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How To Submit a Question

- At any time during the presentation, type your question into the “Q&A” section of your WebEx Q&A panel.
- Please address your questions to “All Panelists” in the drop-down menu.
- Select “Send” to submit your question to the moderator.
- Questions will be read aloud by the moderator.
AHRQ HIE Webinars

• **Webinar 1 (today):** Factors Contributing to the use of Health Information Exchange in Health Care Organizations

• **Webinar 2 (April 21, 2016):** Advanced Application of Health Information Exchange Systems

(https://healthit.ahrq.gov/)
Learning Objectives

At the conclusion of this activity, the participant will be able to—

1. Describe the current use of Health Information Exchange (HIE) in various health care settings.

2. Discuss clinical and health care utilization outcomes associated with HIE in health care and other organizations.

3. Identify the facilitators and barriers to implementation and sustainability of HIE in health care organizations.


5. Explain the benefits of HIE implementation in LTPAC settings.

6. Describe existing policies advancing HIE and interoperability in LTPAC.
Health Information Exchange: Systematic Review and Future Research Directions

William Hersh, M.D.
Karen Eden, Ph.D.
Pacific Northwest Evidence-Based Practice Center
Department of Medical Informatics & Clinical Epidemiology
Oregon Health & Science University
March 16, 2016
Publications From This Work

Evidence Report/Technology Assessment

Number 220

Health Information Exchange

Prepared for:
Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
5440 Gaither Road
Rockville, MD 20850
www.ahrq.gov

Contract No. 279-2012-00014-I

Prepared by:
Pacific Northwest Evidence-based Practice Center
Portland, OR

Investigators:
William Hersh, M.D.
Annette Totten, Ph.D.
Karen Eden, Ph.D.
Beth Devine, Ph.D., Pharm.D., M.B.A.
Paul Gorman, M.D.
Steve Kassakian, M.D.
Susan S. Woods, M.D.
Monica Daeges, B.A.
Mariana Pappas, M.A.
Marian S. McDonagh, Pharm.D.

JMR MEDICAL INFORMATICS

Original Paper

Outcomes From Health Information Exchange: Systematic Review and Future Research Needs

William R Hersh1, MD; Annette M Totten2, PhD; Karen B Eden1, PhD; Beth Devine2, PhD; Paul Gorman1, MD; Steven Z Kassakian1, MD; Susan S Woods3, MD; Monica Daeges4, BS; Marianda Pappas5, MA; Marian S McDonagh6, PharmD

1Pacific Northwest Evidence-Based Practice Center, Department of Medical Informatics & Clinical Epidemiology, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, OR, United States
2Centers for Competitive and Health System Effectiveness, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, United States
3V norian, Affiliates, Maine Health Care Systems, Augusta, ME, United States

International Journal of Medical Informatics 88 (2019) 44-51

Review article

Barriers and facilitators to exchanging health information: a systematic review

Karen B. Eden1,2, Annette M. Totten1, Steven Z. Kassakian1, Paul N. Gorman1,3, Marian S. McDonagh1, Beth Devine2,4, Miranda Pappas5, Monica Daeges4, Susan Woods3,6, William R. Hersh1,2

1 Pacific Northwest Evidence-Based Practice Center, Department of Medical Informatics and Clinical Epidemiology, Oregon Health & Science University, 3181 SW Sam Jackson Park Road, Portland, OR 97239, USA
2 Department of Medicine, Oregon Health & Science University, 3181 SW Sam Jackson Park Road, Portland, OR 97239, USA
3 Department of Medicine, Oregon Health & Science University, 3181 SW Sam Jackson Park Road, Portland, OR 97239, USA
4 University of Washington, Pharmaceutical Outcomes Research and Policy Program, Box 357050, Seattle, WA 98195-7050, USA
5 Vironian, Affiliates, Maine Health Care Systems, Falmouth, Maine, ME 04105, USA

AHRQ Publication No. 15(16)-E002-EF

December 2015

https://effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/search-for-guides-reviews-and-reports/?pageaction=displayproduct&productID=2154
Outline

- Rationale
- Past work
- Effectiveness
- Barriers and facilitators
- Future directions for research
U.S. Has Made Substantial Investment in Health IT

“To improve the quality of our health care while lowering its cost, we will make the immediate investments necessary to ensure that within 5 years, all of America’s medical records are computerized … It just won’t save billions of dollars and thousands of jobs, it will save lives by reducing the deadly but preventable medical errors that pervade our health care system.”

