test these scenarios, pilot participants perform various roles. Jericho Systems serves as primary custodian of the patient's record and houses the Patient Consent Directive (PCD) repository. The University of Texas at Austin HIT Program simulates the role of a research university that requests the patient's record and subsequently acts as the secondary custodian of the information. Conemaugh plays the role of a marketing network that becomes the second requestor.

In support of the DS4P J-UT pilot, a CentOS Virtual Machine (VM) image was successfully retrieved from Jericho and installed on a MIDHT test sever in August 2013. Once installed, the GlassFish server contained within the VM was configured to use ports 443 and 80 instead of ports 8181 and 8080.

On September 19, 2013, Northrop Grumman helped the Jericho technical team establish a GoTo Meeting session that was used to support the Jericho/UT-Austin Pilot use-case demonstration. Northrop Grumman will provide support to Jericho until their contract expires.

Subtask 2.4 Assess and analyze NHIN-related activities, to include data center performance metrics, physician evaluation and usage of the NHIN Portal, and resulting benefits of HIE with federal participants.

### **Utilization Metrics**

All organizational and IRB approvals were received during the previous year. On July 16, 2013, the Conemaugh IRB approved the continuation of the study for an additional year. On July 24, 2013, the U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command's (USAMRMC) Office of Research Protections (ORP), Human Research Protection Office (ORP) acknowledged receipt of the continuing review documents and placed them in the protocol file.

Data collection continues with documentation of monthly transactions between Conemaugh and VA for treatment purposes as reported in Figures 20, 21 and 22 below. In addition, the number of sent invitations, returned authorizations and successful patient discovery correlations are documented in Table 18 and Figure 20 below. Northrop Grumman has provided monitoring statistics from the Glassfish server for much of the past year except for a two month period because the server unexpectedly stopped responding on July 23<sup>rd</sup>. The review and analysis of data center performance metrics is pending.



Figure 20. Patient correlations during year.

The increase in patient correlations has been positive and has been mainly dependent on patient response to the VLER packets sent via postal mail. It is important to note that failed correlations have been less than 5%, which is better than anecdotal concerns heard in other areas. This is likely due to the inclusion of Social Security Number used to make a match.



Figure 21. Summary Count of Clinical Documents Retrieved.

The increase in utilization is promising for the future of the eHealth Exchange and will likely increase after CMMC completes integration of lab data to the C32 document. The increase in documents retrieved is probably due to the flattening of the learning curve, the increase in patient correlations and the increase in users that have been trained on the new system(s).



### Figure 22. Clinical Documents Retrieved by Type and Direction.

I = Continuity of Care Document Inbound
O = Continuity of Care Document Outbound
O = Radiology Report Outbound
) = Discharge Summary Outbound
= Emergency Room Note Outbound
I = C62 Reports Inbound
)

Conemaugh providers prefer retrieving VA lab results and medication history via the continuity of care document (CCD). Retrieval of C62 reports from the VA has been minimal and was highly influenced by one user/day. Likewise, VA providers have preferred to retrieve the CCD from Conemaugh and also radiology reports. Retrieval of Emergency Room notes and discharge summaries have been minimal to date. Interestingly, the initiation of document retrievals is nearly a 50/50 split (Conemaugh N = 52, VA N= 48).

A total of 22 male veterans have responded to the health information exchange survey. Surveys have been sent to 37 veterans for whose health information has been exchanged in production. Below are descriptive results from a few important questions:



Figure 23. Survey respondent by age.



Figure 24. Survey respondent by gender.





Figure 25. Patient perception of HIE benefits.



Did you feel your health information was secure and private?

Figure 26. Data security and privacy.

The limited sample size of Veterans responding to the survey has had a positive experience with health information exchange between Altoona VA and Conemaugh. The majority of patients believe that coordination of care across providers has improved and has reduced the need for Veterans to hand carry their paper records to providers. More than half of survey respondents believe that decision making and quality of care has also improved and there is less duplicate testing because of the electronic exchange of medical information. Additional surveys will be distributed to grow the sample size.

A total of 19 Conemaugh Physician Group (CPG) providers have responded to the provider survey regarding health information exchange. The first six Conemaugh practices onboarded were given an opportunity to participate in the survey. VA has not provided permission yet to survey their staff. Please note only system users (n=11) were allowed to complete all questions. Below are results for a few important questions:



Please select your position.

Figure 27. Survey respondent by position.



Figure 28. Survey respondent by experience.



Figure 29. Provider access to the Exchange.



Please indicate which documents you have accessed through the NwHIN/VLER Exchange? (Please select all that apply)

Figure 30. Type of clinical documents accessed.



I am more satisfied with health information exchange via NwHIN than previous routines (fax, mail, not at all).

Figure 31. Provider satisfaction with HIE.

A few key observations are noted from survey results and personal interaction with providers. Clerical and nursing staffs are the primary users requesting data via the eHealth Exchange, only one CPG physician to date has been an active user. System usage would be higher but in some cases Veterans are still hand carrying their records, thus reducing the need to request information electronically. The most requested and important information to Conemaugh users is lab results performed by VA facilities. This fact promotes continuity of care and a reduction in duplicate testing. As aligned with patient input, providers believe coordination of care has improved and patients have less of a burden on them to hand carry paper records. Not surprisingly, all providers believed that electronic health information exchange has reduced the number of requests made to the VA medical records department. Over 80% of providers agree that the electronic exchange of health information is more satisfying than previous routines of fax, hard copy mail or not having the information at all.

