# **Practicum Report**

Bу

Shree Dhavale

Submitted in fulfillment of the HIT 5000: Practicum in Applied Health Informatics

Shree Dhavale

Student Signature

Faculty: Susan H. Fenton, PhD, RHIA, FAHIMA Associate Dean of Academic Affairs

UT School of Biomedical Informatics

Date Project Submitted: 8/11/14 Date Project Accepted:

# CONTENTS

SUMMARY	3
INTRODUCTION	3
LEARNING OBJECTIVES AND EXPECTED OUTCOME	4
TURF FRAMEWORK	4
EVALUATION OF TURF FRAMEWORK	5
USABILITY EVALUATION AND STUDY METHODS	9
EVALUATION OF APPLICATION OF TURF TOOL	9
USER TESTING ANALYTICS	10
CONCLUSION	15
REFERENCES	16
CONTRIBUTORS	16

#### SUMMARY

The practicum in Health Informatics is a means for the students to apply the knowledge gained during the various courses taken throughout the graduate course work, to the real world. Much of the work that I have done for this practicum relates back to the course work done for HIT 5323 (Evaluation of Health Information Systems in Applied Health Informatics) and HIT 5329 (Assessment and Evaluation). The methods used to identify and assess different aspects of healthcare systems and healthcare workflow and the evaluation of health information system can be applied to this practicum project. The learning objective and the expected outcomes from this exercise include learning about the tool itself and studying how effective the tool is to measure user performance. Both the HIT 5323 and HIT 5329 courses were directly related to the activities that emphasized the need for a user-friendly electronic health record (EHR) design. In the usability studies conducted in HIT 5323, we learnt that, if properly designed, an EHR can improve the quality of the healthcare delivered and increase satisfaction of clinicians and patients. For the purpose of this practicum, a small study was conducted for 2 ambulatory physician practices where the TURF tool was applied and efficiency of the users to complete the same task using two different electronic medical record (EMR) software products was compared.

#### INTRODUCTION

The practicum in Health Informatics at the UT Health School of Biomedical Informatics requires the students to select an area of interest where the knowledge and skills gained during the didactic courses can be applied to real world. I have been an EMR implementation analyst for over four years. Having been through various implementations, I was interested in studying the usability of the various EMR software products that are used in the ambulatory physician practices. With the help of my advisor, Dr. Fenton and the Executive Director of the Gulf Coast Regional Extension Center (REC), Mr. Sam Liong, I was able to finalize the project for my practicum study. The project was to perform usability evaluation for small physician practices using a framework analysis tool developed at UT Health. As a part of my study, I had to offer a minimum of two small practices a no-cost usability evaluation of their work processes using the TURF usability analysis tool. It was necessary for me to learn the TURF usability framework and become familiar with using the tool to apply it to the two practices and gather the needed data to do the analysis.

## LEARNING OBJECTIVES AND EXPECTED OUTCOME

The learning objectives for the practicum involved applying TURF usability framework in a minimum of 2 small practices recommended by Gulf Coast REC.

- 1. Initial objective was to set up TURF framework to study usability evaluation, testing, measurement and design of electronic health record systems.
- 2. The second objective involved identifying inefficient processes and give recommendations for increasing efficiency at the practices where I was going to conduct the usability study.

The following were the proposed outcomes of the practicum study:

- Study the TURF tool in-depth using online tutorials and videos found on the TURF website.
- 2. Under guidance of the REC, apply the TURF usability tool to a minimum of 2 physician practices work processes. The two practices need to be using EHR software.
- 3. Research the effectiveness of the tool itself and make recommendations to improve the tool. Learn how to use TURF to measure user performance after the training.

## TURF FRAMEWORK

The TURF Usability Toolkit has been developed by the SHARPC research group working on addressing the usability and workflow challenges of health information technology (HIT). Per the TURF toolkit website "The National Center for Cognitive Informatics and Decision Making in Healthcare (NCCD) is funded by the Office of the National Coordinator for Health IT (ONC) under the Strategic Health IT Advanced Research Projects (SHARP) Program which supports improvements in the quality, safety and efficiency of health care through advanced information technology". The TURF tool enables data collection that spans capturing user audio, video and keystroke events when the users interact with the EMR software. The tool assists in detailed annotation using evaluation templates and generates statistical reports to evaluate the data collected at the time of usability testing.

