

Implementing an EPR Project: Everyday Features and Practicalities of NHS Project Work

Dave Martin, John Mariani, Mark Rouncefield
Department of Computing, University of Lancaster

Abstract: This paper considers some of the everyday practicalities of delivering an electronic health record project within an NHS Hospital Trust. Using ethnographic, observational, data we document how and in what ways the orderly character of project work is achieved against a background of battles and negotiations to deliver the project within and despite various organisational contingencies and constraints.

Keywords: Electronic patient record (EPR), project work, ethnography

Introduction: Delivering the Electronic Patient Record.

Satisfying the growing demand for improved coordination and cooperation between healthcare providers presents a major challenge for healthcare planners. The NHS strategic programme Information for Health attempts to meet this challenge through the adoption of an electronic health record (EHR)¹. The patchy success record of past

¹ The term EPR (electronic patient record) refers to a record of periodic care held by a single provider. The EHR (electronic health record) refers to the fully integrated record of the patient's complete medical history

electronic patient record (EPR) projects makes it clear that the problems the EHR faces are numerous and often complex. The EHR is seen as making available more and better quality data, and leading to better treatment and the realisation of 'seamless' healthcare. But progress has fallen short of expectations and studies cast doubt on whether EPRs, never mind the EHR, [1, 2], can actually deliver the anticipated improvement in information collation, distribution and use, and promote service integration.

This paper presents some findings from an observational research project that has been investigating some of the everyday practicalities of delivering an EPR project within a hospital Trust. The emphasis is on the EPR as a project that needs to be managed in order to be successful. It recognises that many healthcare IT projects like the EPR are carried out within an organisational and political environment that threatens to overwhelm the project. Our focus is on the everyday work of the project, of the mundane and routine concern with addressing organisational contingencies and constraints. Using ethnographic, observational, techniques we document how and in what ways the orderly character of such project work is achieved and delivered. Of interest are the ways in which EPR design is related to on-going health service workflow management and re-engineering and how stakeholder participation and socio-technical design is scoped and managed.

The setting for this research is an NHS Hospital Trust that is currently in Phase 1 of a three phase comprehensive £8 million EPR project, delivered as a public private partnership (PPP). Phase 1 is due to 'go-live' in February 2004 and involves the core administrative system and connected reporting system, A & E, theatres, order communications, and pathology systems. The core administrative/reporting system incorporates various clinical applications and is designed to be integrated with existing legacy systems, most notably a series of pathology applications. Phase 2 involves documenting care (medical records), and GP access and Phase 3 is concerned with clinical pathways and electronic drug prescription.

Our research uses ethnographic methods, with their emphasis on workplace studies and the 'real world, real time', everyday character of work. The central characteristic of enquiry is the researcher's detailed observation of how the work - in this case the project work associated with designing and implementing an EPR system - actually 'gets done'. Its focus is upon the circumstances, practices and activities that constitute the 'real world', situated character of work. The defining feature of this kind of study is the immersion of the researcher in the work environment where a non-presumptive record is made of all aspects of the day-to-day work over an extended period of time. This has involved 'shadowing' the internal project team leader as they went about their everyday work as well as observing internal implementation analyst meetings, joint US/UK analyst meetings, project leaders meetings, IT communications strategy meetings and meetings with medical staff in their departments. In this way a 'thick description' [5] is built up of the situated working practices associated with the EPR project. The project manager has

responsibility for information provision and distribution, and coordinating activities amongst internal teams and with the system provider. Implementation Team Meetings are the arena in which practical project activities are reported, discussed, negotiated, planned, and decisions made. They are attended by the project manager, analysts from all implementation teams, programme support representatives, trainers, and US analysts via a teleconferencing system. These meetings tend to be fairly technical in nature and involve reporting on progress, issues and concerns. These team meetings provide an opportunity for people to orient to the project as a totality and provide some correspondence between what project members should be and are doing. At the same time the project manager uses team meetings to keep people informed, thereby keeping any progress or problems visible. This is evident in discussions about 'roll-out' time:

– “News has come from XCo that the dates they’ve given us for rolling out the .. database and the interface are months behind ... it doesn’t look like they can give us lot the interface when we need it, ... there’s no guarantee that we’re not going to have a microbiology interface up and running for the beginning of phase one”