January 5, 2009

Health Information Technology for Economic and Clinical Health (HITECH) Act of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA)
- Incentives for electronic health record (EHR) adoption by physicians and hospitals ($30B)
Leading to Substantial EHR Adoption

Office-based physicians (Hsiao, 2014)

Emergency departments (Jamoom, 2015)

Outpatient departments (Jamoom, 2015)

Non-Federal hospitals (Charles, 2014)
Although Less HIE Uptake, Especially in Ambulatory Settings

Hospitals (Swain, 2015)

Physicians and their patients (Heisey-Grove, 2015)
What is the Value of HIE?

• Value as demonstrated by evidence from scientific studies
  ▶ Can apply techniques of evidence-based medicine.
  ▶ When there are many studies, next step is to perform a systematic review.

• We undertook a systematic review looking at four major aspects of HIE:
  ▶ Effectiveness
  ▶ Use
  ▶ Implementation
  ▶ Sustainability

• Funded by AHRQ Evidence-Based Practice Centers program
  ▶ Contract No. 290-2012-00014-I, Task Order 11
What is a Systematic Review?

• A systematic review is a literature review focused on a research question that tries to identify, appraise, select, and synthesize all high-quality research evidence relevant to that question.
  ▶ Cochrane Collaboration
  ▶ www.cochrane.org

• A systematic review is only as good as the underlying studies reviewed.
Other Systematic Reviews of HIE

- **Older**

- **Published while we were doing ours**
Results of Literature Searching

Abstracts of potentially relevant articles identified through MEDLINE, PsycINFO, EMBASE, CINAHL, Cochrane, and other sources \(^1\) (n=5,221)

Excluded abstracts and background articles (n=4,371)

Full text articles reviewed for relevance to a Key Question (n=850)

Articles excluded (n=713)
- Not HIE=319
- Wrong study design=281
- Wrong publication type=1
- No comparison group=3
- No data that answers a Key Question=85
- Systematic review not meeting our requirements=9
- More recent data available=15

Final included publications: 136\(^2\)

Effectiveness: 26
- Harms: 0
- Intermediate outcomes: 8

Use: 58

Usability: 17
- Facilitators & barriers to use: 15

Implementation: 45
- Sustainability: 17

\(^1\)Cochrane databases include the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials, Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effects, and National Health Sciences Economic Evaluation Database

\(^2\)Identified from reference lists, hand searching, suggested by experts, and other sources

\(^3\)Publications may address more than one Key Question, studies may have multiple publications
Effectiveness of HIE

• 34 studies on outcomes
  ► 26 studies reported clinical (intermediate), economic, or population outcomes. Study methods included—
    o Retrospective cohort – 18
    o Randomized controlled trials (RCTs) – 2 (3 papers)
    o Cross-sectional – 2
    o Case series – 2
  ► 8 survey studies reported on perceptions of outcomes

• No studies evaluated primary clinical outcomes from HIE (e.g., mortality and morbidity) or explicitly assessed harms.
Categories of Outcomes (Number of Papers) Reported

- Laboratory testing (6)
- Radiology testing (9)
- Hospital admissions (8)
- Hospital readmissions (2)
- ED costs (2)
- Referrals and consultations (2)
- Quality of care in ambulatory settings (3)
- Public health reporting (3)
- Other aspects of HIE (3)
Laboratory and Radiology Testing

• Laboratory testing – 6 studies
  ► 5 studies showed benefit for HIE in reducing overall tests, although estimates of impact on cost were mixed.
    o 4 took place in ED setting, all showing some aspect of reduced testing and cost savings.
  ► 2 studies conducted in ambulatory settings, with one showing increase and other showing a reduction in increased overall rate of testing.

• Radiology testing – 9 studies
  ► 7 studies in ED setting showed reduced testing.
  ► 2 studies in ambulatory settings, with one showing decrease and other showing no change in rate of testing.
Hospital Admissions and Readmissions

• Hospital admissions – 8 studies
  ► 2 found reduction in hospital admissions and lower costs.
  ► 3 also measured some benefit for HIE use in reducing hospital admissions, although 3 found no such reduction.

• Hospital readmissions – 2 studies
  ► For reducing hospital readmissions, 1 showed benefit for HIE but other did not
Costs, Referrals, and Quality

• Costs – 2 studies
  ► Both found reduced overall ED costs per patient when HIE was available
    o Neither study reported overall ED expenditures, so unknown what proportion of overall ED spending was impacted by HIE

• Referrals – 2 studies
  ► Both assessed HIE for reducing referrals and/or consultations, finding conflicting results.

