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In 2010, the Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology (ONC) established 62 Regional Extension Centers (RECs) tasked to provide electronic health record (EHR) technical assistance primarily to healthcare providers in individual and small practices, as well as to practices that increase access to health care for medically underserved communities, uninsured and underinsured individuals.1,2 This mission encouraged the RECs to recruit many community health center and Federally Qualified Health Center (FQHC) practices that offer primary and comprehensive health care services to underserved communities and populations nationwide. Historically, the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) has played a significant role in supporting health IT adoption among FQHC providers by providing funding for information technology infrastructure, as well as through the Health Center Controlled Network (HCCN) program.3 Building on this foundation, RECs are working with FQHCs to provide support and technical assistance as their providers progress towards meaningful use of EHRs. This brief provides descriptive information on the FQHC practices RECs are working with and their evolution towards meaningfully using EHRs.

83 percent (954 of 1,147) of HRSA funded FQHC and FQHC Look-alike organizations have providers enrolled with an REC.

Figure 1: Percent of HRSA funded FQHCs and FQHC Look-alike Organizations Partnering with RECs by State

SOURCE: Customer Relationship Management (CRM) Tool, maintained by the Office of Provider Adoption and Support (OPAS) at ONC, and Health Care Delivery Sites list maintained by Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA). Data as of November 25, 2012.
## 27 states have 90% or more FQHC and FQHC Look-alike Organizations participating with an REC

Table 1: HRSA funded FQHCs and FQHC Look-alike Organization Participation with RECs in 2012, by State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State or Territory</th>
<th>Total Number of HRSA Funded FQHCs and Look-alike Organizations</th>
<th>Number of HRSA funded FQHC and Look-alike Organizations Working with RECs</th>
<th>Percent of HRSA funded FQHC and Look-alike Organizations Working with RECs</th>
<th>Number of REC Participating Providers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1,147</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>83.17</td>
<td>18,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Customer Relationship Management (CRM) Tool, maintained by the Office of Provider Adoption and Support (OPAS) at ONC, and Health Care Delivery Sites list maintained by Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA). Data as of November 25, 2012.
RECs are providing technical assistance, training, education, and outreach services to over 18,000 providers in HRSA funded FQHCs and FQHC Look-alikes.

Figure 2: REC Participating Providers by Provider Type
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SOURCE: Customer Relationship Management (CRM) Tool, maintained by the Office of Provider Adoption and Support (OPAS) at ONC, and Health Care Delivery Sites list maintained by Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA). Data as of November 25, 2012.

★ Of the 1,173 other provider types, RECs are providing assistance to:
  - 697 Dentists
  - 113 Psychiatrists and psychologists
  - 63 Social workers
  - 39 Optometrists
  - 28 Chiropractors, occupational and physical therapists
  - 11 Registered nurses
  - 5 Speech language pathologists
  - 2 Dieticians
  - 1 Other specialist
79 percent of REC providers (14,355) in HRSA funded FQHCs and FQHC Look-alikes are live with an EHR.

Figure 3: Four of Five REC Providers in HRSA funded FQHCs and FQHC Look-alikes Are Live with an EHR

Recall: Total REC providers in FQHCs and FQHC Look-alikes = 18,268

SOURCE: Customer Relationship Management (CRM) Tool, maintained by the Office of Provider Adoption and Support (OPAS) at ONC, and Health Care Delivery Sites list maintained by Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA). Data as of November 25, 2012.

★ REC providers in HRSA-funded FQHCs and FQHC Look-alikes have the second highest rate of EHR adoption (79% live on an EHR) by practice setting. The highest rate of EHR adoption among REC practice settings is within practice consortiums (82%).
**REC-enrolled FQHC providers have the second highest rate of EHR adoption (live on an EHR) when compared to other REC practice settings**

Figure 4. REC Provider rates of EHR adoption and demonstration of meaningful use by practice setting.

SOURCE: Customer Relationship Management (CRM) Tool, maintained by the Office of Provider Adoption and Support (OPAS) at ONC as of November 25, 2012; and Health Care Delivery Sites list maintained by Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA). Small/Solo Practices are private practices focused on primary care with 10 or fewer providers. Practice Consortia are generally defined by RECs as formerly-small practices that have joined together under a single tax ID to streamline administrative management. Other Underserved Settings are generally defined by RECs to include providers serving high levels of Medicaid and medically-underserved patients who do not fit into one of the other priority setting categories.

- 9% (1,723) of REC providers in HRSA funded FQHCs and FQHC Look-alikes are demonstrating meaningful use of certified EHR technology.
REC providers in HRSA funded FQHCs and FQHC Look-alikes have received over $209 million from the CMS EHR Incentive Program.