### Key Research & Development Accomplishments

Arm 1:

- Completion of data collection and statistical analysis of staff and student nursing satisfaction of BCMA
- Completion of data collection and statistical analysis of pharmacy and nursing workflow analysis (time and motion)
- Intensive review of CMMC medication errors and interim statistical analysis
- Implementation of second MedCarousel in the pharmacy
- Implementation of McKesson BCMA analytics

Arm 2:

- Increasing trend in patient correlations, system users and document exchanges
- Transitioned to CONNECT 3.3.1.3 gateway/adapter in production
- First participant in nation to successfully pass new "eHealth Exchange" testing program
- One year in production phase with Altoona VA Medical Center/VLER

### **Reportable Outcomes**

- Submission of MIDHT code to TATRC and Federal Health Architecture
- Public presentations at CONNECT Code-A-Thon in Maryland

### Conclusion

The MIDHT project continues to implement and research health information technologies (HIT) within the Conemaugh Health System, located in Southwestern Pennsylvania. Core technologies under investigation include pharmacy robotics, bar code medication administration (BCMA) and health information exchange via the eHealth Exchange. Statement of work is being delivered as expected with few technology delays.

Significant progress has been made on both arms of the project. Research activities for Arm 1 have progressed, including an initial analysis on medication errors and completion of statistical testing on nursing workflow and satisfaction. CMMC is participating in the 14th Virtual Lifetime Electronic Record pilot nationwide via data exchange with the Altoona VA Medical Center (Arm 2). Patient correlations, system users and document exchange all have increased throughout the year. CMMC was the first participant in the nation to pass the new "eHealth Exchange" testing program (2010/2011 services).

## Appendices

Appendix A – Acronym List

<u>Acronym</u>	Description/Definition
API	Application Programming Interface
BCMA	Bar Code Medication Administration
CAL	Common Access Layer
CHS	Conemaugh Health System
CMMC	Conemaugh Memorial Medical Center
COTS	Commercial Off The Shelf
СРР	Consumer Preferences Profile
CVMH	Conemaugh Valley Memorial Hospital (dba "CMMC")
DQ	Document Query
DoD	Department of Defense
FHA	Federal Health Architecture
GUI	Graphical User Interface
HIE	Health Information Exchange
JIRA	Bug tracking software
LDAP	Lightweight Directory Access Protocol
MHS	Military Health System
MIMC	Conemaugh Miners Medical Center
MIDHT	Military Interoperable Digital Hospital Testbed
MIS	Management Information Systems
MPI	Master Patient Index
MYMC	Conemaugh Meyersdale Medical Center
NGC	Northrop Grumman Corporation
NwHIN	Nationwide Health Information Network (now called "eHealth Exchange")
OID	Object Identifier
ONC	Office of the National Coordinator for HIT
OpenDS	Open Directory Service
PD	Patient Discovery
PHI	Protected Health Information
PMD	A static ruleset based Java source code analyzer that
	identifies potential problems
QD	Query for Documents
RCMR	Message for document metadata and content query/response
RD	Retrieve Documents
SAML	Security Access Markup Language
SAN	Storage Area Network
SOW	Statement of Work

SRM	Safety and Risk Management
SSO	Single Sign On
SVN	Subversion
TATRC	Telemedicine & Advanced Technology Research Center
UC	Universal Client
UDDI	Universal Description Discovery and Integration
USAMRMC	United States Army Medical Research and Materiel Command
VA	U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs
VAMC	Veterans Affairs Medical Center
VLER	Virtual Lifetime Electronic Record
VNX	Unified Storage Platform by EMC
VPN	Virtual Private Network
WSDL	Web Services Description Language
XDS	Cross-Enterprise Document Sharing

Appendix 1 – MedCarousel 2 Layout



### **Appendix 2 – BCMA Analytics Reports**

	Dep	Entit artmen	y: 01 ht: Show All	Refr	esh			
			Previous	5 Months				
Measure	Nov Dec 2012 2012		Jan 2013	Feb 2013	Mar 2013	Month	Goal	Achievement
and the second second second				Medi	cation Admini	stration		
Total # of Med Admin Attempts	ţ.	ţ	315,216*	184,894*	156,625*	36,156*		
% Med Admins Given	‡	ţ	85.7%*	84.6%*	84.0%*	83.8%*		
% Med Admins w/Drug Barcode Scanned	‡	‡	95.7%*	95.0%*	94.3%*	94.5%*		
% Med Admins Given Early	‡	‡	3.6%*	4.1%*	5.0%*	4.3%*		
% Med Admins Given Late	‡	ţ	14.1%*	15.8%*	16.7%*	16.7%*		
% Admins wNo Med Order Found Override	‡	‡	1.1%*	1.2%*	1.3%*	1.3%*		
% Admins w/ Quantity Override	t	t	0.7%*	0.7%*	0.7%*	0.6%*		
% Admins w/No Schedule Found Override	ţ.	‡	1.2%*	1.3%*	1.4%*	1.4%*		
				Medicatio	n Administrat	ion Warnings		
Total # of Med Admin Warnings	‡	ţ.	180,638*	126,397*	112,451*	25,483*		
% Med Admin Warnings Overridden	‡	‡	44.6%*	48.3%*	48.9%*	47.3%*		
% Med Admin Warnings Leading to Modify	ţ.	t	52.4%*	48.7%*	48.5%*	49.8%*		
% Med Admin Warnings Leading to Cancel	‡	ţ	52.4%*	48.7%*	48.5%*	49.8%*		
					V Administrat	tion		
Total # of IV Administrations	‡	t	13,345*	8,535*	8,866*	1,910*		1
% IV Admin Starts	ŧ	t	48.1%*	47.8%*	48.3%*	49.3%*		
% IV Starts w/ IV Barcode Scanned	‡	ţ	71.3%*	63,3%*	66.2%*	70.5%*		
% IV Admins w/ Wristband Scanned	‡	t	88.9%*	90.1%*	90.2%*	89.1%*		

