association of family health teams of ontario

EMR Survey Results - Comparison of EMR Evaluations

Survey item (Note: the following EMRs were removed from the table since less than 2 FHT responses were received: ABELMed EMR, CLINICARE, EMR Advantage, GlobeMed, Med Access, Wolf, YES)	Accuro(R) EMR by Optimed	Bell EMR (formerly Xwave EMR)	JonokeMed	Nightingale	OSCAR by McMaster U	P & P Data Systems Inc.	PSS by MD Physician Services	York-Med System	HealthScreen	TOTAL[1]
# of FHTs reporting EMR use	6	15	5	5	14	7	59	2	8	**121**
% of all respondents	5.0%	12.4%	4.1%	4.1%	11.6%	5.8%	48.8%	1.7%	6.6%	100.0%
# of respondents evaluating EMR	4	13	5	5	11	7	49	2	7	**103**
Total # of FP users	78	163	37	49	127	78	723	6	50	**1311**
Total # of individual users	224	491	113	237	542	345	2,510	20	219	**4701**
% of all users captured in these responses	4.7%	10.3%	2.4%	5.0%	11.3%	7.2%	52.5%	0.4%	4.6%	98.4%
# of people that signed up for user group participation	3	10	4	4	10	9	45	2	5	**92**

Legend:	Very Poor = 1:00 to1.99; Poor = 2:00 to 2.99	Average = 3:00 to 3.99	Good = 4:00 to 4.99; Excellent = 5:00

Purchase Experience										
Q1. The vendor consistently responded to requests for information in a timely manner, provided clear documentation, and was knowledgeable and forthright regarding the terms of agreement.	4.00	3.33	3.67	2.67	4.09	3.33	3.07	3.00	2.75	3.32
Q2. Pricing information was clearly documented. There were no major hidden costs that became evident after the agreement with the vendor was signed.	4.25	3.64	4.40	2.83	4.64	3.57	3.35	3.00	3.67	3.71
Q3. Once the purchase was concluded, there was a smooth transition from the sales team to the implementation team with respect to my time and that of my office staff.	5.00	3.40	3.67	2.17	4.36	3.38	3.35	3.00	3.67	3.56
Total Mean Score	**4.42**	**3.46**	**3.91**	**2.56**	**4.36**	**3.43**	**3.26**	**3.00**	**3.36**	**3.53**

[1] TOTAL (for evaluation categories) = mean of all scores, not weighted, responses omitted for EMRs with only one or no FHT responses

Survey item (Note: the following EMRs were removed from the table since less than 2 FHT responses were received: ABELMed EMR, CLINICARE, EMR Advantage, GlobeMed, Med Access, Wolf, YES)	Accuro(R) EMR by Optimed	Bell EMR (formerly Xwave EMR)	JonokeMed	Nightingale	OSCAR by McMaster U	P & P Data Systems Inc.	PSS by MD Physician Services	York-Med System	HealthScreen	TOTAL[1]
Implementation Experience										
Q1. Overall Implementation Experience: Satisfactory explanation of the implementation process provided by vendor, and sufficient resources dedicated to ensure that implementation was well coordinated, including the installation of software and computers.	4.00	3.45	3.67	2.67	4.10	3.13	3.46	3.50	3.50	3.50
Q2. Training: Adequate initial and subsequent training provided to ensure users were able to use the system with an acceptable level of comfort and proficiency, and were able to enhance their use of clinical and administrative functions.	4.33	3.07	3.83	2.17	3.90	2.50	3.25	2.50	3.00	3.17
Q3. Change Management: Vendor provided sufficient guidance to physicians and staff to ensure an effective transition to the EMR (e.g., anticipating and accommodating workflow changes in practice, identifying potential new roles for staff, and developing new policies and procedures in areas such as privacy and security).	4.67	2.93	3.50	2.20	3.70	2.63	2.69	2.50	2.80	3.07
Total Mean Score	**4.33**	**3.15**	**3.67**	**2.35**	**3.90**	**2.75**	**3.13**	**2.83**	**3.10**	**3.25**
Support Experience										
Q1. Based on your experience with the vendor, how would you rate your overall support experience, e.g., was the vendor able to keep up with interface enhancements such as new billing requirements and lab downloads by releasing timely patches and new versions of the software?	3.33	3.33	3.83	2.67	3.80	2.67	2.55	3.00	3.00	3.13
Q2. When you contact your vendor for support, how would you rate availability (hours during which support is provided, e.g., Monday to Friday, seven days per week, etc.) and your ability to speak to a support specialist when you call the support line?	4.67	3.38	3.67	3.50	4.18	3.44	3.18	2.50	3.50	3.56
Q3. How would you rate your vendor's ability to provide support through multiple mechanisms such as telephone, email, on-site support, video conference, or through an EMR user group?	4.67	3.13	4.00	3.33	4.18	3.11	3.24	2.50	3.50	3.52
Total Mean Score	**4.22**	**3.28**	**3.83**	**3.17**	**4.05**	**3.07**	**2.99**	**2.67**	**3.33**	**3.40**

