

MEDITECH

ARRA Meaningful Use Stage 3 Usability Study Usability Issues and Recommendations

Web Acute 6.16

Medication Allergy List

Medication List

Drug-Drug, Drug-Allergy Interaction Checks

Electronic Prescribing

Computerized Provider Order Entry - Medications

Computerized Provider Order Entry - Laboratory

Computerized Provider Order Entry - Diagnostic Imaging

Clinical Information Reconciliation and Incorporation

Clinical Decision Support

Demographics

Problem List

Implantable Device List

Date of Usability Test: November 2016 – March 2017

Date of Report: May 2017

Prepared by: Matt Brundage, Supervisor Development | mbrundage@meditech.com

Nicholas Novacek Bundt, Software Designer | nbundt@meditech.com

Jason Botelho, Lead Software Designer | jjbotelho@meditech.com

Table of Contents

Summary	3
Testing Process	4-7
Medication Allergy List	8
Task Data	8
Medication Allergy List Issues	8
Medication List	9
Task Data	9
Medication List Issues	9
Drug-Drug, Drug-Allergy Interaction Checks	10
Task Data	10
Drug-Drug, Drug-Allergy Interaction Checks Issues	10
Electronic Prescribing	11-12
Task Data	11
Electronic Prescribing Issues	11-12
Computerized Provider Order Entry - Medications/Lab/DI	13-14
Task Data	13
Computerized Provider Order Entry - Medications/Lab/DI Issues	14
Clinical Information Reconciliation and Incorporation	15-16
Task Data	15
Clinical Information Reconciliation – General Issues	15-16
Clinical Decision Support	17-18
Task Data	17
Clinical Decision Support – InfoButton Issues	18
Problem List	19
Task Data	19
Problem List Issues	19
Demographics	20-21
Task Data	20

Demographics Issues	20-21
Implantable Device List	22-23
Task Data	22
Implantable Device List Issues	22-23
System Usability Scale (SUS) score	24
Appendix A: Clinical Participant Test Script	25-27
Appendix B: Clinical Participant Demographics	28-30

SUMMARY

From November 2016 to March 2017, MEDITECH conducted a usability test of the Web Acute 6.16 MEDITECH platform, in accordance with National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) and Meaningful Use certification guidelines. In these tests, end users completed a variety of tasks throughout the system; these tasks were designed to assess how easily users could complete representative clinical workflows and to identify areas to improve the usability of our software.

To meet Meaningful Use requirements, we assessed the usability of twelve features throughout the system:

- Medication Allergy List
- Medication List
- Drug-drug, Drug-allergy Interaction Checks
- Computerized Provider Order Entry - Medications
- Computerized Provider Order Entry - Laboratory
- Computerized Provider Order Entry - Diagnostic Imaging
- Electronic Prescribing
- Clinical Information Reconciliation and Incorporation
- Clinical Decision Support
- Demographics
- Problem List
- Implantable Device List

After conducting tests with end users to analyze the usability to each of those features, we analyzed each test to evaluate the usability of our software based on three metrics.

<u>Metric</u>	<u>Analyzes</u>
Effectiveness	Whether or not participants completed the task
Efficiency	The time required and steps taken to complete the task
User Satisfaction	Participant feedback on ease of use and areas for improvement

While gathering and analyzing testing sessions, we noted areas users struggled in the system, the cause of those struggles, and ways to improve the usability of those areas. From these observations, we crafted a list of usability issues and recommendations.

This document describes the usability issues study Web Acute 6.16 MEDITECH.

TESTING PROCESS

This section provides a brief outline of our testing process, including participant profiles, testing procedure, evaluative metrics, and issue identification.

Participants

We tested a total of 26 representative participants for this usability test. All of the participants are active users of the Web Acute 6.16 MEDITECH software representing clinical, administrative, and IT staff. Participants were asked to perform tasks for functions that most closely matched their daily workflow. On average, these participants had, at the time of testing, 10+ years of experience using the MEDITECH system.