#### McK Adoption Horizon AdminRx Analytics

aı	nce A	na	alyti	cs	тм						Da	shi	board		Highlights	Reports	Resources	Scorecards	Logout
-	Display		Aler	ts •	1	Drill Up	Drill Top	•	Export	٠	Print		Preferences	•	Startup				

### McK Adoption HARx Analytics Medication Administration

#### Drill 1 of 8: Month Medication was Charted

Month Medication was Charted	Total Med Admin Attempts	Given	% Barcode Scanned	Schedule Override Count	% wSchedule Override	Drug Warning Override Count	Quantity Override Count	% wQuantity Override
2013_01_January	321,244	275,332	95.6%	3,305	1.2%	3,067	2,026	0.7%
2013_02_February	188,333	159,506	95.0%	2,005	1.3%	1,910	1,078	0.7%
2013_03_March	159,407	133,921	94.3%	1,831	1.4%	1,689	954	0.7%
2013_04_April	16,363	13,612	94.8%	208	1.5%	197	69	0.5%
Report Total	685,347	582,371	95.1%	7,349	1.3%	6,863	4,127	0.7%

. Top of page .

IT Adoption Horizon Admin Rx Analytics 1.2

. Top of page .

ormance Analytics™ Dashboard Highlights Reports Resources

Display • Alerts • Drill Up • Drill Top • Export • Print • Preferences • Startup

McK Adoption HARx Analytics Medication Administration

Drill 1 of 8: Month Medication was Charted Drill 2 of 8: Primary Medication Name; from Month Medication was Charted / 2013\_03\_March

Primary Medication Name	Total Med Admin Attempts	Given	% Given	Barcode Scanned Count	% Barcode Scanned	Schedule Override Count	% wSchedule Override	Drug Warning Override Count	% wDrug Warning Override	Given Late	% Given Late	Given Early	% Given Early	
METOPROLOL TARTRATE	2,904	2,552	87.9%	2,332	91.4%	11	0.4%	11	0.4%	480	18.8%	49	1.9%	
SODIUM CHLORIDE 0.9 %	2,899	1,952	67.3%	1,720	88.1%	144	7.4%	146	7.5%	459	23.5%	7	0.4%	
INSULIN LISPRO	2,779	2,515	90.5%	2,344	93.2%	22	0.9%	15	0.6%	82	3.3%	6	0.2%	11
POTASSIUM CHLORIDE	1,808	1,579	87.3%	1,547	98.0%	11	0.7%	11	0.7%	474	30.0%	22	1.4%	
ENOXAPARIN SODIUM	1,745	1,570	90.0%	1,543	98.3%	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	476	30.3%	57	3.6%	
HEPARIN SODIUM (PORCINE)	1,743	1,578	90.5%	1,546	98.0%	10	0.6%	11	0.7%	213	13.5%	61	3.9%	
LORAZEPAM	1,664	1,534	92.2%	1,460	95.2%	42	2.7%	37	2.4%	130	8.5%	68	4.4%	
ACETAMINOPHEN	1,639	1,567	95.6%	1,526	97.4%	18	1.1%	12	0.8%	67	4.3%	12	0.8%	
GABAPENTIN CAP	1,583	1,492	94.3%	1,487	99.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	218	14.6%	90	6.0%	
SIMVASTATIN	1,478	1,411	95.5%	1,396	98.9%	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	153	10.8%	114	8.1%	
FENTANYL CITRATE (PF)	1,424	1,404	98.6%	1,241	88.4%	91	6.5%	86	6.1%	4	0.3%	0	0.0%	
OXYCODONE	1,372	1,317	96.0%	1,299	98.6%	2	0.2%	2	0.2%	86	6.5%	12	0.9%	1
	1 000	1 010	00 00/	1 200	00 40/	45	4 40/	10	0.00/	20	0 70/	0	0 70/	

### Page 1 of 8 [ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 ]

Drill 1 of 8: Month Medication was Charted Drill 2 of 8: Primary Medication Name; from Month Medication was Charted / 2013\_03\_March Drill 3 of 8: Department where Medication was Given; from Primary Medication Name / LORAZEPAM

Department where Medication was Given	<u>Total Med</u> <u>Admin</u> <u>Attempts</u>	Given	% Given	Barcode Scanned Count	% Barcode Scanned	Schedule Override Count	% wSchedule Override	Drug Warning Override Count	% wDrug Warning Override	Given Late	% Given Late	Given Early	% Given Early
G4	184	170	92.4%	156	91.8%	4	2.4%	4	2.4%	11	6.5%	5	2.9%
G7	167	154	92.2%	130	84.4%	2	1.3%	2	1.3%	29	18.8%	2	1.3%
R1	128	95	74.2%	90	94.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	5.3%	3	3.2%
A1	123	113	91.9%	111	98.2%	1	0.9%	1	0.9%	9	8.0%	6	5.3%
G5	101	96	95.0%	91	94.8%	2	2.1%	2	2.1%	8	8.3%	2	2.1%
G6	97	94	96.9%	92	97.9%	2	2.1%	2	2.1%	12	12.8%	3	3.2%
A8	92	87	94.6%	86	98.9%	1	1.1%	1	1.1%	7	8.0%	1	1.1%
E4	73	71	97.3%	69	97.2%	1	1.4%	0	0.0%	7	9.9%	2	2.8%
A6	68	64	94.1%	61	95.3%	4	6.3%	4	6.3%	1	1.6%	1	1.6%
R8	64	55	85.9%	54	98.2%	1	1.8%	1	1.8%	2	3.6%	3	5.5%
R9	59	58	98.3%	52	89.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	5.2%	1	1.7%
E6	50	48	96.0%	47	97.9%	2	4.2%	1	2.1%	2	4.2%	0	0.0%
M7	44	39	88.6%	38	97.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	7.7%	0	0.0%
7R	39	35	89.7%	33	94.3%	15	42.9%	13	37.1%	2	5.7%	0	0.0%
A9	28	25	89.3%	22	88.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
MF	18	17	94.4%	16	94.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
S5	7	6	85.7%	5	83.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	1,342	1,227	91.4%	1,153	94.0%	35	2.9%	31	2.5%	101	8.2%	29	2.4%