• Quality – 3 studies
  ► 2 retrospective studies found HIE associated with improved quality of care.
  ► An RCT that focused on medication reconciliation found increased ability to detect medication adherence problems, but it was unable to show improvement in adherence after it was identified and addressed by providers.
Public Health and Other

• Public health – 3 studies
  ▶ 3 studies that assessed HIE in public health settings, all in U.S., reported improved automated laboratory reporting, improved completeness of reporting for notifiable diseases, and improved identification of HIV patients for follow-up care.

• Other aspects of HIE – 3 studies
  ▶ Reduction in time for processing of Social Security Disability claims
  ▶ Increased ability to identify frequent ED users
  ▶ HIE implementation associated with improved patient satisfaction scores in hospitals
Conclusions

► Most studies were limited by retrospective nature (potential confounders) and limited questions (ED costs focused on absolute and not relative costs).

► No patient-specific clinical outcomes studied.

► Many studies from a few HIE “leaders” (can results be generalized?).
Barriers and Facilitators to HIE

We identified 10 cross-sectional studies, seven multiple-site case studies, two before-after studies.

The data sources included surveys, interviews, focus groups, and observations from 292 health professionals (nonclinicians) and 402 clinicians in the U.S.

We found additional evidence from European studies.

The settings were diverse: Exchange between emergency departments, ambulatory clinics, and/or hospitals made stratification by setting difficult.
Methods

• Content analysis and qualitative synthesis was performed to identify concepts.

• Concepts were sorted into groupings related to barriers and facilitators to actual HIE use.

• Two investigators used an iterative, open coding approach to refine the grouping and themes until consensus was achieved.

• Themes were refined and then a third investigator reviewed final groupings.
15 Barriers and 20 facilitators were identified and fell into three broad themes:

- Completeness of information
- Organization and workflow
- Technology and user needs
Completeness of Information

• Privacy and security
• Clinicians concern about liability, malpractice
• Patients outside of the HIE catchment area
• Matching of patients
• Health system competition
Organization and Workflow

• Login process
• Proxy users
• Technical support
• Ongoing feedback and access
Technology and User Needs

• Integration
• Competition with hospital portal
• HIE reports
• Data standards
Challenges to Identifying Barriers

- Changing nature of HIE and workflow locally
- Lack of standard HIE classification and terminology
- Lack of a consistent or coherent theoretical framework underlying the implementations or evaluations of HIE
Future Work

• The evidence was inadequate to compare barriers to HIE use by type of function (query-based or pull vs. directed or pushed exchange) or by type of architecture (centralized or not).

• Understanding optimal functionality of HIE is challenged by the lack of consistent classification and terminology of HIE and the changing nature of the sociotechnical systems involved.
Conclusions

• While the evidence is currently incomplete, there were several facilitators that showed promise in promoting electronic health data exchange:
  ► Obtaining more complete patient information
  ► Thoughtful implementation and workflow
  ► Including users in identifying key functions for HIE use and reporting
Future Research Needs

• More rigorous research methods
  ▶ How to do because classic RCTs cannot be done?

• Prospective evaluation of care delivered in presence of HIE
  ▶ Use of research data networks, such as PCORnet?
Funding

• AHRQ Contract No. 290-2012-00014-I, Task Order 11

• Dr. Kassakian’s work was also supported by the National Library of Medicine of the National Institutes of Health under Award Number T15LM007088.
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Factors Contributing to the Use of HIE in Health Care Organizations – A Focus on Long Term & Post Acute Care
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BACKGROUND

Jennie Harvell
ARRA/HITECH made available funds that supported—

- Incentive payments for the meaningful use of certified EHR technology by eligible hospitals and professionals (aka “Eligible Providers” (EPs)) – an estimated $15 Billion from 2014 – 2019 will be available; and
- Development of a nationwide health IT infrastructure that allows for the electronic use and exchange of health information -- approximately $2 billion was made available to the Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology (ONC) to carry out HITECH activities.
  - These funds primarily targeted Eligible Providers.

