

# Electronic Health Record Reporting Program

## Draft Voluntary User-Reported Criteria Summary Tables

*June 2020*

Tables 1-4 below summarize draft voluntary user-reported criteria for public feedback organized by the 21st Century Cures Act categories and stakeholder priority topics. In addition, table 5 summarizes product and user characteristics that stakeholders identified as contextual information for comparing products based on criteria. The numbering aligns with question numbers in the user questionnaire. Additional information on these topics will be collected from other sources, such as developers and existing data.

### Contents

Table 1. Interoperability Draft Criteria	2
Table 2. Usability Draft Criteria	3
Table 3. Privacy and Security Draft Criteria	4
Table 4. Other Draft Criteria	4
Table 5. Product and User Characteristics	6

**Table 1. Interoperability Draft Criteria**

Stakeholder Priority Topic	User Questionnaire
<b>HIEs, HIOs</b>	5.4 Ease of exchange with health information organizations (HIOs) or health information exchanges (HIEs)
<b>PDMPs</b>	5.8 Ease of connecting with local Prescription Drug Monitoring Program (PDMP)
<b>Other providers and payers</b>	5.1 Ease of exchange with clinicians who have a different EHR/health IT product  5.2 Ease of exchange with clinicians outside organization  5.3 Ease of exchange with clinicians inside organization  5.5 Ease of exchange with payers
<b>Registries and other public health</b>	5.6 Ease of exchange with state registries including public health  5.7 Ease of exchange with clinical registries
<b>Reports and data</b>	5.9 Ease of producing all the reports required for specialty
<b>Incentive programs</b>	5.10 Ease of attesting to the Promoting Interoperability Program and the Merit-based Incentive Payment System (MIPS)

**Table 2. Usability Draft Criteria**

Stakeholder Priority Topic	User Questionnaire
Overall usability	6 Satisfaction with overall usability
Provider burden	Satisfaction with how product:  7.1 allows users to be more productive  7.2 aligns with practice workflow  7.3 easily accesses and assimilates data from other products  7.4 produces clinical benefits for the practice  7.5 decreases time spent documenting patient care
Quality and safety	Satisfaction with how product:  7.6 enables delivery of high-quality care  7.7 improves patient safety  7.8 does not disrupt interaction with patients  7.9 easily produces understandable clinical summaries  7.10 helps prevent care delivery errors  7.11 has advantages that outweigh the disadvantages overall
Analytics	8.1 Ease of use for data analytics
Orders	8.2 Ease of use for default values for common orders  8.4 Ease of use for evidence-based order sets and charting templates
Documentation	8.11 Ease of use for structured templates
e-Prescribing controlled substances	8.3 Ease of e-prescribing of controlled substances
Receiving and reviewing images	8.5 Ease of image receipt and review
Chronic disease management tool	8.6 Ease of use for integrated chronic care management tool

Stakeholder Priority Topic	User Questionnaire
Accessibility	8.7 Ease of mobile access 8.10 Ease of remote access
Optical character recognition	8.8 Ease of use for optical character recognition
Patient reminders	8.9 Ease of sending patient reminders
Telemedicine	8.12 Ease of use for telemedicine capabilities
User-configured interfaces	8.13 Ease of use for user-configured interfaces
Voice recognition	8.14 Ease of use for voice recognition / voice-to-text capabilities

**Table 3. Privacy and Security Draft Criteria**

Stakeholder Priority Topic	User Questionnaire
Overall privacy and security	13. Overall satisfaction rating for security and privacy features

**Table 4. Other Draft Criteria**

Stakeholder Priority Topic	User Questionnaire
Overall satisfaction	3. Overall satisfaction rating 4. Likelihood of recommending product to colleague with similar practice
Pricing model	14. Pricing model(s) (perpetual license, subscription, or other)
Costs	15. Approximate total implementation cost 16. Approximate annual cost to maintain product
Implementation Process	9. Overall satisfaction with the implementation process
Maintenance and upgrades	12. Satisfaction rating for:

Stakeholder Priority Topic	User Questionnaire
	<p>12.1 overall upgrades and maintenance</p> <p>12.2 downtime or burden associated with upgrades and system maintenance</p> <p>12.3 advance notification of upcoming upgrades or maintenance</p> <p>12.4 support for upgrades or maintenance</p>
<p><b>Support for standard use</b></p>	<p>10. Availability of support and whether additional fee is required for:</p> <p>10.1 24/7 help desk support</p> <p>10.2 dedicated client support</p> <p>10.3 in-person support</p> <p>10.4 online user guides and/or video tutorials</p> <p>10.5 live and/or recorded webinars</p> <p>11. Satisfaction rating for available support</p>
<p><b>Contractual information</b></p>	<p>17. Whether contract includes a defined cost and/or procedure for users to leave the product (sometimes called “out clause”)</p>

**Table 5. Product and User Characteristics**

Stakeholder Priority Topic	User Questionnaire
<b>Product characteristics</b>	1. Certified health IT product(s) used (vendor/product/version selected from dropdown)
<b>User characteristics</b>	2. Type of clinical or non-clinical user  18. Setting  19. Practice size  20. Types of services provided at practice  21. State  22. Urban/suburban/rural  23. Share of patients uninsured or covered by Medicaid  24. User proficiency with product

# Acknowledgments

This research was funded by the Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology. We are grateful to them and to all our funders, who make it possible for Urban to advance its mission.

The views expressed are those of the authors and should not be attributed to the Urban Institute, its trustees, or its funders. Funders do not determine research findings or the insights and recommendations of Urban experts. Further information on the Urban Institute’s funding principles is available at [urban.org/fundingprinciples](http://urban.org/fundingprinciples).



500 L'Enfant Plaza SW  
Washington, DC 20024

[www.urban.org](http://www.urban.org)

## ABOUT THE URBAN INSTITUTE

The nonprofit Urban Institute is a leading research organization dedicated to developing evidence-based insights that improve people’s lives and strengthen communities. For 50 years, Urban has been the trusted source for rigorous analysis of complex social and economic issues; strategic advice to policymakers, philanthropists, and practitioners; and new, promising ideas that expand opportunities for all. Our work inspires effective decisions that advance fairness and enhance the well-being of people and places.

Copyright © June 2020. Urban Institute. Permission is granted for reproduction of this file, with attribution to the Urban Institute.