### Appendix 3 – BCMA Survey Instrument

### Medication Administration System Survey - Nurses' Assessment Survey

### 1. Welcome

Thank you for participating in the Medication Administration System Survey -

Nurses' Assessment Survey (MAS-NAS) project.

Completing this form indicates you recognize that this is a research project. As a token of our appreciation, you will receive a \$20,00 incentive from Crossroads café or similar venue when you have completed the survey. After completion, please call 814-269-5232 to arrange receipt and please have your "SUM" available. We reserve the right to withhold incentive for any reason related but not limited to that which compromises the survey intent, data validity, completion compliance, or respondent eligibility.

If you previously completed a MAS-NAS, please complete this survey so we can learn how barcode/eMAR has changed how you administer medications. We will compare nurses' responses on this MAS-NAS with previous surveys completed in 2011 and 2012 to learn the impact of converting to barcode/eMAR on CHS nurses.

If this is your first MAS-NAS, we would like to learn your beliefs about the system.

Please create a five digit confidential identifier called SUM. This allows us to maintain your privacy while being able to compare surveys taken at different times. Even if this is your first survey, please compute your SUM. We ask you to calculate the following number and place it in the space provided. The number is the SUM of the last five digits of your social security number added to the last five digits of your home telephone number. If your telephone number changed, please use the number you previously used. Only the SUM of those two numbers should be recorded on the first page of the survey. If your sum has more than five digits, record only the last five. See example below.

Last five social security numbers = 52346

Last five home telephone numbers = 58721 SUM = 111067

ENTER 11067 (last five)

After calculating your SUM, please; Add your SUM on the next page and complete the survey.

Thank you for your participation in this important project!

### 2. Introduction

\*1. SUM:

\*2. Date of completing the survey:

Plage T

Medication Administration System Survey	<ul> <li>– Nurses' Assessment Survey</li> </ul>
*3. Nursing Unit:	
Meyersdale Medical Center	
Miners Medical Center	
Ashman 6 ICU	
Ashman 7	
Ashman 8	
Ashman 9	
Ashman 10	
O Rose 6 ICU	
O Rose 7 CICU	
O Rose 7 Telemetry	
O Rose 8	
O Rose 8 PCU	
O Rose 9	
O Rose 10	
○ E4	
O E6	
O GS 4	
O GS 6	
O ASU	
O PACU	
Crichton Rehab	
Med Surg 7	
O Maternity	
O Pediatrics	
Geropysch	
O Aloysia Hall	
O Behavioral Health	
O School of Nursing	
C Float	

Page 2

M	edication	Administratio	on Syster	n Survey	- Nurses'	Assessment	Survey

0	
()	TCL
$\smile$	

Other (please specify)

The following statements describe experiences and beliefs about the current medication administration system you use. By current medication administration system, we mean the institutional structures and operational policies that direct and support the process and procedures of delivering/administering pharmaceutical products to patients. This includes all activities from medication ordering to dispensing to administration and documentation as well as all supplies and technologies associated with the current medication system, such as computer terminals, medication storage units, drug/drug interaction information, patient education sheets, infusion pumps, tubings, syringes, etc that are required in the process of getting medications to patients.

Completing this survey should take about 10 minutes.

- By completing this survey, you are indicating consent to participate in this evaluation.
- Please read each statement and circle the number that best expresses your own experiences and beliefs.

There are no right or wrong answers.

Do not write your name on the survey.

Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each item by using the following RATING SCALE.

#### Choose:

- 1 if you strongly agree with the statement.
- 2 if you moderately agree with the statement.
- 3 if you slightly agree with the statement.
- 4 if you slightly disagree with the statement.
- 5 if you moderately disagree with the statement.
- 6 if you strongly disagree with the statement.

NA if the statement does not apply to you.

Example: The current medication administration system provides adequate information about possible mediation side effects. Answer: If you believe that you always have access to the type and amount of information you need to be able to assess for and manage potential side effects of medications you administer, you should circle 1 because that statement best expresses your belief.

#### **3. Questions**

4. Because of information available through the current medication administration system I know both the intended actions and side effects of medications I administer.

$O_1$	$O^2$	O 3	O 4	05	O <sup>6</sup>	() NA
Strongly	Moderately	Slightly	Slightly	Moderately	Strongly	Not
Agree	Agree	Agree	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Applicable

5. I find the drug alert feature (drug/drug or drug/food interaction) of the current medication administration system helpful.