Although ONC made some HITECH funds (approximately $7 million) available to support HIE by LTPAC providers, these funds/resources were not generally available to support the acquisition/use of health IT/EHRs by providers who were not eligible for the EHR Incentive Programs.
Achieving Better Care, Healthier People, & Smarter Spending

Why Post-Acute Care Matters:

- **32,617** Post-Acute Care (PAC) Facilities
- **6.8 million** Medicare Beneficiaries
- **$74 billion** Medicare Spending
- **PAC 14.8% of Total Medicare Spending**

**420 Long-Term Care Hospitals (LTCH):**
Services provided: Rehabilitation, respiratory therapy, pain management, and head trauma treatment

**15,000 Nursing Homes:**
Services provided: Short-term Skilled nursing and rehabilitation services to individuals whose health problems are too severe or complicated for home care or assisted living

**12,311 Home Health Agencies (HHA):**
Services provided: Skilled nursing or therapy services provided to Medicare beneficiaries who are homebound

**1,166 Inpatient Rehabilitation Facilities (IRF):**
Services provided: Intensive rehabilitation therapy including physical, occupational, and speech therapy

**3,720 Hospices:**
Services provided: Palliative and support services for beneficiaries with a life expectancy of 6 months or less
e-HIE is Needed but Limited in LTPAC

- Transitions in care between providers eligible for incentives and providers who are not eligible are common. For example:
  - In 2008, almost 40 percent of all Medicare beneficiaries discharged from acute care hospitals received post-acute care; and of these beneficiaries, more than 15 percent were readmitted to the acute care hospital within 30 days of hospital discharge\(^1\).

- Instances of shared care are also common between eligible and ineligible providers. For example:
  - Medicare requires that both the physician and HHA sign a home health plan of care\(^2\).

- National data is limited regarding the use of health IT/EHRs by LTPAC providers\(^2\):
  - Surveys of LTPAC providers use of technology are typically not national in scope.
  - Data varies in their focus and definitions of technology.
    - Adoption rates vary from less than 10% to more than 40%.
    - Technology adoption rates for LTPAC providers cannot and should not be compared to adoption rates for EPs since they do not measure comparable EHR technology.

Nonetheless:
- Technology adoption rates are believed to be lower among LTPAC providers than among Eligible Providers.
- Electronic health information exchange by LTPAC providers is believed to be lower still
- Interoperable health information exchange by LTPAC providers is rare.

---


\(^2\) Devers, K. et al "Health Information Exchange in Long-Term and Post-Acute Care Settings." Prepared for the OASPE.
Factors Influencing HIE by LTPAC Providers

• The Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (ASPE) in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) sponsored research examining health information exchange on behalf of individuals who receive LTPAC services. Key findings include the following:

  ► Drivers of HIE between LTPAC providers and their trading partners include—
    o Availability of ONC grant funds
    o Payment and service delivery reforms, such as ACOs, bundled payments, hospital readmission penalties, increasing use of integrated delivery networks, market consolidation

  ► Barriers to HIE by LTPAC providers include—
    o Costs
    o Relatively limited requirements for Eligible Providers to exchange information with LTPAC providers in earlier stages of the meaningful use requirements
    o Technology challenges
    o Limited technical assistance

- Devers, K. et al “Health Information Exchange in Long-Term and Post-Acute Care Settings.” Prepared for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation.
Business and Policy Levers for Interoperability Across the Care Continuum

Jennie Harvell
• A bipartisan bill was introduced in March 2014. The U.S. House and Senate passed it on Sept. 18, 2014, and President Obama signed it into law Oct. 6, 2014.

• The Act requires the submission of standardized assessment data by:
  – Long-Term Care Hospitals (LTCHs): LTCH CARE Data Set (LCDS)
  – Skilled Nursing Facilities (SNFs): Minimum Data Set (MDS)
  – Home Health Agencies (HHAs): OASIS
  – Inpatient Rehabilitation Facilities (IRFs): IRF-Patient Assessment Instrument (IRF-PAI)

• The Act requires that CMS make interoperable standardized patient assessment and quality measures data to allow for the exchange of data among PAC and other providers to facilitate coordinated care and improved outcomes.
Why IMPACT? Why Now?

- The lack of comparable information across PAC settings undermines the ability to evaluate and differentiate between appropriate care settings for and by individuals and their caregivers.

- Standardized PAC assessment data will allow for continued beneficiary access to the most appropriate setting of care.

- Standardized PAC assessment data allows CMS to compare quality across PAC settings (longitudinal data).

- Standardized and interoperable PAC assessment data allows improvements in hospital and PAC discharge planning and the transfer of health information across the care continuum.

- Standardized PAC assessment data will allow for PAC payment reform (site neutral or bundled payments).