My initial objective was to set up TURF framework, study the tool itself and evaluate the toolkit. I decided to evaluate the toolkit based on two evaluation methods. The first one is a criteriabased assessment, which is a software evaluation methodology described by Jackson, Crouch and Baxter in their paper 'Software Evaluation: Criteria-based Assessment'. The second evaluation method that I decided to use was Nielsen's Heuristics.

The criteria-based assessment gives the measure of quality in the areas of usability, sustainability and maintainability. The criteria based assessment involves checking whether the software follows numerous features or shows the qualities that are expected of a sustainable software. For the purpose of my study, I focused only on usability, documentation and sustainability aspect of the criteria-based evaluation methodology. The following criteria was used to evaluate the TURF tool usability and sustainability. Ju- Ne

### **EVALUATION OF TURF FRAMEWORK**

#### Usability

Understandability	Yes/No, supporting comments if warranted
How straightforward is it to understand:	Software is pretty straightforward to understand
What the software does and its purpose?	It is a toolkit to measure usability of EMR
. С.	systems.
The intended market and users of the	EMR software trainers and developers
software?	
The software's basic functions?	Capture user interactions while navigating
	various EMR screens
The software's advanced functions?	In-depth statistical reporting functionality
High-level description of what/who the	No. There is inadequate documentation on the
software is for is available.	website explaining the audience and purpose of
	the software
High-level description of what the software	Yes. There is documentation on the website
does is available.	describing what the software does.
High-level description of how the software	The Tutorial videos are very good and sufficient
works is available.	to understand how the software works.
Design rationale is available – why it does	No.
it the way it does.	
Descriptions of intended use cases are	Yes. The videos explain the use cases very well
available.	

Case studies of use are available.	No
------------------------------------	----

# Documentation

Looking at the user documentation, what is	Yes/No, supporting comments if
its	warranted
Quality?	The documentation is only in form of online
	videos. The quality of which is very good.
Completeness?	The training videos were thorough and
	complete
Accuracy? Appropriateness? Clarity?	The training videos were accurate,
	appropriate and very clear
The only desired documentation was a written	online help section. It was glaringly missing
and would have added value to the TURF web	site
Lists resources for further information.	No
Is task-oriented.	Yes
Consists of clear, step-by-step instructions.	Yes
Gives examples of what the user can see at	Yes
each step e.g. screen shots or command-line	.0)
excerpts.	
$\sim 0$	
Sustainability and maintainability	<u> </u>

Identity	Yes/No, supporting comments if warranted
To what extent is the identity of the Project/software clear and unique both within	It is very clear as the TURF tool is very well branded
its application domain and generally?	
Project/software has its own domain name.	Yes
Project/software has a logo.	Yes
Project/software has a distinct name within its Application area.	Yes
A search by Google on the name plus keywords from the application area throws up the project web site in the first page of matches.	Yes
Existing trade-mark.	Yes
Project/software name is trade-marked	Yes

# Installability

How straightforward is it to:	
Meet the pre-requisites for the software on a	Very straightforward as this is a free
target platform?	downloadable software
Install the software onto a target platform?	Very easy if you have a Java plug-in installed
Configure the software following installation	No configuration required
for use?	
Verify the installation for use?	Just like any executable that is downloaded
	from the internet
Web site has instructions for installing the	Yes.
software	

The second evaluation method that I used to evaluate TURF tool was Nielsen's Heuristics.

	Nielsen's Heuristics					
	Heuristics		Did TURF tool pass this criteria?	Did TURF tool pass this criteria?		
•	Visibility of system status		The system should always keep users informed about what is going on, through appropriate feedback within reasonable time	Yes		
•	Match between system and the real world	3	The system should speak the users' language, with words, phrases and concepts familiar to the user, rather than system-oriented terms. Follow real-world conventions, making information appear in a natural and logical order.	Yes		
•	User control and freedom	•	Users often choose system functions by mistake and will need a clearly marked "emergency exit" to leave the unwanted state without having to go through an extended dialogue. Support undo and redo.	Yes		
•	Consistency and standards	•	Users should not have to wonder whether different words, situations, or actions mean the same thing. Follow platform conventions.	Yes		
•	Error prevention	•	Even better than good error messages is a careful design which prevents a problem from occurring in the first place. Either eliminate	Yes		