The 'Contract':

Central to these meetings, and much of the work surrounding the development and implementation of the EPR, is the 'contract'. The 'contract' - the formal, legal stipulation of work and responsibilities - gets dragged into everyday work and used in a number of ways. For example, the contract gets referred to in everyday talk because of its importance in specifying responsibility - who is formally responsible for what - as illustrated in the following exchanges:

“...you can bet that he went back and checked on the contract right away and he was the one who actually pointed out to me that it was in the contract so .. he was going to speed this through”

“.. why are they talking to us about cost?.. contractually its on (Xco's) head”

Attention to the detail of the contract ensures that the organisation, through the project team, effectively 'covers its bases' - or fulfills its obligations - ensuring that any (inevitably costly) breakdowns cannot be attributed to the project team or the organisation it represents:

“...we have to be very pro-active and keep emailing your analyst and say what do you want me to work on? what d'you want me to do? ..-I'm getting nervous for a variety of reasons .. I'm just not sure what they're going to throw back at me .. just want to make sure we're .. covering our bases as well...”

Of course, the contract, like any plan does not, cannot, lay out in endless detail exactly what it takes to fulfill the contract. Contractual ambiguities arise over the definition of actions:

“...this goes back to the issue of .. whose responsibility is it to do certain things with setting up and configurationthe expectation has always been that well we would participate in configuration... it was on the understanding that they would be directing that configuration”

The contract therefore offers the Project Leader and Project Team possibilities for finding flexibility within contractual limits (what Bittner [4] might term 'organisational acumen') - for finding within the formal contract the means to ensure they get what they want:

"...its important that we are getting the things that we require within the contractual limitations and y'know I understand that we have to work within that but if also within that we need to make sure we are getting what we require"

Getting a Project to Work

Our observations of the implementation of an EPR project indicate a number of ways by which the contingencies and uncertainties of organisational and project life can be handled. Most obviously planning is a way of managing contingency - but, of course, plans do not implement themselves but have to be made to work in 'real world, real time'. As Button and Sharrock note [5], organising a project into 'phases', for example, is intended to ensure that tasks are worked on until completed, to achieve for the work a paced sequential progression and provide for the recognition of uncompleted steps. All phases are planned in advance in terms of what they consist of and when they will take place - identifiable major phases in this project include: procurement, award and signing of contract, 'data collection', 'database build and configuration', 'application testing', 'integration testing', and finally 'go-live and transition management'. Phasing exhibits some sensitivity to timelines of practical decision making - by specifying considerations relevant to a decision prior to any deliberation on that decision. Phases may be (almost certainly will be) delayed, tasks reallocated, items of the contract and hence the phasing re-negotiated and re-defined. Nevertheless phasing remains a key resource for the on-going practical management of the project - enabling the distribution and coordination of work, allocating responsibilities, keeping track of activities, measuring work progress.

Phasing also relates to another aspect of practical project management, the methodic handling of tasks (or at least maintaining the semblance of method) and some way of measuring progression - how they are doing, how much has been done, where they are, what remains to be done? This involves maintaining the agenda of tasks, ordering, sequencing, allocating, managing and keeping track of progress and problems. In this fashion the project manager can determine where they are relative to the project schedule, and whether the work, going at the pace it is now being conducted at, will be done by the scheduled date. The field note below, from a project meeting, illustrates just such an attempt to keep a project 'up-to-speed':

"And if I can just ask everyone to keep doing that I think we have to be very pro-active and keep emailing your analyst and say what do you want me to work on what d'you want me to do ..I'm getting nervous for a variety of reasons .. I'm just not sure what they're going to throw back at me .. just want to make sure we're .. covering our bases as well."