O4 05 () NA  $()_1$  $()^{2}$ ()3 ()6 Strongly Strongly Moderately Slightly Slightly Moderately Not Agree Agree Agree Disagree Disagree Disagree Applicable





Page 4

Medication Administration System Survey – Nurses' Assessment Survey									
11. I know where all the medications I need are stored									
(either on the unit or if they need to be procured from									
the pharmacy).									
O 1 Strongly Agree	O 2 Moderately Agree	O 3 Slightly Agree	O 4 Slightly Disagree	5 Moderately Disagree	O 6 Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable			
12. The current medication administration system									
helps me to be efficient at medication administration.									
O 1 Strongly Agree	O 2 Moderately Agree	O 3 Slightly Agree	O 4 Slightly Disagree	O 5 Moderately Disagree	O 6 Strongly Disagree	O NA Not Applicable			
13. The current medication administration system									
makes it easy to check that I am following the "5									
rights"	when I a	dminist	ter medi	ications.					
O 1 Strongly Agree	O 2 Moderately Agree	O 3 Slightly Agree	O 4 Slightly Disagree	O 5 Moderately Disagree	O 6 Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable			
14. The	14. The turnaround time for receiving medications								
neede	d "stat" o	r for pa	tients n	ewly adm	itted to	the			
unit is	adequate								
O 1 Strongly Agree	O 2 Moderately Agree	O 3 Slightly Agree	O 4 Slightly Disagree	O 5 Moderately Disagree	O 6 Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable			
15. The	e current	medica	tion ad	ninistrati	on syste	emis			
effecti	ve in redu	icing a	nd preve	enting me	dicatio	1			
errors.									
O 1 Strongly Agree	O 2 Moderately Agree	O 3 Slightly Agree	O 4 Slightly Disagree	O 5 Moderately Disagree	O 6 Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable			
16. The current medication administration system is									
medica	ations.	are nui	363 WIN	o auninii 3					
1 Strongly Agree	2 Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	4 Slightly Disagree	5 Moderately Disagree	6 Strongly Disagree	NA Not Applicable			

Page 5

Strongly Agree	O 2 Moderately Agree	O 3 Slightly Agree	O 4 Slightly Disagree	O 5 Moderately Disagree	O 6 Strongly Disagree	O NA Not Applicable		
18. Inf medic: what t	ormation ation adm o do shou	availab ninistra ıld my j	le throu tion sys patient l	igh the cu tem help: have any	irrent s me to bad rea	know ctions		
from a O 1 Strongly Agree	medicati O 2 Moderately Agree	On. O 3 Slightly Agree	O 4 Slightly Disagree	O 5 Moderately Disagree	O 6 Strongly Disagree	O NA Not Applicable		
19. i have n	ave to kee nedicatio	ep stas ns l nee	hes of n ad when	nedication	ns to be em.	sure l		
O 1 Strongly Agree	O 2 Moderately Agree	O 3 Slightly Agree	O 4 Slightly Disagree	O 5 Moderately Disagree	O 6 Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable		
5. Ope	n-ended	I						
20. Ple systen admin	ease add a n and the ister med	any cor degree ication change	nments to which s safely e one thi	you wish ch compo and profe	about t onents o essiona current	he current m f the current lly. medication	edication a system su	administration Ipport your abili Ition system, wl
21. If y would	it be?	_					-	
21. If y would	it be?						2	

Medication Administration System Survey – Nurses' Assessment Survey									
22. Did you work on an in implemented?	patient nurs	ing unit at Cl	HS before BCN	1A (Admin-R	x) was				
O Yes O No									
7.									
Comparing now (using barcode/eMAR) w	ith the old system, p	blease respond to the	following 7 statements						
23. It is easier to do all th	e checking s	steps needed	during the me	dication adm	ninistration				
process.									
O Strongly Agree Agree	O Slightly Agree	O Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	O Strongly Disagree	O Did not use old system				
24. This is a safer system for patients.									
Strongly Agree		ntly Disagree	O Did not use old system						
Moderately Agree		erately Disagree							
Slightly Agree	O Stro	ngly Disagree							
25. With the new system,	it is easier t	o access info	rmation I need	to administe	ər				
medications.									
O Strongly Agree	O slig	ntly Disagree	O Did not use old system						
O Moderately Agree		erately Disagree							
O Slightly Agree O Strongly Disagree									
26. I am more satisfied wi	ith this new i	medication ad	Iministration s	ystem than v	with the				
previous one.									
O Strongly Agree		ntly Disagree	0	O Did not use old system					
O Moderately Agree		erately Disagree							
Slightly Agree	O Stro								
27. I have more time to sp	end with pa	tients.							
O Strongly Agree		ntly Disagree	0	Did not use old sys	tem				
Moderately Agree		erately Disagree							
Slightly Agree	O Stro	ngly Disagree							

Page 7

Medication Adm	ninistration	System S	Survey	– Nu	irses' /	Asses	sment Survey		
28. Barcode/eMAR has made the medication administration process more efficient for me.									
O Strongly Agree	0	O Slightly Disa	agree		0	Did not use	old system		
Moderately Agree	Moderately Disagree								
Slightly Agree	Slightly Agree O Strongly Disagree								
29. Medications a	are more readil	y available	when I	need ti	hem for j	patients			
O Strongly Agree	9	O Slightly Disa	agree		0	Did not use	old system		
Moderately Agree	)		Disagree						
O Slightly Agree	0	O Strongly Dis	agree						
8 Closing									
o. closing									
$\star$ 30. Overall, how satisfied are you with the current medication administration									
system? Please s	elect.								
O 1 - O 2	O3 O4	05.	06	07	O °	Ô٥	O 10-		
Completely Dissatisfied		Neither satisfied					Completely Satisfied		
		nor dissatisfied							
*31. How long h	nave vou been	usina the l	BCMA si	stem	(Admin-	Rx) with	patients?		
Less than 1 month		4-6 months			$\cap$	10-12 mont	ths		
1-3 months	3	7-9 months			0				
Please provide the following information about vourself and your background									
32. Gender:			1995- <b>7</b> 06-1999-1993						
			0	Female					
<b>U</b>			0						
33. Age:									
34. Highest nurs	ing degree:								
	O Diploma		S/AD	(	BS/BSN				
35. Number of ye	ars employed	as a nurse	:						
*36. Number of	years employ	ed by Cone	maugh:						
14 (17) - 1									