Testing Procedure

Participants completed 30 tasks across the system to test multiple functionality points. We composed the tasks to mimic a representative clinical workflow, with different tasks spread across a patient visit. Here's an example task:

Amanda has taken nitrofurantoin for her urinary tract infection, but has had dyspnea, cough, and chest and back pain since starting the medication. Discontinue this medication.

Each participant performed each task without assistance to the best of his or her ability, as quickly as possible, and with the fewest possible deviations. After each task, we asked the participant to rate the ease or difficulty of the task and gathered any participant feedback about the task.

Test Environment

Following is a summary of the participants' computing environment:

Tested product:	MEDITECH EHR, version 6.16
Computer platforms:	HP Probook with a 15" display
Display:	VA1926wSERIES display
Screen resolution:	1440 x 900 resolution
Operating system:	Windows 7

Morae© software was used to assist with data collection.

Evaluative Metrics

To analyze testing results, we captured seven primary pieces of data: task success, task errors, task deviations, task performance time, task time standard deviations, task rating, and System Usability Scale scores.

Task Success

We counted a task as a success if the participant was able to achieve the correct outcome without assistance. We compiled the overall success rate for a task by dividing the number of task successes by the number of task attempts.

Task Errors

While each participant worked through a task, we recorded his or her path to complete the task. We noted an error if the participant, for example, went to a wrong screen, clicked on an incorrect menu item, or followed an incorrect link *and* was not able to complete the task without returning to a previous step in the intended path.

Task Deviations

While each participant worked through a task, we recorded his or her path to complete the task. We noted a deviation if the participant performed an unexpected or unnecessary action, navigated to an incorrect screen, or selected an incorrect item, but was able to continue towards completing the task.

Task Time

We recorded the time from when a participant started a task to the time they finished it, expressed in seconds. Participants reported when they finished a task. We stopped task times when a participant failed to finish a task and continued task times when participants finished a task but failed to recognize they had completed it.

Task Time Standard Deviation

We calculated the standard deviation of task performance times. The task time standard deviation captures the number of seconds that constitutes one standard deviation from the mean task performance time. For example, a standard deviation of 10 seconds indicates that one standard deviation from the mean task time is equal to the mean task time plus or minus 10 seconds.

Task Rating

After each task, participants scored the ease or difficulty of the task on a scale of 1 (very difficult) to 5 (very easy). We computed the average rating for each task. In addition, during this process, we gathered participant feedback about the task—what they liked, disliked, thought could be improved, etc.

System Usability Scale (SUS)

The SUS is an industry-standard, 10-item questionnaire that assesses the usability of the system under test. We administered the SUS to each participant following each testing session and compiled the overall SUS scores. During this process, we asked participants for their feedback on the entire system.

Issue Identification

After completing each testing session and compiling test data and observations, we identified areas where participants struggled in using the system. For example, if a task had a low task success rate and high task time, we analyzed the task to see if participants made common deviations to increase task time and prevent them from completing the task. If a task had low task ratings, we reviewed feedback to determine if participants had common complaints about the functionality in the task.

Conversely, we noted areas where the system performed well to determine what workflows participants liked. We can use positive findings to help identify intuitive areas of the system and expand that functionality when possible to less intuitive functions.

For each issue, we calculated the number of participants who struggled with that issue, where the issue occurred in the participants' workflow, how the issue affected the outcome of the task, and whether or not the issue may affect patient safety. With that information, we assigned a priority to each issue, on a scale of 1 –3.

Severity 1: Severe usability issue that caused multiple or significant task failures or has room to improve patient safety.

Severity 2: Major usability issue that caused major struggles, or significantly slowed down users, or caused an isolated task failure.

Severity 3: Efficiency usability issue. Efficiency or workflow could be improved but the issue did not cause significant disruption.

In addition to identifying the details and priority of each issue, we composed a recommendation to each issue.