Of course, 'slippage' from the plan is a 'normal, natural trouble' and its importance or magnitude is measured against the schedule:

"...there was fifty three days where we were looking at database configuration and I've said that now there's, not to scare anyone, twenty eight days left ... twenty eight business days left before .. its in the plan its identified that we're going to start testing, we've not done any configuration"

Where 'slippage' does occur, contingency plans are made by reference to possible implications:

"...it may be that we'll we'll have to go with the idea that they don't interface in phase one..... but we'll carry on in discussing it um, further just to sort of look at all of the implications around it and I'm hoping that its not as. Its more annoying than anything right now if the truth be told, but in term of the scope of the overall project I think there's ways we can get around it without making it um too specific too much of an impact on the end user"

Such solutions often involve considering various workarounds:

"...we need to start thinking about ...how we would deal with that if we can't get (system) linked, we just need to start thinking what are our options whether people continue ordering micro on .. paper or whether we have .. ordering . . . I think we just have to look at all the different options ... of how to deal with it without, sort of, causing sort of too much, damage, to the microbiology staff but also without too much impact on the end user"

Keeping Track of Issues:

Getting a project to work requires that the project leader keeps track of issues and problems as they arise and are prioritised and dealt with. Issues are conventionally managed through formal and informal conversations allied with the use of various forms of documentation (schedules, logs, and meeting minutes):

"I think we just raise it so that its minuted that we've raised it ..see what their response is.."

Nevertheless items can fall off the agenda causing problems - "*I'm worried that this one has fallen through the cracks*". Sometimes 'others' - usually the suppliers - have let the project down in some sense by not conforming to agreed deadlines:

A: "...it was identified that this should be in place by June so we thought we were merrily, things were progressing the way they should but now the last information that we received, contradicted that so-so I'm going to start ah doing some phoning today .-and see what we can do..."

A: I went back to the minutes from the initial Z Co meetings and, X had said very clearly

B: Yeah he was quite confident it be ready by June

A: And we would be the first ones installed and so from the initial reports that's why I've never got too concerned and again that was a

C: Mm

A: Fatal mistake

As the above extract shows deadlines are no guarantee that work will be done and as the following shows, problems may also return:

“No I think that’s a real concern and as I’ve said I have raised it earlier and have actually added it to the issues log earlier and we have got some movement then but we’re still we’re we had some creep back”

Escalating Problems:

Orienting to the project as a totality also includes an attention to escalating things in the correct fashion, with sensitivity to the correct routes by which this should be accomplished. How can a problem be raised as an issue in such a way as to ensure it is addressed whilst maintaining otherwise cordial professional relationships? Within the EPR project there is a managed, ordered process for escalating problems:

“In some of the escalation process stuff ..I try and do everything as a staged process ...and I do try and keep things away as much as possible so that you’re not having to get involved in the in the fight part so to speak”

There are ordered ‘issues’ and ‘risks’ logs - issues become risks when they are deemed to be a threat to the planned delivery of the system:

“..its already on the Risk, Log we uhm probably up the risk number at this stage cos its obviously increased in possibility or likelihood”

When problems cannot be readily solved between analysts they are removed from the discussions:

“I’m trying to as much as possible keep the grappling over this with XCo at the level of me because I don’t want to impair your working relationships with your analysts”

The logs (particularly the risk log) are used as a means of escalating the problem to be dealt with at a higher organisational level - in this fashion attempting to ensure that harmonious working relationships can be maintained at a lower level.

“just to reassure you tomorrows IM & T steering group you can bet that this issue is going to come up at that because I already know and Y knows the issues around the code of connections.. once I’ve got the IM & T steering group fully aware of all of these issues .. they’ll take a stand, in a sense an official stand from the hospital perspective which will make it a little easier for me to put a put more pressure on XCo but I do want to keep you aware of sort of how things are going and again I do try and .. keep ... that argument side of it away from this group...”

Keeping Users in Mind:

Throughout the project there is a need (and desire) for ‘user’ involvement - though this may get submerged in the myriad demands of keeping a project on track. In these circumstances a focus on practice as well as process (a socio-technical perspective) and an understanding that a ‘domestication’ process [6] that fully involves the various stakeholders is required. Of course, ‘users’ come in various forms, and on occasion it may be that the interests (requirements or convenience) of one set of users, say administrative staff, may clash with those of another, say clinical staff or patients. Tensions (professional and design related) exist between different user groups. Even within the clinical user group there are many different sub groups; consultants, doctors,

nurses, physiotherapists, occupational therapists, radiologists, lab staff etc. Each has different work oriented perspectives on same patient and this can have implications for the design of the EPR. Nevertheless the EPR system, as an infra-structural backbone to the organisation requires a close match with organisational structure, process and practice. The system is inextricably linked to all work activities so it is of crucial importance to understand and take users' everyday activities into account. One problem that arises therefore is in considering the relationship of the EPR to other organisational changes, where there may be a lack of understanding of just what the implications of the EPR are on everyday organisational workings. In these circumstances the problem emerges of human factors effectively being downgraded, being dumped (perhaps by necessity in this type of project) down the schedule, or treated as 'other' types of problem and perhaps not adequately addressed.