# Nielsen's Heuristics

	Heuristics	Did TURF tool pass this criteria?				
			error-prone conditions or check for them and present users with a confirmation option before they commit to the action.			
•	Recognition rather than recall	•	Minimize the user's memory load by making objects, actions, and options visible. The user should not have to remember information from one part of the dialogue to another. Instructions for use of the system should be visible or easily retrievable whenever appropriate.	Yes		
•	Flexibility and efficiency of use	•	Accelerators—unseen by the novice user—may often speed up the interaction for the expert user such that the system can cater to both inexperienced and experienced users. Allow users to tailor frequent actions.	Yes		
•	Aesthetic and minimalist design	•	Dialogues should not contain information which is irrelevant or rarely needed. Every extra unit of information in a dialogue competes with the relevant units of information and diminishes their relative visibility.	Yes		
•	Help users recognize, diagnose, and recover from errors	•	Error messages should be expressed in plain language (no codes), precisely indicate the problem, and constructively suggest a solution.	Yes		
•	Help and documentation:		Even though it is better if the system can be used without documentation, it may be necessary to provide help and documentation. Any such information should be easy to search, focused on the user's task, list concrete steps to be carried out, and not be too large.	It would have been helpful to have an online 'Help' menu with documentation for novice users like me. The only source of help were the online videos.		

#### TURF FRAMEWORK EVALUATION CONCLUSION

The TURF FRAMEWORK was easy to install. It is a software that can be downloaded from the internet with the help of a Java plug-in. After evaluating the software using the criteria-based assessment and Nielsen's Heuristics, one can infer that it meets almost all of the measures described in the two measuring tools. The higher the scores achieved on the rating scale the better the software that is being evaluated. From the scores achieved on both the evaluation criteria, it would be safe to infer that the TURF Framework software has good usability and sustainability and users will find it greatly helpful when trying to use it for assessment of EMR systems implemented in the physician practices.

#### APPLICATION OF TURF TOOL

Under guidance of the REC, the TURF usability tool was installed on a laptop that belonged to the Gulf Coast REC (GCREC). The Executive Director of GCREC and another GCREC analyst working with the physician practices reached out to the two physician practices who agreed to participate in the small study. One of the practices was using NextGen as their preferred EMR software while the other practice was using Practice Fusion as their preferred EMR software in their respective practices.

In order to have a baseline evaluation criteria, it was decided that I would record the workflow for the E-prescribing feature of both the EMR software. For users to conduct user testing of the respective EMR software at the two practices, the following steps were set up within the TURF software.

- 1. Set up two testing projects separately for the two practices.
- 2. Create folder structures for user data to record the E-prescription workflow in NextGen and Practice Fusion respectively.
- 3. Create Demographics form and System Usability Survey forms for users to fill out.
- 4. Set up the Data capture folders so that the users can record the workflow in real time.
- 5. Set up User Testing forms for the users to complete.
- 6. Export the User Data.
- 7. Analyze the data using the statistical tools available in TURF.

With the set up for recording the user workflow ready on the laptop, I was able to visit the two practices with the GCREC personnel. The physicians were asked to open the folders created in their name for recording the workflow and asked to click the 'Record' button in TURF and follow their usual workflow when they e-prescribe a medication using their EMR medication module. After the workflows were captured, the two physicians and their MA's who participated in the study were asked to fill out a System Usability Survey (SUS) so that the SUS scores could be calculated at the end of the study. The user testing analytics was done using descriptive analysis, analysis of the SUS scores, task time comparison, task time and number of steps comparison and creating pivot comparison table to compare the efficiency of the two EMR software.

### USER TESTING ANALYTICS

1. Descriptive Analysis

This analysis compared the Users on the criteria of age, gender, education, role in the practice, computer proficency, EMR software proficiency