MEDICATION ALLERGY LIST

Task Data

The Medication Allergy List portion of the usability study was composed of three tasks. The following table outlines the mean effectiveness, efficiency, and user satisfaction data of these three tasks.

Task	Effectiveness (% Success)	Efficiency	User Satisfaction (Rating)
Access Allergies	100%	Time (sec): 13 Std Dev (sec): 4.8 Errors: 0 Deviations: 0	4.4/5.0
Change Allergy	91%	Time (sec): 52.2 Std Dev (sec): 51 Errors: 3 Deviations: 0	3.6/5.0
Record Allergy	100%	Time (sec): 61.8 Std Dev (sec): 39 Errors: 1 Deviations: 2	3.6/5.0

Medication Allergy List Issues

Issue 1: Participants select Allergy header to access data instead of Edit button

Issue Data

Severity: **3** Patient Safety: **No** Number of users: **3**

Findings

Multiple participants attempted to access Allergy data by selecting the Allergy header instead of the Edit button, but were eventually successful locating the Edit button.

Quotes

None

Recommendations

Evaluate changing the launch point of the allergy list to best match user expectations.

MEDICATION LIST

Task Data

The Medication List portion of the usability study was composed of three tasks. The following table outlines the mean effectiveness, efficiency, and user satisfaction data of these three tasks.

Task	Effectiveness (% Success)	Efficiency	User Satisfaction (Rating)
Access Medication	100%	Time (sec): 22 Std Dev (sec): 5.6 Errors: 0 Deviations: 0	4.4/5.0
Change Medication	100%	Time (sec): 62 Std Dev (sec): 22.5 Errors: 2 Deviations: 0	3.8/5.0
Record Medication	73%	Time (sec): 131.6 Std Dev (sec): 76 Errors: 8 Deviations: 0	3.8/5.0

Medication List Issues

Issue 1: Cursor does not immediately go to required field

Issue Data

Severity: **3** Patient Safety: **No** Number of users: **4**

Findings

When entering a new home medication with an unanswered required field, the cursor does not immediately go to that field. This results in users having to visually scan the screen to locate the missing required field.

Quotes

"It's saying I'm missing something, but I'm not sure what."

Recommendations

Evaluate changes to have the cursor move to the required field either immediately or upon attempting to save the medication.

DRUG-DRUG, DRUG-ALLERGY INTERACTION CHECKS

Task Data

The Drug-Drug, Drug-Allergy Interaction Checks portion of the usability study was composed of two tasks. The following table outlines the mean effectiveness, efficiency, and user satisfaction data of these two tasks.

Task	Effectiveness (% Success)	Efficiency	User Satisfaction (Rating)
Adjustment of Severity Level for Drug-Drug Interaction Check	100%	Time (sec): 56 Std Dev (sec): 25 Errors: 0 Deviations: 0	4.0/5.0
Drug-Allergy Interaction	100%	Time (sec): 28 Std Dev (sec): 22 Errors: 0 Deviations: 0	4.0/5.0

Drug-Drug, Drug-Allergy Interaction Checks Issues

Issue 1: Interaction checks can lead to alert fatigue

Issue Data

Severity: **2** Patient Safety: **N** Number of users: **3**

Findings

Multiple participants commented that too many interaction check warnings can lead to alert fatigue.

Quotes

"I don't care about food interactions. I should be able to turn those off."

Recommendations

Organizations are trained to manage the alerts that appear to help with alert fatigue. Evaluate if additional changes could provide greater options for users to determine the number and severity level of alert triggers.

ELECTRONIC PRESCRIBING

Task Data

The Electronic Prescribing portion of the usability study was composed of two tasks. The following table outlines the mean effectiveness, efficiency, and user satisfaction data of these two tasks.