- Standardized and interoperable PAC assessment data supports service delivery reform.
CMS Quality Strategy

Goals

- Make care safer
- Strengthen person and family centered care
- Promote effective communications and care coordination
- Promote effective prevention and treatment
- Promote best practices for healthy living
- Make care affordable

Foundational Principles

- Enable Innovation
- Foster learning organizations
- Eliminate disparities
- Strengthen infrastructure and data systems
• Achieving standardization (i.e., alignment/harmonization) of clinically relevant data elements improves care and communication for individuals across the continuum:
  ► Enables shared understanding and use of clinical information
  ► Enables the re-use of data elements (e.g., for transitions of care, care planning, referrals, decision support, quality measurement, payment reform, etc.)
  ► Supports the exchange of patient assessment data across providers
  ► Influences and supports CMS and industry efforts to advance interoperable health information exchange and care coordination

• While data element standardization is required for certain assessment domains/categories in the IMPACT Act, unique data elements specific to PAC settings will also persist.
The IMPACT Act requires that CMS make post-acute care assessment data elements interoperable to—

“allow for the exchange of data among PAC providers and other providers and the use by such providers of such data that has been exchanged, including by using common standards and definitions, in order to provide access to longitudinal information for such providers to facilitate coordinated care and improved Medicare beneficiary outcomes.”
Opportunities to Re-Use Standardized and Interoperable Assessment Data Elements

• Leveraging and mapping PAC assessment data elements to nationally accepted Health IT standards supports:
  ► Information exchange and re-use with and by—
    ▪ Acute care hospitals and primary care providers
    ▪ LTPAC providers
    ▪ Home and community-based providers (HCBS)
    ▪ Other providers
    ▪ HIE Organizations
  ► Use and re-use of assessment data in a variety of document types, including—
    ▪ Transfer documents
    ▪ Referral documents
    ▪ Care plans
    ▪ LTPAC assessment summary documents

• CMS will make available public reports of PAC Assessment Data Elements mapped to health IT standards.
The IMPACT Act requires a quality measure on—

- The transfer of individual health information and care preferences of an individual to the individual, family care caregivers, and service providers when the individual transitions from:
  - Hospital or critical access hospital (CAH) to another setting including Post-Acute Care (PAC) provider or home
  - PAC provider to another setting, including a different PAC provider, a hospital or CAH, or home
Business Drivers (cont’d) and ONC Activities to Advance Interoperability

Liz Palena-Hall
Delivery System Reform

• HHS Departmental Initiative
• **Goal**: Better Care, Smarter Spending, Healthier People

**Historical state**

**Key characteristics**
- Producer centered
- Incentives for volume
- Unsustainable
- Fragmented Care

**Systems and Policies**
- Fee-For-Service Payment Systems

**Evolving future state**

**Key characteristics**
- Patient centered
- Incentives for outcomes
- Sustainable
- Coordinated care

**Systems and Policies**
- Value-based purchasing
- Accountable Care Organizations
- Episode-based payments
- Medical Homes
- Quality/cost transparency
HHS Goals for Medicare Value-Based Payments

**Medicare Fee-for-Service**

**GOAL 1:** 30%

Medicare payments are tied to quality or value through alternative payment models (categories 3-4) by the end of 2016, and 50% by the end of 2018.

**GOAL 2:** 85%

Medicare fee-for-service payments are tied to quality or value (categories 2-4) by the end of 2016, and 90% by the end of 2018.

**STAKEHOLDERS:**
- Consumers
- Businesses
- Payers
- Providers
- State Partners

**NEXT STEPS:**

Testing of new models and expansion of existing models will be critical to reaching incentive goals.

Creation of a Health Care Payment Learning and Action Network to align incentives for payers.
## CMMI Models Align With Delivery System Reform

### Pay Providers

**Test and expand alternative payment models.**
- **Accountable Care**
  - Pioneer ACO Model
  - Medicare Shared Savings Program (housed in Center for Medicare)
  - Advance Payment ACO Model
  - Comprehensive ERSD Care Initiative
- **Primary Care Transformation**
  - Comprehensive Primary Care Initiative (CPC)
  - Multi-Payer Advanced Primary Care Practice (MAPCP) Demonstration
  - Federally Qualified Health Center (FQHC) Advanced Primary Care Practice Demonstration
  - Independence at Home Demonstration
  - Graduate Nurse Education Demonstration
- **Bundled Payment for Care Improvement**
  - Model 1: Retrospective Acute Care
  - Model 2: Retrospective Acute Care Episode & Post Acute
  - Model 3: Retrospective Post Acute Care
  - Model 4: Prospective Acute Care
  - Oncology Care Model
- **Initiatives Focused on the Medicaid**
  - Medicaid Emergency Psychiatric Demonstration
  - Medicaid Incentives for Prevention of Chronic Diseases
  - Strong Start Initiative
  - Medicaid Innovation Accelerator Program
- **Dual Eligible (Medicare-Medicaid Enrollees)**
  - Financial Alignment Initiative
  - Reduce Hospitalizations among Nursing Facility Residents