Page 8
Medication Administration System Survey – Nurses' Assessment Survey						
37. Number of hours worked	in a typical wee	ek:				
38. Typical shift rotation sch	edule:					
All Shifts	O Rotate D/E		O 7A-7P			
O Evenings	O Rotate D/N		O 7P-7A			
O Nights	O All Days					
39. Typical weekly schedule	:					
O mostly weekend/holiday		O rotate weekday	/s/weekends/holidays			
O mostly Monday-Friday						
*40. Current position:						
Staff/direct patient care (staff RN/NIC)		O education				
O leadership/management		O Student				
Other (please specify)						
41. Compared to your nursir	ng peers, how do	o you rate your	computer skills?			
O Above Average	O Average		O Below Average			
42. Do you use a computer a	t home?					
O Yes		O No				
43. How do vour rate vour sk	till at obtaining r	patient care inf	ormation from the Conemaugh			
computer systems?			-			
O Excellent O Go	bod	O Fair	O Poor			
44. Did you ever use barcod	e/eMAR in anoth	er hospital bei	fore working at CHS?			
O Yes		O No				
Copyright by Ann C. Hurley, Diane R. Lancast written permission of the researchers.	er, Judy Hayes, Anne Ban	e, Chantel Wilson Chas	e, 2003. Do not copy, circulate, or cite without			

Page 9

## Appendix 4 – Nurse Shadowing

### Memorial Medical Center (CMMC)

CMMC PRE (N = 26 observations - RN):

	Nurse Shadowing: Study Time Period = PRE, Location = MMC								
	Processes	ranked by	/ Total Tim	ne per PID			PI	D ranked b	y Count
PID	cumulative time, hh:mm:ss	cumulative % of time	% of Total Time per PID	Total Time / PID, hh:mm:ss	PID		PID	Count of Activity IDs	avg. time / AID, hh:mm:ss
4	20:48:13	19.7%	19.7%	20:48:13	4		4	1290	0:00:58
1	37:50:29	35.9%	16.2%	17:02:16	1		7	1217	0:00:33
2	53:28:41	50.8%	14.8%	15:38:12	2		1	987	0:01:02
3	68:09:45	64.7%	13.9%	14:41:04	3		9	600	0:00:50
7	79:14:10	75.2%	10.5%	11:04:25	7		3	559	0:01:35
9	87:35:16	83.1%	7.9%	8:21:06	9		2	252	0:03:43
10	92:57:44	88.2%	5.1%	5:22:28	10		8	227	0:01:12
8	97:30:48	92.5%	4.3%	4:33:04	8		10	90	0:03:35
6	98:30:09	93.5%	0.9%	0:59:21	6		6	51	0:01:10
5	98:37:32	93.6%	0.1%	0:07:23	5		5	13	0:00:34

Table 19. CMMC PRE: Details by Process.

CMMC POST (N = 26 observations - RN):

	Nurse Shadowing: Study Time Period = POST, Location = MMC								
	Processes	ranked by	/ Total Tin	ne per PID			PI	D ranked by	y Count
PID	cumulative time, hh:mm:ss	cumulative % of time	% of Total Time per PID	Total Time / PID, hh:mm:ss	PID		PID	Count of Activity IDs	avg. time / AID, hh:mm:ss
1	22:10:21	21.1%	21.1%	22:10:21	1		7	1261	0:00:33
2	41:42:02	39.8%	18.6%	19:31:41	2		1	1249	0:01:04
4	60:07:50	57.3%	17.6%	18:25:48	4		4	1109	0:01:00
3	72:12:12	68.8%	11.5%	12:04:22	3		9	598	0:00:55
7	83:46:53	79.9%	11.0%	11:34:41	7		3	491	0:01:29
9	92:56:34	88.6%	8.7%	9:09:41	9		2	363	0:03:14
8	98:28:14	93.9%	5.3%	5:31:40	8		8	221	0:01:30
10	100:57:21	96.2%	2.4%	2:29:07	10		10	39	0:03:49
6	101:05:17	96.4%	0.1%	0:07:56	6		6	8	0:00:59
5	101:07:23	96.4%	0.0%	0:02:06	5		5	3	0:00:42

 Table 20. CMMC POST: Details by Process.

## Meyersdale Medical Center (MYMC)

### MYMC PRE (N = 1 observation - LPN):

	Nurse Shadowing: Study Time Period = PRE, Location = MYMC									
	Processes	ranked by	/ Total Tin	ne per PID			PI	D ranked by	y Count	
PID	cumulative time, hh:mm:ss	cumulative % of time	% of Total Time per PID	Total Time / PID, hh:mm:ss	PID		PID	Count of Activity IDs	avg. time / AID, hh:mm:ss	
10	1:06:28	28.3%	28.3%	1:06:28	10		1	35	0:00:55	
3	1:53:05	48.1%	19.8%	0:46:37	3		7	17	0:00:41	
4	2:27:58	63.0%	14.8%	0:34:53	4		4	16	0:02:11	
1	3:00:04	76.6%	13.7%	0:32:06	1		3	7	0:06:40	
7	3:11:43	81.6%	5.0%	0:11:39	7		10	6	0:11:05	
9	3:20:48	85.4%	3.9%	0:09:05	9		9	5	0:01:49	
2	3:23:09	86.4%	1.0%	0:02:21	2		8	2	0:00:54	
8	3:24:57	87.2%	0.8%	0:01:48	8		2	1	0:02:21	
5	3:25:23	87.4%	0.2%	0:00:26	5		5	1	0:00:26	
6	3:25:23	87.4%	0.0%	0:00:00	6		6	0		

