# IMMUNIZATION REGISTRY TARGETED RESEARCH Evaluation Of Private Provider Participation In An Immunization Registry In Washington State Status Report To CDC/NIP

**December 2,1999** 

Robert L. Davis, MD, MPH. Principal Investigator

Betsy Klebanoff-Hills, MPH Project Coordinator

Collaboration of
Group Health Cooperative of Puget Sound
Public Health Seattle King County
Snohomish County Health District
University of Washington
Washington State Dept. of Health

Funded by CDC/NIP

#### Research Objective

What are the most effective ways to both <u>secure</u> & <u>maintain</u> the active participation of private providers in an immunization registry?

### The Registry

**CHILD Profile:** 

<u>Child Health Immunization</u> <u>Linkages & Development</u>

CHILDWEB Internet interface
HII partnership

## **Study Design**

Two observational, cross-sectional studies assessing attributes associated with increased participation & utilization of an immunization registry

#### Recruitment Study (Participation)

Addresses "how to <u>secure</u> private provider participation"

### Retention Study (Utilization)

Addresses "how to maintain private providers in an immunization registry"

#### **Methods:**

Statewide focus groups

In-depth interviews

Follow-up interviews

CHILD Profile agreements & utilization reports

Health Dept. & local health jurisdictions

**Census Bureau** 

Labor Dept.

State medical organizations

#### **Developing The Instrument**

### 5 Focus Groups (n = 47):

- 3 Provider Focus & "telefocus" groups (n = 29)
- 1 Health Plan "telefocus" group (n = 9)
- 1 Registry user "telefocus" group (n = 9)

#### **Salient Points**

Immunization Information - problematic

Immunization registries - good idea

Widespread participation is key - mandate?

Decision depends on cost-benefit analysis & registry features

Low awareness of CHILD Profile & few registry user endorsements

### Focus Group Findings

Potential predictor variables influencing provider recruitment & retention:

**Provider features** 

**Practice features** 

**Registry features** 

**Community features** 

#### Recruitment Samples

N = 265 Medical organizations participating in VFC in 3 counties exposed to CHILD Profile Information in 1998

n = 115 Randomized VFC sites in 3 Counties

43% = Sample Target (115/265)

#### **Retention Sample**

- n = 35 Medical organizations contributing data to CHILD Profile in 1998
- N = 41 Total # of medical organizations contributing data to CHILD Profile in 1998
- 85% Sample target (35/41)

#### Recruitment Questionnaire

**Exposure To Registry & Decision Status** 

Will participate - Reasons

Will <u>not</u> participate - Reasons

**Deciding - Assessments** 

Not considering - Reasons

**No Exposure To Registry**Hypothetical Considerations

#### Recruitment Qx. Cont....

Immunization & the community
Computer status
Recommendations
Funding preferences
Management preferences
Mandates

#### **Retention Questionnaire**

Immunization & the community
Computer status & internal costs
CHILD Profile experience & usage
Benefits
Satisfaction
Evaluation & overall opinions
Clinic information & participation method

#### **User Group Characteristics-Retention**

N = 40 CHILD Profile Users

N = 29 Users Surveyed (73%)

11 non-responders

2 not giving shots

2 lost staff user/no one in charge

1 done in recruitment sample

3 too busy

3 never responded

#### User Group Characteristics cont....

Public 48% Private 41%

Rural 58% Urban 42%

East 14% Central 7% West 59%

11 Health Dept. (38%)
9 Private medical organizations (31%)
6 Community clinics (20%)
3 Hospital-based clinics (10%)

#### **User Fees & Contracts**

55% participants contracted (16/29)

7 contracted with HII CW

9 contracted with CP

44% participants not contracted (13/29)

## **Registry Use**

	<b>Daily</b>	Weekly	Monthly	<u>Annual</u>
Online	28	24	10	_
Batch	3	3	14	7
Web	3	3	3	

## **Experience & Usage Section**

Registry Attribute	<u>Daily</u>	<u>Weekly</u>	<b>Monthly</b>	Not at all
Entering immunization records	41%	31%	14%	3%
Looking immunization records	35%	38%	7%	3%
Accountability reports	31%			62%
Recommendation screen	21%	17%	<b>7</b> %	38%
Reminder & Recall	3%		7%	72%
Exemption lists				<b>76%</b>

## **Benefits (Users)**

Registry Features	Beneficial &Very Beneficial	Not & Somewhat Beneficial	DK/NA
Retrieving imm. records	<b>72%</b>	24%	3%
Documenting immunizations	69%	24%	6%
Integrating CP into office	59%	28%	13%
Increasing imm. rates	51%	24%	24%
Reducing missed opportunities	48%	28%	24%
Recommendation screen	38%	34%	27%
Decreasing record keeping	31%	59%	10%
Reminder & Recall notices	10%	41%	48%

## **Satisfaction (Users)**

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied
Product as a whole	28%	52%	21%
Cumulative cost of participating	21%	38%	14%
Your over-all satisfaction	24%	55%	10%

# **Evaluation (Users)**

	Good to excellent	Fair to Poor	DK/NA
Help Desk support	90%	3%	7%
Ability to impact imm. rates	65%	10%	24%
User-friendliness	59%	41%	
Ease of integrating CP	48%	42%	10%
	10%	69%	21%

#### Participation of other organizations

Database population 7% 76% 17%

#### Potential Users -Recruitment

N = 267 VFC sites not using CP N = 101 Survey participants (38%)

**Yakima County** 

N = 51 potential participants

**n = 26 (51%) responders** 

**Thurston County** 

**N** = 30 potential participants

**n = 10 (33%) responders** 

**King County** 

N = 186 potential participants

**n = 65 (35%) responders** 

#### Potential Users (N = 101)

No. Clinic sites 3.7 (mean)

No. Providers 3.4 (mean)

**Rural 33% Urban 66%** 

East WA 4% Cent WA 21% West WA 67%

Private
Public
Hospital-based clinics
Community clinics

88%
4%
4%

## **PC Status (n = 101)**

PC Usage	Yes	No
Billing	93%	7%
Word processing	83%	17%
Databases	<b>73%</b>	<b>27%</b>
Scheduling (pts. or staff)	61%	39%
Internet/email	48%	<b>51%</b>
Immunization info. & tracking	29%	<b>70%</b>
Electronic medical records	25%	<b>75%</b>
HEDIS reports	9%	91%

## **Reasons to Participate**

N = 7	Important To Very Important	Not to Somewhat Important	DK/NA
Impact immunization rates	100%		
Accuracy	100%		
Recommendation screen	100%		100%
Ease in loading historical data	89%		11%
Participation by other organizations	89%		11%
Clinical assessments	89%		11%
Management	88%		12%
	<b>78%</b>		22%

**Ease of integrating into practice Security &confidentiality** 

**78%** 

22%

#### **Reasons Not to Participate**

N = 13	Important to Very important	Not or Somewhat Important	DK/NA
Integrating into practice	75%	20%	5%
Loading historical data	<b>75%</b>	20%	5%
Accuracy	70%	30%	
Fees	65%	30%	5%
Security & Confidentiality	65%	35%	
Hardware cost	35%	30%	5%
Participation by other organizations	15%	70%	15%