### Deliver Care

**Support providers and states to improve the delivery of care.**
- **Learning and Diffusion**
  - Partnership for Patients
  - Transforming Clinical Practice
  - Community-Based Care Transitions
- **Health Care Innovation Awards**
- **State Innovation Models Initiative**
  - SIM Round 1
  - SIM Round 2
  - Maryland All-Payer Model

### Distribute Information

**Increase information available for effective informed decision-making by consumers and providers.**
- **Information to providers in CMMI models**
- **Certified health IT requirements or performance reward**
- **Shared decision-making required by many models**

* Many CMMI programs test innovations across multiple focus areas
The CMS Medicaid Data and Systems Group and ONC Office of Policy have partnered to update the guidance on how states may support health information exchange and interoperable systems to best support Medicaid providers in attesting to Meaningful Use Stages 2 and 3.

This updated guidance will allow Medicaid HITECH funds to support all Medicaid providers that Eligible Providers want to coordinate care with.

Medicaid HITECH funds can now support HIE onboarding and systems for behavioral health providers, long term care providers, substance abuse treatment providers, home health providers, correctional health providers, social workers, and so on.

It may also support the HIE on-boarding of laboratory, pharmacy or public health providers.

Interoperability Vision for the Future

Federal Health IT Strategic Plan Goals

VISION
High-quality care, lower costs, healthy population, and engaged people

MISSION
Improve the health and well-being of individuals and communities through the use of technology and health information that is accessible when and where it matters most

Goal 1
Advance Person-Centered Health and Self-Management

Goal 2
Transform Health Care Delivery and Community Health

Goal 3
Foster Research, Scientific Knowledge, and Innovation

Goal 4
Enhance Nation’s Health IT Infrastructure

Goal 4
Objective A: Implement the Shared Nationwide Interoperability Roadmap
What is Interoperability? What are the Benefits?

Interoperability Defined: The ability of a system to **exchange** electronic health information with and **use** electronic health information from other systems without special effort on the part of the user.

What it should look like:
- All individuals, their families, and health care providers should be able to send, receive, find, and use electronic health information in a manner that is appropriate, secure, timely, and reliable to support the health and wellness of individuals through shared decisionmaking.

Benefits: The electronic exchange and re-use of information means that “individuals, their families, and their health care providers have appropriate access to health information that:

- Allows individuals and caregivers to be active partners and participants in their health and care; and
- Improves the overall health of the nation’s population.”

*From ONC’s Connecting Health and Care for the Nation, 10 Year Vision to Achieve and Interoperable Health IT Infrastructure; A Shared Nationwide Interoperability Roadmap Final Version 1.0.*
**Overarching Interoperability Goals**

**2015-2017:** Send, receive, find, and use priority data domains to improve health care quality and outcomes.

**2018-2020:** Expand data sources and users in the interoperable health IT ecosystem to improve health and lower costs.

**2021-2024:** Achieve nationwide interoperability to enable a learning health system, with the person at the center of a system that can continuously improve care, public health, and science through real-time data access.

*From ONC’s Connecting Health and Care for the Nation, A Shared Nationwide Interoperability Roadmap Final Version 1.0*
• Contains new and updated vocabulary, content, and transport standards for the structured recording and exchange of health information

• Establishes a Common Clinical Data Set to encourage the exchange of a core set of data across the care continuum

• The ONC Health IT Certification Program is “agnostic” to settings and programs, but can support many different use cases and needs.

• This allows the ONC Health IT Certification Program to support multiple program and setting needs, such as—
  ▶ EHR Incentive Programs
  ▶ Long-term and post-acute care
  ▶ Chronic care management
  ▶ Behavioral health
  ▶ Other public and private programs
Certified Health IT Module(s) to Support Other Health Care Settings (LTPAC Example)

Long-Term and Post-Acute Care Certification (example only)

Certification Criteria to Support Meeting Specific Needs
- Transitions of Care
- Clinical Information Reconciliation and Incorporation
- Care Plan

Conditional Certification Requirements
- Privacy and Security
- Safety-enhanced Design
- C-CDA Creation Performance

Mandatory Certification Requirements
- Quality Management System
- Accessibility-centered Design

Use of the ONC Health IT Certification Program to Support the Care Continuum
Renamed the “Common MU Data Set.” This does not impact 2014 Edition certification.