In this project there is a desire to gain an understanding of current procedures - as part of an attempt, in some cases, to transform them. In this case, user involvement comes in the form of 'expert' or 'super-users' who are involved in specifying current configuration and procedure. The main involvement of these super-users comes during testing which, it is envisaged will highlight various human factors problems. Though identifying what the problem is and how to solve it can be difficult with piecemeal documentation of current practice. The influence of these super-users is variable and partially reliant on their relationship with their UK analyst and their experiences of the healthcare system. So, for example, the pathology analyst has worked to develop systems with users over a long period and is good at championing their cause:

"..if there's no way to get the information, from the microbiology system into (system) then people will still have to go to multiple places to get the information they want and that defeats the object (of the project)"

"if we have a single sign on procedure, to get both onto the network and onto (system), we may run into problems in the laboratory with our connections to all our other analysers"

One example of the way in which human factors enter into the project and are given serious discussion came with a debate concerning 'logging-on' procedures – taking in issues of security that particularly arise in the chaotic work environment of A & E.

A: Because if they've got to log out people will not log out of it they don't now ..

B: But maybe they won't have a chance because the log in time out will...

A: Well I understand that .. but if it doesn't time out before someone gets their hands on the keyboard, .hh that next action is taking place under someone else's signature

B: Mm hm

A: And that's a problem

C: Mm hm it is a problem

A: And in A & E, in that chaotic, you know, environment, they will not log out

C: Well and again that is something I mean again this is one of the reasons why we've asked for the IT trainers here as well so that this is ... yesterday I met with the IT trainers and we started talking about some of the issues that we need to make sure that everyone is aware of .. this is one of the key ones . making sure that people log out and understanding the implications because in a fact it's an electronic signature, and

that's going to give a print, of where you've been on the system and if you don't log out you're allowing someone else to use that that signature

A: But it's not a training issue

C: Mm

A: The fact is that the log out procedure will not be looked upon as important as treating a patient

C: Sure

A: And in that environment they're not going to turn round, and log out, every time they walk away from a PC, I can guarantee that

C: Yeah so .. we need to to look at it.. I agree it's not completely a training issue I do think it is partially a training issue

As healthcare organisations seek to deploy the EPR as an infrastructural technology, i.e., as a backbone for organisational activities, the need for a close match with the organisation increases [2, 7]. A growing body of research has reported the difficulties involved in designing systems that match the complex and particular needs of organisational users. To work and be useful, systems have to be adapted in the course of implementation to match them to users' technical and organisational contexts [2, 8]. To be successful, such processes of configuration, 'design in use' or *domestication* [9] require contributions from a wide range of organisational members as well as technical specialists.

For example, underlying technical and organisational issues, problems with 'legacy' systems hinder the development and deployment of the EPR. This is not just about linking software from different systems, but also understanding how the organisation works. An appreciation of legacy needs to move away from a purely technological stance to admit the importance of a subtle appreciation of factors that may appear distant from the technology, including details of everyday working practice. Any attempt to resolve legacy issues will depend for its success on understanding that organisational change will necessarily have to confront the legacy of current practices. This involves understanding how technologies become embedded, and are oriented to, within everyday working practice.

The configuration challenges for the EPR are numerous and significant. There are a large number of issues concerning the detailed design of user interaction with the system. Perhaps more importantly, many implications of information integration, i.e., more rapid information flows, novel information representation and record-keeping practices, will only become understood through experience gained in use. Integration may change existing -- or create new -- work dependencies between e.g., clinical and administrative departments in unexpected ways. This is seen, for example, in the debates around security policy:

– “Yeah um can I ask a quick question .. what's gonna be the policy with regard to time out, functionality of the software?... if we have a single sign on procedure, ... we may run into problems in the laboratory

with our connections to all our other analysers, if somebody initiates a data transfer, ... for reviewing and authorising results as they come up on analyser and the network connection is cut because the time out's kicked in ... you could end up locking a lot of results that takes a long time to actually retrieve.”

