

April 28, 2008

## **Novo Innovations Healthcare Grid Information Exchange Survey Results Summary**

### **Survey Demographics**

Novo surveyed physician practices and business affiliates (EMS providers) at the following Novo customer sites in early 2008:

- UPMC Medical Center, Pittsburgh, PA
- Inova Health System, Fairfax, VA
- Exempla Health System, Denver, CO

There were 24 respondents including physicians, physician office managers, other clinicians, IT resources, billing analysts and EMS technicians. Their practice environments were highly varied, including immunology, cardiology, emergency medicine, family practice, gastroenterology, internal medicine, nephrology, OB/GYN, pediatrics, podiatry, general surgery and others.

The respondents indicated that they were utilizing a variety of EMR systems including GE Centricity, EMScharts, Allscripts Healthmatics, MediNotes - e, Misys EHR and SafetyPad EMS. Eight respondents did not answer this question – this is not unusual, as many clinicians do not know the name of their EMR. As a result, there were many other EMRs represented in the survey that are not listed here.

NOTE: All percentages do not add to 100% due to rounding.

### **Installation Quality, Timeframe and Cost**

As to the implementation, the respondents indicated that Novo met or exceeded their expectations as follows:

- Quality of Implementation: 91%
- Quality of Training: 90%
- Quality of End-Product: 91%

77% of respondents indicated that the Novo solution was installed in less than 8 hours. That percentage increased to 86% in less than 16 hours. Only three respondents indicated that it took more than 24 hours to complete the installation.

54% of the respondents indicated they paid \$0 to be connected to the Novo Grid. 22% paid between \$1 and \$10,000. 22% were not sure what was paid.

## Impact of Grid on Practice

Over 60% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the Grid reduced costs, improved patient care, improved staff efficiency and improved their ability to do business with the hospital. Physician efficiency was the only response that did not exceed 60% agreement. This is not surprising as the impact of Novo is most evident with the physician staff that must get information into the EMR for the physician to review. Two respondents manually added that the Grid speeds billing (that was not a standard survey response option).

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Sure
Reduced Paper Costs	52.2%	26.1%	13.0%	4.3%	4.3%	0.0%
Reduced Labor Costs	39.1%	30.4%	26.1%	0.0%	4.3%	0.0%
Improved Overall Patient Care	30.4%	30.4%	30.4%	0.0%	0.0%	8.7%
Improved Timeliness of Results	65.2%	21.7%	4.3%	8.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Reduced Callbacks	47.8%	21.7%	17.4%	4.3%	0.0%	8.7%
Improved Physician Efficiency	28.6%	19.0%	19.0%	4.8%	0.0%	28.6%
Improved Compliance Effort	38.1% (8)	33.3%	14.3%	9.5%	0.0%	4.8%
Improved Delivery Reliability	38.1%	33.3%	14.3%	9.5%	0.0%	4.8%
Improved ability to do business with the hospital	54.5%	22.7%	13.6%	0.0%	4.5%	4.5%

## Referral Increase

Respondents were asked to indicate where they were **most likely** to send referrals when reimbursement rules did not dictate. Their responses indicated that the hospitals captured significant business from local providers and a small amount of business from national providers:

	Hospital	National Provider	Local Provider
Prior to Grid Installation	73%	27%	21%
After Grid Installation	88%	25%	7%
Net Difference	+15%	-2%	-14%

## **Grid Impact on You, Practice and Patients? (Unedited Responses):**

Helped staff, not scanning, improved efficiency. Very pleased at how easy to map everything.
it has been fantastic to get labs, reports, transcriptions almost instantly from the time they are reported or transcribed! It has made patient care more efficient, and saved a lot of staff time now that they don't need to call for reports
No duplication of pulling medical records for test results.
Time saving on chart completion and accurate data
able to find result quicker on patient that our doctors have seen in hospital
We are more prepared for the patients office visit
We have noticed a dramatic change in the ability to obtain information. Our phone calls to providers and patients have decreased.
Timely reports into the EMR has increased reliability and decreased staff time in receiving patient reports.
Its Ok, but the data generated at the hospital is my data. A complete Continuity of Care Record and Medication reconciliation needs to be put in place
When it is working properly we can obtain up to date insurance information that we were not able to get before.
improved and expedited returns
FASTNER TURN AROUND FOR INFORMATION ON PATIENT INSURANCE. ABLE TO BILL CORRECTLY AND SOONER.
As a small/local emergency medical service, we now spend less time, money and effort retrieving patient billing information. We can now get prompt updated information to correctly bill our patients which in turn keeps the service running well financially.
it has made it much easier for our billing office and our medic because we do not have to wait for front sheets from the hospital
Has made it very easy to obtain needed information for EMS billing purposes and assisted with most accurate information. Decreased number of bills returned due to incorrect information

## **General Comments (Unedited Responses):**

Great system!!!
We love the help in getting correct information. need to add more hospitals. Thank you
Great job overall, keep up the good work, thanks for helping us do our jobs more efficiently and improving our reimbursement practices.
We are very pleased with this system, and feel this has been a great asset to our facility.
All said and done, the process was painless and professional from beginning to end.
Our current interface is a small step towards liberating our data from the IT system of the hospital. The interface needs to be bi-directional. A complete Continuity of Care Record needs to be established and shared. EKGS need to be included. Links to view Imaging studies need to be included so that films can be viewed from my desk top. Thanks, John L. Behm, MD

### Catholic Health System Survey

CHS administered their own survey prior to Novo's survey offering. At the time of the survey in early 2008, CHS was determining the value of adding transcribed reports for radiology and other sources to the Novo Grid. CHS reports that their average lab volume growth over the four years from 2003-2006 averaged approximately 3.4%. In 2006 the Grid was installed and the resulting 2007 lab volume growth was 7.09%, representing in excess of 100% increase in growth compared to the previous years. CHS installed approximately 30 practices during this timeframe and continues to deploy to additional practices. Their survey results are summarized as follows:

Question: Your practice type is?

- Primary Care: 50%
- Community based medical specialist: 30%
- Community based surgical specialist: 10%
- Hospital based specialist: 10%

Question: In what way, if any, has the percentage of your lab services handled by CHS labs changed since the implementation of the EMR interface?

- 42% increased
- 58% no change
- 0% decreased
- Conclusion: 100% of respondents increased or maintained their level of utilization. *CHS has stopped the loss of volume to commercial labs among the respondents.*

Question: How satisfied are you with the EMR integration currently provided by the CHS laboratory?

- 8% not satisfied
- 16 percent somewhat satisfied
- 41% satisfied
- 33% very satisfied.
- Conclusion: 74% of respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with the EMR integration service.

Question: Would you recommend CHS laboratory services to your colleagues?

- 100% Yes

Question: How important would a Radiology Report interface be to your practice?

- 0% not important
- 0% somewhat important
- 20% important
- 30% very important
- 50% extremely important
- Conclusion: 100% of respondents found radiology reports to be important, with 50% saying extremely important.

Question: Would development of the Radiology Report interface increase your usage of CHS Radiology services?

- 50% yes
- 20% no
- 30% unsure

Question: How important would a Transcribed Report (History & Physicals, Operative Notes) interface be to your practice?

- 0% not
- 11% somewhat
- 11% important
- 22% very important
- 56% extremely important

### **KLAS Ratings**

Novo Innovations is not a subscriber to KLAS and as a result, we cannot provide KLAS data. However, we are aware that the KLAS scores for Novo are exceptionally high and invite Novo customers and prospects to research these scores.