Includes key health data that should be accessible and available for exchange.

Data must conform with specified vocabulary standards and code sets, as applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient name</th>
<th>Lab tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Lab values/results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of birth</td>
<td><strong>Vital signs</strong> (changed from proposed rule)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Care team members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred language</td>
<td>Immunizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems</td>
<td><strong>Unique device identifiers for implantable devices</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking Status</td>
<td><strong>Assessment and plan of treatment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medications</td>
<td>Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medication allergies</td>
<td><strong>Health concerns</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ONC Interoperability Roadmap Goal**

2015-2017

Send, receive, find, and use priority data domains to improve health and health quality

Red = New data added to data set (+ standards for immunizations)
Blue = Only new standards for data
The standards advisory represents an updated list of the best available standard(s) and implementation specification(s). The list is not exhaustive, but it is expected that future advisories will incrementally address a broader range of clinical health IT interoperability needs.

Purpose:

• To provide the industry with a **single, public list of the standards and implementation specifications** that can best be used to fulfill specific clinical health information interoperability needs.

• To reflect the results of **ongoing dialogue, debate, and consensus among industry stakeholders** when more than one standard or implementation specification could be listed as the best available.

• To **document known limitations, preconditions, and dependencies, as well as known security patterns**, among referenced standards and implementation specifications when they are used to fulfill a specific clinical health IT interoperability need.
Collective Action to Achieve Interoperability Across the Care Continuum

• Need to leverage all knowledge, resources on an organizational, community, State, association, and Federal level to support health IT across LTPAC settings:
  ► Determine successful models for implementation and replicate where appropriate
  ► Providers explore new options for financing
  ► Collaborative learning leveraging Federal, State, and association resources
  ► Inform federal and state policy on health IT-enabled delivery system reform

Near-Term Success: An increase in the proportion of individuals, office-based physicians, hospitals and behavioral health, and long-term care and post-acute care providers that:
  ► Send, receive, find, and use electronic health information
  ► Have electronic health information available from outside sources and make electronic health information available to outside sources
  ► Use electronic health information to inform decision-making

*From ONC’s Connecting Health and Care for the Nation, A Shared Nationwide Interoperability Roadmap Final Version 1.0*
• Federal Health IT Strategic Plan 2015-2020: https://www.healthit.gov/sites/default/files/9-5-federalhealthitstratplanfinal_0.pdf

• Connecting Health and Care for the Nation: 10 Year Vision to Achieve an Interoperable Health IT Infrastructure: http://www.healthit.gov/sites/default/files/ONC10yearInteroperabilityConceptPaper.pdf


• ONC 2016 Standards Advisory: https://www.healthit.gov/standards-advisory/2016
Advance Interoperable Health Information Exchange Program

Larry Jessup
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>Awards</th>
<th>Performance Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Information Exchange</td>
<td>$29.6M</td>
<td>37*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2 year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal:** Leverage successes from initial State HIE projects to increase the adoption and use of interoperable health IT to improve care coordination.

*All 37 HIE applications met said criteria & moved forward for objective review.*
Advance Interoperable HIE Program Awardees

1. Arkansas Office of Health Information Technology*
2. Colorado Department of Health Care Policy and Financing*
3. Delaware Health Information Network*
4. Illinois Health Information Exchange Authority*
5. Nebraska Department of Administrative Services*
6. New Hampshire Health Information Organization Corporation*
7. New Jersey Innovation Institute*
8. Oregon Health Authority
9. Rhode Island Quality Institute*
10. South Carolina Health Information Partners, Inc.*
11. State of California Emergency Medical Services Authority
12. Utah Health Information Network*

*Selected Long-Term Post-Acute Care as a Target Population
Community Interoperability and HIE Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Awards</th>
<th>Performance Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Interoperability and HIE Program</td>
<td>$1M</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal:** Create projects at the community level to increase HIE adoption and use among specific populations, which will help to address interoperability challenges.