Task	Effectiveness (% Success)	Efficiency	User Satisfaction (Rating)
Locating Rx Fill Status	70%	Time (sec): 131 Std Dev (sec): 76 Errors: 10 Deviations: 1	3.0/5.0
Generate a Refill	70%	Time (sec): 99 Std Dev (sec): 51 Errors: 7 Deviations: 0	3.0/5.0

Electronic Prescribing Issues

Issue 1: Users cannot easily locate the Rx Fill Status

Issue Data

Severity: **2** Patient Safety: **No** Number of users: **5**

Findings

Five participants had difficulty locating the Rx Fill Status. Two were able to recover and eventually locate it, but three were unable to successfully complete the task. Multiple participants commented that they liked the Rx Fill Status, but thought it was hard to locate.

Quotes

"I like how the system can display more details about this."

"I like this. Now that I know where it is, it should be easier."

Recommendations

When pharmacies begin to utilize Rx Fill Status messages, evaluate any points in the workflow where the system could more prominently display Rx Fill Status.

Issue 2: Users struggled to generate a ePrescribing refill order

Issue Data

Severity: **2** Patient Safety: **No** Number of users: **3**

Findings

Three participants had difficulty initiating a refill order through electronic prescribing and were unable to successfully complete the task.

Quotes

None

Recommendations

Evaluate the process for generating a refill using ePrescribing to determine if the process can be enhanced. Also, ensure the online help and supporting documentation is sufficient to guide and instruct users on performing this function.

COMPUTERIZED PROVIDER ORDER ENTRY

Task Data

The Computerized Provider Order Entry (CPOE) portion of the usability study was composed of nine tasks. The following table outlines the mean effectiveness, efficiency, and user satisfaction data of these nine tasks.

Task	Effectiveness (% Success)	Efficiency	User Satisfaction (Rating)
Record CPOE Medication	100%	Time (sec): 255 Std Dev (sec): 121 Errors: 2 Deviations: 0	3.2/5.0
Change CPOE Medication	100%	Time (sec): 151 Std Dev (sec): 92 Errors: 7 Deviations: 2	3.6/5.0
Access CPOE Medication	100%	Time (sec): 34 Std Dev (sec): 6 Errors: 0 Deviations: 0	4.8/5.0
Record CPOE Laboratory	100%	Time (sec): 62 Std Dev (sec): 24 Errors: 1 Deviations: 1	3.2/5.0
Change CPOE Laboratory	91%	Time (sec): 96.5 Std Dev (sec): 105 Errors: 4 Deviations: 1	3.6/5.0
Access CPOE Laboratory	100%	Time (sec): 21 Std Dev (sec): 5 Errors: 0 Deviations: 0	4.8/5.0
Record CPOE Diagnostic Imaging	91%	Time (sec): 63 Std Dev (sec): 21 Errors: 4 Deviations: 0	3.2/5.0
Change CPOE Diagnostic Imaging	80%	Time (sec): 190 Std Dev (sec): 102 Errors: 7 Deviations: 3	3.2/5.0
Access CPOE Diagnostic Imaging	100%	Time (sec): 26 Std Dev (sec): 7 Errors: 0 Deviations: 0	4.6/5.0

Computerized Provider Order Entry Issues - Medications/Laboratory/Diagnostic Imaging

Issue 1: Confusion over submit queue for orders

Issue Data

Severity: **2** Patient Safety: **No** Number of users: **3**

Findings

When placing an order, users can select a checkbox next to the order to add the order to their Manage Orders queue. However, this checkbox does not add the order to the submit queue. To add an order to the submit queue, users must select the urgency status for the order. These multiple checkboxes caused confusion for users, who had difficulty monitoring which orders had made their submit queue.

Quotes

"It seems like this is an extra click to get to this."

Recommendations

Evaluate ways to make the relationship between Manage Orders and the submit queue more apparent to users. Determine preferred user workflows in adding additional order details.

Issue 2: Unable to edit Service Date/Time by clicking on Date column value

Issue Data

Severity: **2** Patient Safety: **No** Number of users: **4**

Findings

Four participants attempted to edit the Service Date/Time of a laboratory test by clicking on the date in the Date column. When this did not work, participants then navigated to the test name field and clicked the test name to initiate the Service Date/Time edit.