L.	1					TUD	201					
PL	1						2.0.1					
	File Home	Heuristic Evaluation	User Testing	Analyze View	Settings							
	R 🗐 🗍	<u></u>	Sum V. Minimum St	ariance	Skewness	t u		SA	$\mathcal{A}$			
Q	uery Load New C iles Files Sheet	Variable	Maximum ⊻ R Mean Ki	ange urtosis	Run Tv	vo-Sample Mann-Wi T U	nitney One-way Coun ANOVA	t SUS Linear P Score Regression	earson Correlation coefficient			
	Data	Process Raw Data		Descriptive Analysis		Compare M	eans Ca	alculate Regression	Correlation			
Г										▼ × ₩		
ſn												- N
					Dra	g a column header here	to group by that column					oard
	Name	Participant ID	First Name	Last Name	Age	Gender	Education	Name of Clinic / Or	Role in the Organiz	Computer Keyboar	Next Gen EHR Proficiency	T
	GLADYS GALINDO	3	GLADYS	GALINDO	20 - 40 yrs	Female		DR. BAY VAN NGU	FRONT DESK	Expert Computer	Worked With EHR Module	I ^
	Bay Van Nguyen	4	Bay	Nguyen	>60 yrs	Male	M.D., Ph.D.	Bay Van Nguyen,	Physician	Very Little Experien	Worked With EHR Module	I
	Physicial1_DrDancel	1	Federico L.	Dancel	40 - 50 yrs	Male	M.D	Dr. Dancel's practice	Physician	Very Little Experien	Worked With EHR Module	I
	Laurie	2	Laurie	Lawrence	50 - 60 yrs	Female	Hiugh School	Dr Dancel	Office Manager	Good Experience w	Worked With EPM and EHP	R
Ŀ	4					11					•	
					С	hoose Templates for A	nalytics: None	<ul> <li>Template Ma</li> </ul>	intenance 🔡 Swit	tch to Pivot Table/Chart	Export to Storyboa	rd

### 2. Analyze SUS scores

At the end of the workflow recording each participant was asked to fill out a survey that measured the satisfaction of the user with the software. Using the statistical functionality of the TURF Tool, the SUS scores were calculated and compared for both the EMR software products.

The SUS score for NextGen was 66.25 and the SUS score for Practice Fusion was 60. Please see the images below to view how the SUS score is calculated using the statistical functionality in TURF.

4	TURF 2.0.1	_ = ×				
File Home Heuristic Evaluation	User Testing Analyze View Settings	۵				
Query Load New Files Files Sheet Data	Sum     Variance     Skewness     Image: Constraint of the station       Minimum     Standard deviation     Image: Constraint of the station     Image: Constraint of the station       Mean     Kurtosis     Rung     Image: Constraint of the station       Descriptive Analysis     Compare Means     Constraint of the station					
SUS_1 × SUS_1 of SUS Score analytics_1 ×		▼ × Sto				
	Drag a column header here to group by that column	ryboard				
File Name SUS Score						
SUS_DrDancel1 70		A				
SUS_Laurie 62.5						
	SUS_Laurie 62.5					

#### NextGen SUS Scores for the physician and the medical assistant (MA)

# NextGen Average SUS Score

<b>t</b>		TURF 2.0.1	_ = ×
File Home Heuristic Evaluation	n User Testing Analyze View Settings		⇔ <b>0</b>
Query Load New Files Files Sheet Data	Sum Variance Skewness Minimum Standard deviation Maximum Range Run V Mean Kurtosis Descriptive Analysis	Image: Two-Sample         Image: Two-White         Image: Two-Sample         Two-Sample         Image: Two-Sample         I	
SUS_1 × SUS_1 of SUS Score analytics	1 × SUS_1 of SUS Score analytics_1 of Descriptive analytics	1 ×	▼ × Story
		Drag a column header here to group by that column	board
Name Mean			
SUS Score 66.25			A

Practice Fusion SUS Score the physician and the MA

	t		TURF 2.0.1	_ = ×
6	File Home	Heuristic Evaluation	User Testing Analyze View Settings	۵ ۵
	Query Load New Files Files Sheet Data	Convert to Numeric Variable Process Raw Data	Sum     Variance     Skewness     Image       Minimum     Standard deviation     Image     Image       Maximum     Range     Run       Kurtosis     Two-Sample       Descriptive Analysis     Compare Means	
4	SUS_1 × SUS_1 of S	US Score analytics_1 ×		▼ X
			Drag a column header here to group by that column	board
	File Name	SUS Score		
	SUS_GALINDO	62.5		A
	Nguyen	57.5		