Figure 5. Cumulative Amount of CMS EHR Incentive Funds Received by REC-Enrolled FQHC and FQHC Look-alike Clinic Providers through October 31, 2012

9,762 REC providers (53%) in HRSA funded FQHCs and FQHC Look-alikes have received CMS EHR Incentive funds to adopt, implement or upgrade (AIU) EHR technology.

390 REC providers in HRSA funded FQHCs and FQHC Look-alikes have been paid by the Medicaid and Medicare EHR Incentive Program for demonstrating meaningful use of certified EHR technology.

More than $938 million potentially available to FQHC providers for AIU and Meaningful Use

- Assuming all remaining unpaid FQHC providers are eligible for the program, there is more than $174 million available to assist these providers to adopt, implement or upgrade EHR technology.
- Assuming all REC FQHC providers are eligible for and apply for meaningful use, there is more than $764 million available in meaningful use incentives to assist these FQHC providers.

Summary

REC-enrolled providers working in HRSA funded FQHCs and FQHC Look-alikes are significantly more likely to be live on an EHR than REC providers who do not practice in FQHCs (79% compared with 71%, RR=1.10, p<0.0001). This high adoption rate among REC providers in HRSA funded FQHCs and FQHC look-alikes is likely related to the historic support and financial assistance provided by HRSA and other funders. Although FQHC providers have high rates of health IT adoption, their progress towards meaningful use of EHRs is more modest—only 9% are currently demonstrating meaningful use. Delays in state Medicaid EHR Incentive Program launches and vendor upgrades, as well as the perception of competing priorities, may have slowed further health IT adoption and utilization. However, many FQHCs have specific quality improvement goals such as efforts to promote the use of proven self-management.
education programs by individuals with chronic conditions such as heart disease and diabetes. These efforts may stand alone or be part of more comprehensive initiatives such as ‘medical home’ work, where meaningful use requirements align and/or are foundational to successful achievement. REC staff report that in locations where FQHC leadership and staff recognize this association, motivation for meaningful practice transformation is happening. ONC, HRSA and CMS are continuously working to provide greater support for these vulnerable patients and providers through additional programs and funding streams that further health care transformation efforts.

Definitions
Federally Qualified Health Centers: These health centers are HRSA-supported public and private non-profit healthcare organizations that meet certain CMS criteria. FQHC look-alikes are health centers that meet the CMS “health center” definition but do not receive Section 330 funding (Section 330 of the Public Health Service Act).45 The match between HRSA and ONC REC organizations is based on HRSA funded FQHC and FQHC look-alike administrative locations and REC practices.

Performance milestones. The performance milestones for REC providers indicate a threshold at which point RECs qualify for grant reimbursement. RECs may enroll healthcare providers regardless of their CMS EHR Incentive Program eligibility.

- **Milestone 1.** Signed technical assistance contract between the Regional Center and provider with receipt of any participation fees required (enrollment).
- **Milestone 2.** Documentation of Go-Live status on an EHR, with active quality reporting and electronic prescribing.
- **Milestone 3.** Demonstrates meaningful use.

Medical Home: team-based health care delivery model led by a primary care provider, the goal of which is to maximize healthy patient outcomes through the provision of comprehensive and continuous medical care.

Data Sources
The information on enrollment with RECs and milestone achievement was obtained from the ONC Customer Relationship Management (CRM) Tool, maintained by the Office of Provider Adoption Support (OPAS) at ONC. Data represented in this brief are current as of November 25, 2012. Each REC reports milestone achievement data to ONC at time of achievement using the CRM.

Information on Centers for Medicaid and Medicare EHR Incentive Program participation status and payment amount was received from CMS and matched with ONC CRM data on the basis of the provider’s National Provider Identifier. CMS data represented in this brief are as of October 31, 2012, merged with ONC CRM data through November 25, 2012.

Data on HRSA-funded FQHCs and FQHC look-alikes were downloaded from the HRSA Data Warehouse Health Care Service Delivery Sites data set (http://datawarehouse.hrsa.gov/Download_HCC_LookALikes.aspx) on February 23, 2012.

HRSA funded FQHC and FQHC look-alike administrative locations were matched to the ONC CRM practices on the basis of address and practice name. A manual review of all grantee-level matches was performed by REC program staff to ensure accuracy of the match. Additional matching was performed, again on the basis of address and site name, to ensure that all ONC CRM sites within the matched practices matched against the HRSA grantee affiliates. Only providers located at the matched ONC CRM sites are included in the participating provider counts reported in this publication.
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