It is vital that system implementers be aware of such changes, evaluate their significance and match them to system configuration options. For this to happen, there must be effective mechanisms for feeding back experience of use to implementers, and appropriate policies in place for negotiating how this is acted upon.

Discussion: Project Work & Organisational Issues.

This section attempts to link the everyday concerns of managing a major IT project with other important organisational considerations. The project is characterised by on-going negotiations about tasks and responsibilities and substantial on-going effort to coordinate work across diverse inter-organisational teams across sites and time-zones. This is managed through both formal (contracts, schedules, meetings, visits) and informal means (email, telephone calls etc.) Working with and working out these relationships between organisations;

“in a sense our thing is with, ** the ..(Yco's) manager and theirs is (with) XCo”

...involves learning how they are structured:

“I’ve got the numbers to start phoning myself and trying to pursue it we’re a bit in a situation where we’re at the mercy of .different organisations because ..its ZZ .. and so we’re trying to liaise through various layers of people to try and get this to move on, so ...”

... and (of course!) with inter-organisational working others failings can suddenly become your problems:

“it is our issue but its .. not us holding it up on this one ... but it will not be seen that way in the Trust they’ll see it as the EPR not meeting a target”

System design in a large NHS Trust (and the associated processes of analysis, configuration, testing, integration, evolution etc.) is a complex, messy business. This EPR project within the Trust is proceeding in tandem with the implementation of a new network infrastructure. In these circumstances, issues such as hardware provision, data point placement, database configuration and population, interface design and training is inextricably linked to other projects and organisational working associated with modernisation and investment in IT. At the same time the NHS environment can be said to be characterised by upheaval and changing circumstances, policies, even governments. Furthermore, given national, governmental targets and priorities there is a sense in which this is a project that cannot afford to fail - unlike the software projects documented by Button and Sharrock [5], and despite the long history of IT failures within the NHS, there is a strong sense that this is a project that must succeed, that abandonment to work on another project is not an available, or thinkable option. And, of course, resource remains a problem within the NHS environment. Variations in resource coverage are due to

histories of systems use, problems in attracting technical staff, differing systems expertise, different mechanisms for clinical input, varied relationships with clinical staff etc. all of which bear on the success of the project and its associated work. Similarly, reliance on many providers adds even greater complexity to working relationships. The core system, legacy applications (e.g. pathology) and middleware are all provided (or have been provided) by different companies, and the advent of PPP has changed relationships between providers such that the Trust only has an indirect relationship with legacy providers.

Some impediments to integration through the EHR simply reflect the scale of the organisations and services involved. For large organisations with complex information systems, achieving even modest levels of integration can be difficult in practice [10]. Here the issue of funding and ensuring accurate statistics brought this concern to the fore:

– “..I did meet with XXX yesterday to discuss some of the issues .. because the reports we hand into the NHS are crucial to our funding, as a Trust and obviously we have to get the reporting right and there’s a huge risk to the Trust because we’re going live six weeks before the end of year, and .. all of our end of year reports we have to make sure are right between that six week period, ... I needed to speak .. and make sure he understood very clearly, what these risks were ... it is an issue that we need to really look at because we do need to make sure our reports are correct that we’re handing in and XCo has to build the system to NHS requirements so we do have to sort of match up all these things..”