#### Table 21. MYMC PRE: Details by Process.

MYMC POST (N = 1 observation - LPN):

1	Nurse Shadowing: Study Time Period = POST, Location = MYMC								
	Processes	ranked by	/ Total Tin	ne per PID			PI	D ranked b	y Count
PID	cumulative time, hh:mm:ss	cumulative % of time	% of Total Time per PID	Total Time / PID, hh:mm:ss	PID		PID	Count of Activity IDs	avg.time/ AID, hh:mm:ss
3	1:42:04	39.9%	39.9%	1:42:04	3		7	44	0:00:48
1	2:40:13	62.6%	22.7%	0:58:09	1		4	28	0:00:59
7	3:15:08	76.2%	13.6%	0:34:55	7		1	22	0:02:39
4	3:42:51	87.1%	10.8%	0:27:43	4		3	10	0:10:12
9	3:58:57	93.4%	6.3%	0:16:06	9		9	4	0:04:01
2	3:58:57	93.4%	0.0%	0:00:00	2		2	0	
5	3:58:57	93.4%	0.0%	0:00:00	5		5	0	
6	3:58:57	93.4%	0.0%	0:00:00	6		6	0	
8	3:58:57	93.4%	0.0%	0:00:00	8		8	0	
10	3:58:57	93.4%	0.0%	0:00:00	10		10	0	

 Table 22. MYMC POST: Details by Process.

#### Appendix 5 – VLER Patient Letter





Dear Veteran,

There is a new way to share information with your healthcare providers in southwestern Pennsylvania!

The Virtual Lifetime Electronic Record (VLER) health program will allow you to share your electronic health information, via the Nationwide Health Information Network (NwHIN), with your providers who are members of the Conemaugh Health System and the James E. Van Zandt VA Medical Center in Altoona, PA.

We invite you to sign up for the VLER Health program by completing and signing the enclosed forms. After you join, your health care providers will be able to see your current medical issues, emergency room reports, discharge summaries, medications, allergies, and other important information in your medical record as necessary for your treatment. This information will be used to improve the care you receive from your providers, and avoid duplicating services. Access to your information will be strictly controlled and protected using data security standards commonly used in the banking industry.

Once you have completed and signed the forms we have included, please return them in the envelope provided. Signing these forms means that you are agreeing to share your health Information among health care providers in the NWHIN Exchange who provide your medical treatment.

If you have questions, please contact: John Hargreaves, Conemaugh Health System, at (814) 269-5277, and/or Barbara Rabiak, VLER Coordinator, James F. Van Zandt VA Medical Center, at (814) 943-8164 Ext. 8022.

We are proud to serve Veterans that served our country!

Scott Becker Chief Executive Officer Conemaugh Health System

ALCER

Medical Center Director James E. Van Zandt VA Medical Center

I) you decide not to join, do nothing. Your health record will not be shared with advant tealthcore facilities using this program. Your choice will not affert the care you menies from your providers, your future care of the VA of your VA benefits. If you choose in your now and later change your minel, please contact the VA Release of Information Office at (814) 943-8104 Ext. 8022. Appendix 6 – Testing Summary Report



Certification Commission for Health Information Technology

# eHealth Exchange Participant Testing Test Summary Report – 2010 & 2011

# **Conemaugh Health System**

10/25/2013

# **Document Change History**

Version Nbr	Date	Change Description	Changed By
1.0	10/25/2013	Initial Report for 2010	Heather Geier, CCHIT
1.1	10/25/2013	Merged Report for 2010 & 2011 (Initial Report for 2011)	Heather Geier, CCHIT

# **Summary Report Overview**

Date of completion	September 3, 2013
For	Conemaugh Health System
Applicant Primary	John Hargreaves
contact	jhargrea@conemaugh.org
	(814) 269-5277
Gateway Implementation Technology Vendor	Northrop Grumman Information Systems
if applicable	
Gateway Name and Version	CONNECT 3.3.1.3
Scope of testing	Conemaugh Health System tested 2010 and 2011 versions for eHealth Exchange Participant Testing.
	Testing validated adherence to the following eHealth Exchange specifications (unless otherwise noted):
	Patient Discovery, version 1.0 (2010) & version 2.0 (2011)
	Query for Documents, version 2.0 (2010) & version 3.0 (2011)
	Retrieve Documents, version 2.0 (2010) & version 3.0 (2011)
	<ul> <li>Messaging Platform, version 2.0 (2010) &amp; version 3.0 (2011)</li> </ul>
	Authentication Framework, version 2.0 (2010) & version 3.0 (2011)
Summary of test results	PASS: Conemaugh Health System successfully completed and passed eHealth Exchange Participant Testing for 2010 &2011, with the exception of known issues with the CONNECT gateway for versions lower than 4.0.