### Practice Fusion Average SUS Score

4		TURF 2.0.1			~
File Home Heuristic Evaluation User Te	esting Analyze View Settings				۵ 📀
🔍 🧐 📋 🛄 🛄 Sum	Variance Skewness	$t  u  \mathcal{A}$	CSA	A	
Query Load New Convert to Numeric Maximu Files Files Sheet Variable Variable	Jm Range Run Tw Kurtosis	ro-Sample Mann-Whitney One-way T U ANOVA	Count SUS Linear Score Regression	Pearson Correlation coefficient	
Data Process Raw Data	Descriptive Analysis	Compare Means	Calculate Regression	Correlation	
SUS_1 × SUS_1 of SUS Score analytics_1 × SUS_1	of SUS Score analytics_1 of Descriptive analytics_1 ×				▼ X Stor
	Drag	g a column header here to group by that colu	mn		yboard
Name Mean					
SUS Score 60					A

3. Analyze Task Times and Compare Number of Steps

As the user recorded the clicks in the steps of the workflow, the screen capture utility created a spreadsheet that captured each click as an event. Using this spreadsheet the task times and number of steps were calculated for each users. The image below is an example of the screen capture and data created by the clicks in his workflow while prescribing a medication electronically in NextGen followed by an image of screen capture for Practice fusion E-Prescription.

NextGen Events Screen



### Practice Fusion Events Screen



The screen below compares Practice Fusion and NextGen task time showing that the task of prescribing medications electronically took a little more time in Practice Fusion than in NextGen.

#### NextGen: 174 seconds

#### Practice Fusion: 221 seconds

1	t								TURF 2.	.1						
	File	Home	Heuristic Evaluation	User Testing	Analyze	View	Settings									
	È,	<b>i</b>		Sum Minimum	Variance Standard devi	SI ation	kewness	t	U	$\mathcal{A}$	CS		$\mathcal{A}$			
	Query Files	Load New Files Sheet	Convert to Numeric	Maximum	Range		Run	Two-Samp T	le Mann-Whitr U	ey One-way	Count SUS	Linear Regression	Pearson Corre	elation nt		
		Data	Process Raw Data	• Inicali	Descriptive A	nalysis			Compare Mean	5	Calculate	Regression	Correlatio	on		
[	Win_1	×														
ſ								Deep a salue								
								Drag a colum	n neader here to g	roup by that co	olumn					
	Na	me	Task time													
	▶ Wir	n_Nguyen	22	21												
	Wi	n_Dancel	17	74												
	Wir	n_Gladys	24	17												

The screen below compares Practice Fusion and NextGen task time and number of steps comparison.

The number of steps taken to prescribe a medication in NextGen was 64.

The number of steps taken to prescribe a medication in Practice Fusion was 53.

<b>t</b>			TURF 2.0.1	_ = ×
File Home	Heuristic Evaluation Us	Iser Testing Analyze View Setting	15	۵ (۵
Query Load New Files Sheet Data	Convert to Numeric Variable Process Raw Data	m Variance Skewness inimum Standard deviation aximum Range ean Kurtosis Descriptive Analysis	Image: Second system     Image: Second system <th>▼ × Stopbard</th>	▼ × Stopbard
Name	Task time Nu	umber of steps		
Win_Dancel	174	64		A
Win_Nguyen	221	53		
Win_Gladys	247	88		

The pivot comparison table shows comparison between number of steps and task time for both the physicians using two different software products doing exact same task.