Quotes

None.

Recommendations

Evaluate the process for editing a test or procedure Service Date/Time by allowing the user to click on the date field instead of the procedure name to access the test specific information.

CLINICAL INFORMATION RECONCILIATION AND INCORPORATION

Task Data

The Clinical Information Reconciliation and Incorporation portion of the usability study was composed of three tasks. The following table outlines the mean effectiveness, efficiency, and user satisfaction data of these three tasks.

Task	Effectiveness (% Success)	Efficiency	User Satisfaction (Rating)
Consume CCD - Allergies	64%	Time (sec): 221 Std Dev (sec): 132 Errors: 20 Deviations: 0	3.3/5.0
Consume CCD - Problems	64%	Time (sec): 199 Std Dev (sec): 196 Errors: 9 Deviations: 0	3.6/5.0
Consume CCD - Medications	73%	Time (sec): 207 Std Dev (sec): 111 Errors: 8 Deviations: 0	2.8/5.0

Clinical Information Reconciliation – Problems/Medications/Allergies

Issue 1: Use of 'Add Selected...' footer button is not intuitive

Issue Data

Severity: **1** Patient Safety: **No** Number of users: **6**

Findings

Numerous participants struggled with the consume process, and specifically the use of the 'Add Selected...' footer button.

Quotes

None

Recommendations

Evaluate changes to streamline the consume process to more closely match the expected user workflow. Remove the user interaction required to trigger consuming discrete data.

Issue 2: Consume screens are different for Problems, Meds, and Allergies

Issue Data

Severity: **1** Patient Safety: **No** Number of users: **4**

Findings

The expected workflow for consuming external problems, medications, and allergies is the same, but the screen layout and design is different.

Quotes

“It seems like there were three ways to do this.”

Recommendations

Evaluate changes to standardize the screen layout and design so the workflow is the same for external problems, medications, and allergies.

Issue 3: System should auto-reconcile matching entries

Issue Data

Severity: **1** Patient Safety: **No** Number of users: **3**

Findings

Four participants commented that the system should be able to match any data coming in on the CCD as long as it matches entries already in the system. There is too much manual data entry when the system could alleviate some of the work. For example, if any allergy (including severity and reaction) come in on a CCD and everything matches data entry values in the system, then the system should default all of that data onto the allergy, instead of requiring a user to match each value.

Quotes

“Why can’t the system do this? The entries are the same.”

Recommendations

Automatically import 1-to-1 matches between the system and CCD. Ensure users can review, confirm, and edit any auto-imported data, as needed.

CLINICAL DECISION SUPPORT

Task Data

The Clinical Decision Support portion of the usability study was composed of eight tasks. The following table outlines the mean effectiveness, efficiency, and user satisfaction data of these eight tasks.

Task	Effectiveness (% Success)	Efficiency	User Satisfaction (Rating)
Generate Problem List Interventions	100%	Time (sec): 32 Std Dev (sec): 8 Errors: 0 Deviations: 0	4.2/5.0
Generate Medication List Interventions	100%	Time (sec): 51 Std Dev (sec): 11 Errors: 0 Deviations: 0	4.2/5.0
Generate Medication Allergy Interventions	100%	Time (sec): 36 Std Dev (sec): 6 Errors: 0 Deviations: 0	4.2/5.0
Generate Demographics Interventions	100%	Time (sec): 42 Std Dev (sec): 9 Errors: 0 Deviations: 0	4.2/5.0
Generate LAB Test and Result Interventions	100%	Time (sec): 33 Std Dev (sec): 8 Errors: 0 Deviations: 0	4.2/5.0
Generate Vital Signs Interventions	100%	Time (sec): 24 Std Dev (sec): 4 Errors: 0 Deviations: 0	4.2/5.0
Identify User Diagnostic and Therapeutic Reference Information	36%	Time (sec): 94 Std Dev (sec): 52 Errors: 8 Deviations: 0	3.0/5.0
Enable Clinical Decision Support Interventions	100%	Time (sec): 67 Std Dev (sec): 12 Errors: 2 Deviations: 0	4.4/5.0

Clinical Decision Support – Infobutton Issues

Issue 1: Accessing InfoButton is not intuitive

Issue Data

Severity: **3** Patient Safety: **No** Number of users: **8**

Findings

Almost all participants were aware of how to access information via the external links button, but struggled with locating the InfoButton to access item-specific external evidence-based vendor information.