**Program Awardees:**
1. AltaMed Health Services Corporation (CA)*
2. Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System
3. Community Health Center Network, Inc. (CA)
4. Georgia Health Information Network
5. National Healthy Start Association (SC – *based in DC*)
6. Nevada Dept. of Health and Human Services (DHHS)
7. Peninsula Community Health Services
8. Rhode Island Quality Institute
9. Utah Department of Health
10. Washtenaw County - Community Support and Treatment Services (MI)

* Working with skilled nursing facilities and acute rehabilitation facilities
Target Populations

Eligible Professionals (EP)
- Safety Net Providers
- Primary Care Providers/Clinics

Eligible Hospitals
Long-Term Post-Acute Care (LTPAC)
- Skilled Nursing Facilities (SNF)
- Rehabilitation Facilities
- Home Health Agencies

Behavioral Health (BH)
- Mental Health
- Substance Abuse

Individuals (Consumers) + Caregivers
Pharmacies

Poison Control Center
Emergency Medical Services (EMS)
Public Health
- Public Health Immunization Registry Departments
- Public Health Disaster Response Providers
- Public Health Departments
Social Service Providers
- Aging
- Physical/Developmental Disabilities
Researchers
• Increase interoperable electronic health information exchange capability and expand the flow and use of essential electronic health information.

• Success will be defined and measured by—
  ▶ **M1:** Increased adoption of critical health information exchange infrastructure, tools, and services
  ▶ **M2:** Increased movement of electronic, secure, and standardized patient health information to improve care transitions
  ▶ **M3:** Increased interoperability of health information from external data sources used by consumers and providers from unaffiliated organizations

• The near-term goals (2015-2017) of the draft ONC Interoperability Roadmap focuses measurement and exchange efforts on certain populations, such as office-based physicians, hospitals, individuals, and long-term care and behavioral health care providers.
Current Awardee Activity

- Delaware, Illinois, and Colorado are implementing use of the KeyHIE Transform tool to translate home health and SNF patient assessment data into standardized CCDA template.

- Rhode Island is sending HL7 ADT alerts via mobile phone or message to LTPACS, individuals, and family members.

- New Jersey (NJ) is sending ADT messages between NJ Transitions of Care Services to LTPACs.

- Several States are increasing adoption of HIE and exchange of TOC documents among LTPACs by implementing Direct mailboxes and query-based exchange.

- Utah is developing filters to push out discharge summaries from hospital to LTPAC in a timely manner.

- Measuring the extent to which providers are leveraging data exchanged by incorporating summary of care records into workflow.

- Reducing readmission from the LTPAC to the hospital.
Challenges for the LTPAC Setting

• Difficulty engaging with LTPAC Facilities

• Challenges with meeting facilities on differing levels of adoption spectrum (no adoption → high adoption)

• No agreed-upon content

• Unclear if the sending site has what the receiving site needs

• No compelling business case

• Limited or no financial support

• Identifying workflows and connections that inhibit patient information from flowing to the right place at the right time

• Many LTPACs are unable to contribute anything to the State or Local HIE, due to view-only capabilities.
To identify and promote the value of health information exchange for LTPAC providers by defining the value proposition, addressing common barriers, and developing mitigation strategies to expand the use of HIE with providers across the entire continuum of care.
1. Demonstrate the value proposition.
2. Make data usable.
3. Develop trust among partners.
LTPAC Community of Practice Deliverables

- Value propositions for LTPACs
- Workflow scenarios and use cases for the use of HIE in transitions of care
- List of strategies on how to gain buy-in and expand service adoption and utilization of HIE among LTPACs
- Documented knowledge of what other HIEs are doing with similar projects
- Lessons-learned documents that highlight workflow, adoption, and value statements
• December 15, 2015
Discussed common barriers to health information exchange between LTPAC settings and providers across the care continuum.

• January 5, 2016
Two leading physicians led a discussion of how payment reform impacts the value proposition for LTPAC and HIE.

• February 2, 2016
Missouri Quality Initiative for Nursing Homes discussed proven strategies for engaging and communicating with LTPAC facilities.
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How To Submit a Question

• At any time during the presentation, type your question into the “Q&A” section of your WebEx Q&A panel.
• Please address your questions to “All Panelists” in the drop-down menu.
• Select “Send” to submit your question to the moderator.
• Questions will be read aloud by the moderator.
If you would like to receive continuing education credit for this activity, please visit:

http://hitwebinar.cds.pesgce.com/eindex.php

Next HIE Webinar: April 21, 2016
Register at AHRQ HIT Web site: https://healthit.ahrq.gov/events