# **Test Results Summary**

# 2010 Version

# Smoke Test Cases

Service Set	Scenario	Test Case	Status	Analysis/Notes
SS: PRL-0000.0-	TS: PRL-I-0000.0-	TC: PD-I-0000.0-2010	PASS	
2010	2010			
SS: PRL-0000.0-	TS: PRL-I-0000.0-	TC: QD-I-0000.0-2010	PASS	
2010	2010			
SS: PRL-0000.0-	TS: PRL-I-0000.0-	TC: RD-I-0000.0-2010	PASS	
2010	2010			
SS: PRL-0000.0-	TS: PRL-R-0000.0-	TC: PD-R-0000.0-2010	PASS	
2010	2010			
SS: PRL-0000.0-	TS: PRL-R-0000.0-	TC: QD-R-0000.0-2010	PASS	
2010	2010			
SS: PRL-0000.0-	TS: PRL-R-0000.0-	TC: RD-R-0000.0-2010	PASS	
2010	2010			

## 2011 Version

## Smoke Test Cases

Service Set	Scenario	Test Case	Status	Analysis/Notes
SS: PRL-0000.0-	TS: PRL-I-0000.0-	TC: PD-I-0000.0-2011	PASS*	*Manually override status to a Pass
2011	2011			with a reason of "Failing only because
				SSN was part of message. SSN was
				verified to be sent correctly"
SS: PRL-0000.0-	TS: PRL-I-0000.0-	TC: QD-I-0000.0-2011	PASS	
2011	2011			
SS: PRL-0000.0-	TS: PRL-I-0000.0-	TC: RD-I-0000.0-2011	PASS	
2011	2011			
SS: PRL-0000.0-	TS: PRL-R-0000.0-	TC: PD-R-0000.0-2011	PASS	
2011	2011			
SS: PRL-0000.0-	TS: PRL-R-0000.0-	TC: QD-R-0000.0-2011	PASS	
2011	2011			
SS: PRL-0000.0-	TS: PRL-R-0000.0-	TC: RD-R-0000.0-2011	PASS	
2011	2011			

## Security Test Cases

Service Set	Scenario	Test Case	Status	Analysis/Notes
SS: PRL-0006.0-	TS: PRL-R-0006.0-	TC: MAQD-R-0003.000-	PASS	
2011	2011	2011		
SS: PRL-0006.0-	TS: PRL-R-0006.0-	TC: MAQD-R-0003.101-	PASS	
2011	2011	2011		
SS: PRL-0006.0-	TS: PRL-R-0035.0-	TC: MAQD-R-0003.301-	PASS*	*Manually override status to a Pass
2011	2011	2011		with a reason of "Known Issue"
SS: PRL-0006.0-	TS: PRL-R-0036.0-	TC: MAQD-R-0003.302-	PASS	
2011	2011	2011		
SS: PRL-0006.0-	TS: PRL-R-0036.0-	TC: MAQD-R-0003.303-	PASS	
2011	2011	2011		
SS: PRL-0006.0-	TS: PRL-R-0037.0-	TC: MAQD-R-0003.306-	PASS	
2011	2011	2011		

SS: PRL-0006.0-	TS: PRL-R-0037.0-	TC: MAQD-R-0003.307-	PASS	
2011	2011	2011		
SS: PRL-0006.0-	TS: PRL-R-0038.0-	TC: MAQD-R-0003.308-	PASS	
2011	2011	2011		
SS: PRL-0011.0-	TS: PRL-R-0040.0-	TC: MAQD-R-0003.315-	PASS	
2011	2011	2011		
SS: PRL-0011.0-	TS: PRL-R-0040.0-	TC: MAQD-R-0003.316-	PASS	
2011	2011	2011		
SS: PRL-0011.0-	TS: PRL-R-0041.0-	TC: MAQD-R-0003.317-	PASS	
2011	2011	2011		
SS: PRL-0011.0-	TS: PRL-R-0043.0-	TC: MAQD-R-0003.325-	PASS	
2011	2011	2011		
SS: PRL-0011.0-	TS: PRL-R-0044.0-	TC: MAQD-R-0003.326-	PASS	
2011	2011	2011		
SS: PRL-0012.0-	TS: PRL-R-0046.0-	TC: MAQD-R-0003.401-	PASS	
2011	2011	2011		
SS: PRL-0013.0-	TS: PRL-R-0052.0-	TC: MAQD-R-0003.421-	PASS*	*Manually override status to a Pass
2011	2011	2011		with a reason of "Known Issue"
SS: PRL-0013.0-	TS: PRL-R-0053.0-	TC: MAQD-R-0003.423-	PASS	
2011	2011	2011		
SS: PRL-0013.0-	TS: PRL-R-0053.0-	TC: MAQD-R-0003.424-	PASS*	*Manually override status to a Pass
2011	2011	2011		with a reason of "Known Issue"
SS: PRL-0013.0-	TS: PRL-R-0054.0-	TC: MAQD-R-0003.426-	PASS	
2011	2011	2011		
SS: PRL-0013.0-	TS: PRL-R-0054.0-	TC: MAQD-R-0003.427-	PASS	
2011	2011	2011		

# References

<sup>1</sup> Hassink J, Jansen M, Helmons P. Effects of bar code-assisted medication administration (BCMA) on frequency, type, and severity of medication administration errors: a review of the literature. *European Journal of Hospital Pharmacy*. 2012;19:489-494.

<sup>2</sup> Poon EG, Keohane CA, Yoon CS et al. Effect of bar-code technology on the safety of medication administration. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2010;362: 1698-1707.

<sup>3</sup> Franklin BD, O'Grady K, Donyai P, et al. The impact of a closed-loop electronic prescribing and administration system on prescribing errors, administration errors and staff time: a before and after study. Quality & Safety in Healthcare. 2007;16:279-284.

<sup>4</sup> Morris FH, Abramowitz PW, Nelson SP, et al. Effectiveness of a bar-code medication administration system in reducing preventable adverse drug events in a neonatal intensive care unit: a prospective cohort study. *Journal of Pediatrics*. 2009;154: 363-368.