[1] TOTAL (for evaluation categories) = mean of all scores, not weighted, responses omitted for EMRs with only one or no FHT responses

![afhto - association of family health teams of ontario]

Survey item (Note: the following EMRs were removed from the table since less than 2 FHT responses were received: ABELMed EMR, CLINICARE, EMR Advantage, GlobeMed, Med Access, Wolf, YES)	Accuro(R) EMR by Optimed	Bell EMR (formerly Xwave EMR)	JonokeMed	Nightingale	OSCAR by McMaster U	P & P Data Systems Inc.	PSS by MD Physician Services	York-Med System	HealthScreen	TOTAL[1]
Usability										
Q1. Provides a consistent and clean user interface with only the tools I need to do the job and not a lot of extraneous information. Controls, icons, screens and hot keys are consistent across the user interface and match the way I practice medicine.	5.00	3.33	4.17	3.40	4.18	3.56	4.00	3.00	3.60	3.80
Q2. Displays relevant information when needed so that I do not have to remember all the details (e.g. shows allergies and current medications during prescribing).	5.00	3.64	4.00	3.40	4.36	3.89	4.21	2.50	3.40	3.82
Q3. Provides tools to support workflows in my practice, such as entering information into templates, notes, referral letters, with information like patient name, address, problem lists, etc. as appropriate.	4.67	3.43	4.17	3.40	4.27	3.33	4.16	3.00	3.60	3.78
Total Mean Score	**4.89**	**3.47**	**4.11**	**3.40**	**4.27**	**3.59**	**4.12**	**2.83**	**3.53**	**3.80**
Clinical Satisfaction										
Q1. Clinical Satisfaction: I have achieved gains in quality of care. I can frequently provide care in a way that was not possible before I had the EMR (e.g., enhanced ability to recall patients for preventive care, manage co-morbid disease, easily write prescriptions, or identify potential drug-drug or drug-disease interactions).	4.67	3.62	4.33	3.20	4.50	3.56	4.02	3.00	3.75	3.85
Q2. Workload: Workload has decreased or remained neutral. As a result of the EMR, I am generally able to do more for patients or I am able to see a greater number of patients in the same period of time.	5.00	3.00	4.00	2.40	4.00	3.56	3.33	3.00	3.33	3.51
Q3. Efficiency: On average, I am aware of improved efficiency in my ability to record encounter notes, access lab results or historical information, bill directly from the encounter, or access my EMR remotely from outside my office.	5.00	3.31	4.17	2.60	4.40	4.11	3.87	3.00	3.80	3.81
Total Mean Score	**4.89**	**3.31**	**4.17**	**2.73**	**4.30**	**3.74**	**3.74**	**3.00**	**3.63**	3.72

[1] TOTAL (for evaluation categories) = mean of all scores, not weighted, responses omitted for EMRs with only one or no FHT responses

Last Update: May 9, 2012