t	TURF 2.0.1 _
File Home Heuristic Evaluation User Testing Analyze View Settings	
Sum Variance Skewness	t <u>u</u> <u>A</u> <u>c</u> <u>s</u> <u>A</u> <u>A</u>
Query Load         New         Convert to Numeric         Maximum         Range         Rur           Files         Files         Sheet         Variable         Ø         Mean         Kurtosis           Data         Process Raw Data         Descriptive Analysis         Descriptive Analysis	n Two-Sample Mann-Whitney One-way Count SUS Linear Pearson Correlation T U ANOVA Score Regression coefficient
Win_1 of Pivot analytics ×	Compare means curcume megression contention
	ŧ x
	Drop hiter helds Here
Data Headers Name	
Product Number of steps Task time Number of steps Task time	
2 53 221	
	Mi Suuitek ta Takular Viau
	switch to labolar view Save lempiste
Chart Type: Bar Stacked Series 2D * 🗹 SI	how Point Labels 🔘 Generate Series From Columns 🔘 Generate Series From Rows Export Type: Both Data And Chart 🍷 🛗 Export to Storyboard
-	
100 -	
64	
0	
Win_Dancel   Number of steps	
Win_Dancel   Number of steps	Win_Dancel   Task time
Win_Dancel   Number of steps	Win_Dancel   Task time
Win_Dancel   Number of steps	Win_Dancel   Task time
Win_Dancel   Number of steps	Win_Dancel   Task time
Win_Dancel   Number of steps       It       File     Home       Heuristic Evaluation     User Testing       Analyze     View       Stewness     Stewness       Standard deviation     Stewness	$Win_Dancel   Task time$ $TURF 20.1 - \sim \sim \circ$
It     Image: Standard deviation       File     Home       Heuristic Evaluation     User Testing       Analyze     View       Standard deviation     Skewness       Query Load     New       Convert to Numeric     Maximum       Range     Runge       Runding     Range	Win_Dancel   Task time
Win_Dancel   Number of steps       It       File     Home       Heuristic Evaluation     User Testing       Analyze     View       Standard deviation     Skewness       Query Load     New       Convert to Numeric     Maximum       Plats     Process Raw Data	Win_Dancel   Task time
Win_Dancel   Number of steps       Win_Dancel   Number of steps       Image: Steps       Image: Steps       Query Load New Friles Sheet Origon (Convert to Numeric Variable Data Descriptive Analysis)       Image: Steps       Image: Steps	Win_Dancel   Task time
Win_Dancel   Number of steps       It       File     Home       Heuristic Evaluation     User Testing       Analyze     View       Stemmer     Stewness       Ouery     Load       Data     Convert to Numeric       Win_1 of Pivot analytics     X	Win_Dancel   Task time       TURF 2.0.1       Turo Sample       Mann-Whatney       ANOVA       Court       Score       Regression       Compare Means       Compare Means
Image: Win_Dancel   Number of steps       Image: Win_Dancel   Nume of steps	Win_Dancel   Task time       TURF 2.01       Image: Turo-Sample       Mann-Whitney       One-way       Court       Store       Regression       Compare Means       Court       Court       Court       Court       Court       Store       Regression       Correlation
Um_Dancel   Number of steps       Number of steps       Number of steps	Win_Dancel   Task time       TURF 20.1       Image: Turo-Sample       Mann-Whitney       One-way       Court       Store       Regression       Correlation       Correlation       Correlation       Turo Falter Fields Here
Image: Steps	Win_Dancel   Task time       TURF 2.01       Image: Control Supervision       Image: Control Supervision       Compare Means       Compare Means       Compare Means       Person Correlation       Correlation       Image: Control Supervision       Compare Means       Image: Control Supervision       Compare Means       Person Correlation       Image: Control Supervision       I
Win_Dancel   Number of steps         It         File       Home         Heuristic Evaluation       User Testing         Analyze       View         Sum       Variance         Standard deviation       Skewness         Process Raw Data       Maximum         New       Convert to Numeric         Win_1 of Pivot analytics ×         Product       Number of steps         Number of steps       Task time         1       64         174       53         221	Win_Dancel   Task time       TURF 2:01       Ture-Sample     Mann-Whitney       Count     SUS       Count     Count       Sus     Count       Count     Sus       Drop Filter Fields Bere     # x
Win_Dancel   Number of steps	Win_Dancel   Task time       TURF 2:01       Image: Supple Control of C
Win_Dancel   Number of steps       It       File     Home       Heuristic Evaluation     User Testing       Analyze     View       Sum     Variance       Convert to Numeic     Maximum       Process Raw Data     Descriptive Analysis       Win_1 of Pivot analytics ×       Product     Number of steps       Task time     64       174     53       21     53	Unplace!   Task time       TURF 2:01       Image: Ture Sample Mann-Whitney One-way ANOVA       Count SUS Court Sus Court Sus Court Sus Court Sus Correlation Coefficient       Compare Manns       Drop Filter Fields Here
Win_Dancel   Number of steps       It       Image: Standard deviation       Image: Standard deviation       Oursey: Load       New       Convert to Numeric       Image: Standard deviation       Data       Process Raw Data       Vin_1 of Pivot analytics ×       Image: Standard deviation       Number of steps       Task time       1       64       174       53       21	Win_Dancel   Task time         TURF 2.01         Ture-Sample         Mann-Whitney         One-way         Court         Score         Regression         Correlation         Correlation         Correlation         Top Fater Fields Here
Image: Standard deviation     User Testing     Analyze     View     Standard deviation       Standard deviation     Sum     Variance     Skewness       Outer     Image     Image     Image       Data     New     Convert to Numeric     Maximum     Range       Very Load     New     Voccess Raw Data     Descriptive Analysis       Vin_1 of Proot analytics ×     Image     Number of steps     Task time       1     64     174     53     221	Win_Dancel   Task time       TURF 2.01       Image: Control Score       Image: Control Score
Image: Standard Series 2D       Win_Dancel   Number of steps         Image: Standard Series 2D       Standard Series 2D         Image: Standard Series 2D       Standard Series 2D         Image: Standard Series 2D       Standard Series 2D	Win_Dance!   Task time         TURF 2.01         I       Image: Colspan=Wann-Wintney       Image: Colspan=Wann-Wint
Win_Dancel   Number of steps         It         File       Home         Heuristic Evaluation       User Testing         Analyze       View         Standard deviation       Standard deviation         Query       Convert to Numeric         Minimum       Standard deviation         Query       Convert to Numeric         Win_Standard deviation       Rau         Data       Descriptive Analysis         Win_1 of Pivot analysics       X         Rate.Hsaders       Nume         Number of steps       Task time         Number of steps       Task time         1       64       174         2       53       221	Unin, Dancel   Task time         TURF 2:01         Toro-Sample         Mann-Whitting         Count       Stip         Compare Means         Count       Stip         Compare Means         Count       Stip         Count       Stip         Compare Means       Count         Drop Filter Fields Bere       # x         Import Labels       Generate Series From Columns         Generate Series From Columns       Generate Series From Rows Export Type:         Both Data And Chart       Export to Stopboard

