

# NEXT GENERATION OF ELECTRONIC HEALTH RECORDS

COPENHAGEN, DENMARK  
21 MARCH 2018

**DEADLINE FOR  
SUBMISSIONS**  
15 February 2018

**SUBMIT TO**  
[naja@di.ku.dk](mailto:naja@di.ku.dk)

**SPEAKERS ARE  
ANNOUNCED**  
January 2018

## ORGANIZERS

Naja L. Holten Møller  
ACM's Future of Computing Academy

Jørgen P. Bansler  
University of Copenhagen, Denmark

Sun Young Park  
ACM's Future of Computing Academy

Marianna Obrist  
ACM's Future of Computing Academy

This workshop is organized by the ACM Future of Computing Academy – in collaboration with University of Copenhagen, Department of Computer Science – to co-create questions that can guide future research in Next Generation Electronic Health Records.

The excitement around data-driven healthcare raises questions about both the kinds of Electronic Health Records (EHR) we should aim for in the future, and whether new types of data support the effective provision of healthcare. These are not solely issues of return on investment, but they touch on the very core questions concerning the direction that healthcare as a practice should take - while practically inseparable from the technologies we design.

The workshop goal is to leverage research and practice in new ways by bringing computing research in healthcare into conversation with relevant collaborators. The workshop aims at identifying key problem areas for future computational researchers to focus on by facilitating comparison between cases [8] and practical experiences with Next Generation EHR across contexts [3]. In particular, the workshop invites empirical contributions that report on the use of and experience with Next Generation EHR.

One subject for comparison in the workshop is the EHR itself. Epic is one prominent example of a Next Generation EHR [4] and a key player in the market, as the most frequently selected higher-cost EHR solution in the U.S. in 2016-2017. Meanwhile, the implementation of Next Generation EHR has proven difficult [2] and few research projects have managed to investigate the main problem areas, for example, the impacts on data quality [5] and related hazards for patients [6, 10]. Doctors complain that the intensive data entry required by most Next Generation EHR systems transforms them into clerks and distracts from patient care [7]. Another subject for comparison is the increasing demands for interoperability, data safety and current trends towards self-care, which challenge the concept of EHR as mainly a tool for doctors [1].

The broader impact of the workshop is a better understanding of different types of Next Generation EHR – and to what extent key problem areas are local or universal in nature.

## Format of the workshop

The workshop accepts submissions from researchers and practitioners with an interest in Epic or similar Next Generation EHR systems. Participants are required to submit a short paper (max. 1500 words) presenting their perspective and relating to a particular case of how Next Generation EHR are transforming healthcare.

### THE CO-CREATION INITIATIVE

Is a working group sponsored by ACM's Future of Computing Academy (ACM-FCA). The overall aim of ACM-FCA is to empower next generation of computing professionals to address pressing challenges facing the field and society.

[www.acm.org/fca](http://www.acm.org/fca)

## References

- [1] Bansler, J. P., Havn, E. C., Schmidt, K., Mønsted, T., Petersen, H. H., & Svendsen, J. H. (2016). Cooperative Epistemic Work in Medical Practice: An Analysis of Physicians' Clinical Notes. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)*, 25(6), 503-546.
- [2] Bossen, C (2007): Evaluation of a computerized problem-oriented medical record in a hospital department: Does it support clinical practice? *International Journal of Medical Informatics*, Vol. 76, 592-600.
- [3] Chen, Y. and Atwood, M.E (2007): Context-centered design: bridging the gap between understanding and designing, In Jacko J (Eds.), *HCI 2007, LNCS 4550*, pp. 40–48.
- [4] Davis Z, and Khansa L. (2015): Evaluating the epic electronic medical record system: A dichotomy in perspectives and solution recommendations. *Health Policy and Technology*.
- [5] Hanauer DA, Branford GL, Greenberg G, Kileny S, Couper MP, Zheng K, Choi SW. (2017): Two-year longitudinal assessment of physicians' perceptions after replacement of a long-standing homegrown electronic health record: Does a J-curve of satisfaction really exist? *J Am Med Inform Assoc. J Am Med Inform Assoc.* Vol. 24(e1), 157–65.
- [6] Kaziunas, E., Ackerman, M. S., Lindner, S., & Lee, J. M. (2017): Caring through data: Attending to the social and emotional experiences of health datafication. *Proceedings of the CSCW 2017 Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work*. New York, NY: ACM.
- [7] Levinson, J., Bruce, H.P., & Saini, V (2017). *Death By A Thousand Clicks: Leading Boston Doctors Decry Electronic Medical Records*. WBUR, Boston. (<http://www.wbur.org/commonhealth/2017/05/12/boston-electronic-medical-records>, accessed on 31 October 2017).
- [8] Møller, N.H (2013): Achieving Continuity of Care: A Study of the Challenges in a Danish and a US Hospital Department. In *proceedings of the 13th European Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work*, 21-25 September 2013, Paphos, Cyprus, 229-247.
- [9] Rosenbloom, S. T., Denny, J. C., Xu, H., Lorenzi, N., Stead, W. W., & Johnson, K. B. (2011): Data from clinical notes: a perspective on the tension between structure and flexible documentation. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, Vol 18(2), 181-186.
- [10] Siegler, E.L. & Adelman, R. (2009): Copy and Paste: A Remediable Hazard of Electronic Health Records. *The American Journal of Medicine* Vol. 122, 495-496.