Quotes

None

Recommendations

Evaluate training provided to inform users about the InfoButton.

PROBLEM LIST

Task Data

The Problem List portion of the usability study was composed of two tasks. The following table outlines the mean effectiveness, efficiency, and user satisfaction data of these two tasks.

Task	Effectiveness (% Success)	Efficiency	User Satisfaction (Rating)
Access Active Problem List	100%	Time (sec): 15 Std Dev (sec): 2 Errors: 0 Deviations: 0	5.0/5.0
Change Active Problem List	100%	Time (sec): 100 Std Dev (sec): 70 Errors: 0 Deviations: 2	3.5/5.0

Problem List

Issue 1: Difficulty changing an existing problem

Issue Data

Severity: **2** Patient Safety: **No** Number of users: **4**

Findings

Four participants had difficulty changing the status of an existing diabetes problem to uncontrolled. Some attempted to edit the status while others opted to inactivate the existing problem, and then add a new problem.

Quotes

None

Recommendations

Evaluate user workflows and preferences to determine the preferred workflow for editing existing problems.

DEMOGRAPHICS

Task Data

The Demographics portion of the usability study was composed of four tasks. The following table outlines the mean effectiveness, efficiency, and user satisfaction data of these four tasks.

Task	Effectiveness (% Success)	Efficiency	User Satisfaction (Rating)
Record Patient Demographics (Race, Ethnicity, Preferred Language, Sex, Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity, Date of Birth)	90%	Time (sec): 170 Std Dev (sec): 161 Errors: 2 Deviations: 0	4.6/5.0
Access and Edit Patient Demographics (Race, Ethnicity, Preferred Language, Sex, Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity, Date of Birth)	100%	Time (sec): 19 Std Dev (sec): 4 Errors: 0 Deviations: 0	4.6/5.0
Record Preliminary Cause of Death and Date of Death	90%	Time (sec): 108 Std Dev (sec): 48 Errors: 2 Deviations: 0	4.6/5.0
Access and Change Preliminary Cause of Death and Date of Death	100%	Time (sec): 14 Std Dev (sec): 2 Errors: 0 Deviations: 0	4.6/5.0

Demographics

Issue 1: Provide standard responses for queries

Issue Data

Severity: **3** Patient Safety: **No** Number of users: **2**

Findings

Two participants commented that there should be a standard set of responses for these queries.

Quotes

None

Recommendations

Participants were informed that there are standard values associated with each demographic criterion and that group response queries can be built to include each of standard value responses.

IMPLANTABLE DEVICE LIST

Task Data

The Implantable Device List portion of the usability study was composed of two tasks. The following table outlines the mean effectiveness, efficiency, and user satisfaction data of these two tasks.

Task	Effectiveness (% Success)	Efficiency	User Satisfaction (Rating)
Record Unique Device Identifiers Associated with Implantable Device	100%	Time (sec): 123 Std Dev (sec): 83 Errors: 1 Deviations: 0	3.3/5.0
Change Status of Unique Device Identifier	100%	Time (sec): 218 Std Dev (sec): 196 Errors: 5 Deviations: 0	4.5/5.0

Implantable Device List

Issue 1: Unable to edit Implant Date prior to Save

Issue Data

Severity: **2** Patient Safety: **No** Number of users: **2**

Findings

When entering a new implantable device, users are unable to edit the implant date prior to saving the new device. If a user enters an implant date and then attempts to change the date prior to saving, they are unable to make that edit.