The government and public desire for transparency, league tables etc. places a strong reporting focus on the EPR. This accentuates the need for business focused organisational acumen to understand how to produce figures that paint the Trust in the best light within the ‘rules’ of production for those figures (Bittner's ‘gambit of compliance’, [5])

The evolving nature of the services being provided leads to difficulties in providing technical support that can evolve to match organisational change. Large organisations exhibit further complexities related to scale, numbers of distinct roles and processes, and the richness and inter-relatedness of information in the organisation. Information exchange practices and systems are rooted in local work processes as well as wider patterns of co-ordination and communication. Attempts to change practices, and redefine roles and relationships may lead to resistance, if those involved have different commitments and understandings of organisational processes and service provision. Current health and social care policy initiatives in the UK make significant claims about the desirability of integrated services for better health and social care, i.e., more patient-centred healthcare delivery, improved resource utilisation and management of information. Plans for implementing these initiatives appear to be largely predicated on information integration being a precondition for service integration. The EPR is an element of this strategy, yet as our research too readily documents, its implementation presents formidable challenges.

Conclusion

We wish to be cautious about suggesting how the problems and particulars of the EPR project reported on here translate to other NHS settings and projects, however it may be useful for others if we make some tentative remarks on this topic. Firstly, in some fashion the work reported here is as with systems design projects elsewhere. Project work is complicated and messy, managing a project like this involves a lot of ‘work to get the project to work’ (cf. Bowers [11]). Work must constantly be done to move things along, keep track of what is going on, inform the ‘correct’ people of developments, discuss, argue and re-negotiate tasks, roles and responsibilities. The work will not go to plan, certain aspects will be designed a lot more satisfactorily than others – in other words, project work is necessarily a ‘satisficing’ activity (i.e. finding workable and acceptable compromises).

In terms of specifics for the NHS it can be seen that a big challenge for any Trust implementing an EPR is that of achieving a global view of their information flows and processes. The EPR project can serve to expose a current lack of consistency, coherence and integration of terminology, information and processes that must be overcome and reconciled to enable project success. The EPR cannot realize its potential without organizational change. A final point to end on which builds on the previous two is that it is important to acknowledge that the business of system configuration is the major design task. Configuration involves ‘working out how the Trust works’, how activities are structured and so forth, and modeling them such that they are consistent and logical, then building this into a database that may well place further constraints on the models thus forcing further re-design and satisficing. All aspects of this work are difficult and time consuming, as painfully realized by the Trust discussed here. One might consider that the constraints imposed by re-configuring a US application for UK healthcare create particular problems that may be avoided by other service providers, however the biggest problem of configuration has been working out how the hospital works and modeling this in a satisfactory (both to the disparate workers and for the purposes of database build) manner suggesting that this may well be the same for others and thus is a key concern for the development of EPRs.

References:

- [1] Ellingsen G, Monterio E. A patchwork planet: The heterogeneity of electronic patient record systems in hospitals. In Proceedings of IRIS 2000 (Uddevalla, Sweden, August, 2000).
- [2] Hanseth O, Monteiro E. Changing Irreversible Networks. In Proceedings of BCIS 1998 (Aix-en-Provence, June 1998).
- [3] Geertz C. Thick description: Toward an interpretive theory of culture. In *The Interpretation of Culture*. 1973; New York. Basic Books: 3 - 30.
- [4] Bittner E. The concept of organisation. *Social Research* 1965; 23: 239-255.

- [5] Button G, Sharrock W. Occasioned practices in the work of software engineers. In Requirements Engineering Social & Technical Issues, Jirotko M, Goguen J (Eds). 1994 London. Academic Press: 139-166.
- [6] Williams R, Slack R, Stewart J. Social Learning in Multimedia, Final Report to European Commission, DGXII TSER, 2000, University of Edinburgh.
- [7] Rolland K, Monteiro, E. Balancing the Local and the Global in Infrastructural Information Systems. The Information Society 2002; 18 (2): 87-100.
- [8] Heeks R, Mundy D, Salazar A. Why Healthcare Information Systems Succeed or Fail. Institute for development Policy and Management Working Paper Series No. 9. ISBN 1 9025 1825X. 1999 University of Manchester, Manchester.
- [9] Hartswood M, Procter R, Rouncefield M, Sharpe M. Making a Case in Medical Work: Implications for the Electronic Medical Record CSCW Journal 2003; 12 (3): 241-266.
- [10] Ciborra C. The Grassroots of IT and Strategy. In Ciborra and Jelassi (Eds) Strategic Information Systems 1994; Wiley: 16-37.
- [11] Bowers, J. The work to make the network work: Studying CSCW in action. In Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work 1994, ACM Press: 287-298.