Win\_Nguyen | Task time

100

Win\_Nguyen | Number of steps

#### CONCLUSION

Descriptive Analysis and SUS scores:

After analyzing the demographic data gathered for descriptive analysis it was observed that there is a direct correlation between age and level of computer competency and use of the EMR software. The average age for office staff was 20 - 30 years, while the average age for the physicians was 50 - 60 years. The office staff had a high school diploma but were comfortable with using computers. The physicians were not very comfortable using the computers. In spite of this disparity in demographics, the average SUS score for both the softwares is 66.5 for NextGen and 60 for Practice Fusion.

Comparison of Task Time and Number of Steps:

Both the practices completed the exact same task of prescribing a medication electronically. The number of steps taken to prescribe a medication in NextGen was 64 while in Practice Fusion it took 53 steps to complete the same task. In NextGen the users were able to complete the taks in an average time of 174 seconds while in Practice Fusion it was 221 seconds.

The TURF tool was very useful to record the workflows of two different software products. Using the statistical utility in the software we can compare and contrast the ease of use of both products. The TURF tool can be useful while conducting initial studies when physicians are trying to decide upon an EMR product to buy for their practices. It can also be used as an evaluation tool for training pursposes. In a classroom training, after the staff is trained to perform certain tasks TURF can be used to evaluate proficiency of the users. It can be also used to find stopping points in the workflow. It is a user-friendly tool and can be implemented for various different areas of usability studies.

#### REFERENCES

#### Retrieved from turf.shis.uth.tmc.edu/turfweb/

Jackson, M., Crouch, S. and Rob Baxter (NOVEMBER 2011). Software Evaluation: Criteriabased Assessment. Retrieved from <u>software.ac.uk/sites/default/files/SSI-</u> <u>SoftwareEvaluationCriteria.pdf</u>

Nielsen, J. (January 1, 1995). 10 Usability Heuristics for User Interface Design. Retrieved from http://www.nngroup.com/articles/ten-usability-heuristics/

### CONTRIBUTORS

I would like to convey my heartfelt thanks to everyone who helped me complete the practicum.

Dr. Susan Fenton Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, UT School of Biomedical Informatics

Mr. Sam Liong Executive Director of the Gulf Coast REC

Dr. Min Zhu UT School of Biomedical Informatics

Ms. Sheila Banyai, GSEC, CHTS - TS Health Care IT (HIT) Consultant

Special thanks to the practices of Dr. Dancel and Dr.Nguyen for allowing me to take their time between patient appointments so I could complete my small study.