Quotes

"I like how bar code scanning will default all the information."

Recommendations

Evaluate changes to allow editing the implant date prior to saving the new implantable device.

Issue 2: Warning message when Explanting or Inactivating Implantable Device

Issue Data

Severity: **3** Patient Safety: **No** Number of users: **3**

Findings

When Explanting or Inactivating an Implantable Device, a warning message appears after selecting the appropriate footer button. This results in unnecessary extra clicks.

Quotes

“That warning message isn’t necessary. It’s an extra click”

“I shouldn’t get the message right after clicking the button.”

Recommendations

Evaluate changes to remove the warning message so that upon selecting the appropriate footer button, the user is immediately brought to the correct screen to continue with their workflow.

SYSTEM USABILITY SCALE (SUS) SCORE

The System Usability Scale (SUS) analyses subjective user feedback to the system, on a numeric scale from 0 - 100. Generally, anything above 68 is considered usable. In this test, the SUS was 61.7, indicating that there is some room for usability improvements, as outlined in the key issues described above.

Overall SUS Score
61.7

APPENDIX A: CLINICAL PARTICIPANT SCRIPT

Scenario One

Harriet Thompson is a 67-year-old female who was recently admitted. Harriet has diabetes and chronic kidney disease.

Harriet has a winter residence in Arizona, and has been seeing a physician there over the last few months. Harriet has a CCD from that practice. You need to reconcile Harriet's medical information with her record at her other provider. You also want to gather additional clinical information to ensure that Harriet's chart is up to date.

Task 1: Reconcile the allergies on Harriet's CCD with those on her allergy list.

Task 2: Reconcile the problems on Harriet's CCD with those on her problem list.

Task 3: Reconcile the medications on Harriet's CCD with those on her medication list.

Task 4: Harriet reports that she has also started an aspirin regimen. Add this to her medication list as a home medication.

Task 5: Harriet also reports that she got a hip replacement while in Arizona. Record her Regenerex Hip System as an implantable device.

Task 6: Your organization has begun to capture gender identity and sexual orientation in social history. Update Harriet's PFSH to must record this information. Record Harriet's gender identity as female.

Task 7: Next, update her sexual orientation to homosexual.

Scenario Two

Now that you have reconciled external data and updated Harriet's clinical information, you begin your visit workflow.

Task 8: While updating Harriet's clinical information, you noticed that she has an outstanding order for a mammogram. Harriet indicates that she has not had a mammogram in over a year. Update the service date on the mammogram so that Harriet gets the mammogram in the next month.

Task 9: You also noticed Harriet has an outstanding HbA1c order. You decide to perform the procedure while she is admitted. Update the service date to today.

Task 10: After your nurse performed the HbA1c procedure, you continue your review while you await the results. Harriet had high blood pressure when admitted. You decide to prescribe a medication for her hypertension. Order nifedipine 10mg PO QD. If Nifedipine is contraindicated, do not place the order.

Task 11: Because Harriet has CKD and high blood pressure, you are concerned about renal artery stenosis. Order a Renal Arteriogram. If contraindicated, do not place the order.

Task 12: Because the MRA was contraindicated, you want to consider a different diagnostic procedure. Find more info about alternative diagnostics for a Renal Arteriogram to analyze renal artery stenosis.

Task 13: Based on the information you found, you decide to order a Pelvic Ultrasound. Place this order. If the order is contraindicated, do not place the order.

Task 14: Harriet has been complaining of minor headaches. Prescribe prescription-strength ibuprofen. If contraindicated, do not place the order.

Task 15: Submit your orders for Harriet.

Task 16: Update Harriet's problem list based on your observations from this visit. Update her diabetes diagnosis to uncontrolled.

Task 17: Add hypertension as problem.

Scenario Three

Your next patient is 26-year-old Amanda Sullivan. Amanda has a urinary tract infection for which she has received antibiotics, but she's still symptomatic. In addition, she's been having side effects from her antibiotic.

Task 18: Amanda has taken nitrofurantoin for her urinary tract infection, but has had dyspnea, cough, and chest and back pain since starting the medication. Discontinue this medication.

Task 19: You decide to order a urinalysis to determine if Amanda's UTI has been resolved. Order this test for today.

Task 20: Based on results from Amanda's urinalysis, you want to prescribe another antibiotic. Order trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole. If contraindicated, do not place the order.

Task 21: Because Amanda is allergic to TMP/SMX, order fosfomycin. If contraindicated, do not place the order.

Task 22: Submit your orders for Amanda

Task 23: Update Amanda's allergies based on today's visit. Add nitrofurantoin to her allergies.

Task 24: Update the severity on her TMP/SMX allergy to severe.

Task 25: Amanda has asthma and has a refill ordered for her inhaler. She's curious if the pharmacy has filled her prescription. Check the fill status on the prescription.

Task 26: While admitted Amanda would also like to have her Stradis IUD removed. Record the Explant of the the Stradis IUD from her implantable device list.

Scenario Four

You have received a phone call from Ademaro Reynoso. He plans to come into your clinic for his first appointment next week.

Task 27: Create a new patient entry for Ademaro Reynoso for Practice LSSMPMA GP and book a NEW PT VIS appointment for him.

He gives his address as 574 3rd Ave for Saint Paul, MN, 55103.

His birth date is 08/09/1982, he is male, he chooses not to give his Social Security, he is married, he says he is Hispanic or Latino for race, and his preferred language is Spanish.

His home phone is 651-555-7844.

The visit reason will be New Pt and book the appointment 7 days from now for 10:00 am.

Scenario Five

You have received a phone call from patient Helen Potter. She has decided to disclose some additional demographics to you.

Task 28: Access Helen Potter's account and update her demographics with the following:

Her preferred language is English.

Her race is White.

Scenario Six

A provider at your clinic, Dr. Mark Jones, is frustrated with receiving mild drug-drug interaction warnings.

Task 29: Edit the necessary settings for the MARKJONES entry in the MIS Interaction/Conflict Groups Dictionary to remove mild drug-drug interaction warnings.

Scenario Seven

Your organization has noted that pregnant women are not getting the recommended DTaP immunization in the third trimester of pregnancy. In the interest of increasing compliance with this recommendation, your organization plans to edit an existing pregnancy order set.

Task 30: Modify the 28 Week Pregnancy Visit order set in the AOM Order Set Dictionary to include a DTaP immunization procedure. Set the item to be checked as a default for the set.

APPENDIX B: CLINICAL PARTICIPANT DEMOGRAPHICS

Gender

Female	19	73%
Male	7	27%

Age

Choose not to disclose	0	0%
Under 20	0	0%
20-29	3	12%
30-39	10	38%
40-49	8	31%
50-59	5	19%
60-69	0	0%
Over 65	0	0%

What is the highest level of education you have completed?

Choose not to disclose	0	0%
No schooling	0	0%
8th grade or under	0	0%
High school graduate, or equivalent	3	12%
Trade/technical/vocational training	1	4%
Associate degree	3	12%
Bachelor's degree	12	46%
Master's degree	0	0%
Professional degree	0	0%

Doctorate degree	7	26%
------------------	---	-----

What is your occupation/role? (Select all that apply)

Registered Nurse ⁶	8
LPN	0
Nurse Practitioner	1
Physician	6
Resident	0
Administrative	3
IT Staff	8
Other	0

How many years have you been working in your current profession?

Less than 1 year	0	0%
1-3 years	5	19%
4-6 years	7	27%
7-9 years	3	12%
Over 10 years	11	42%

How many hours per week do you spend on a computer?

0-10	1	4%
11-25	2	8%
26+	23	88%

How many years experience do you have with any EHR?

Less than 1 year	1	4%
1-2 years	4	15%
3-5 years	6	23%

Over 5 years	15	58%
--------------	----	-----