
Evaluating new interactions in healthcare: challenges and approaches

Rebecca Randell

Centre for HCI Design
City University
London, EC1V 0HB UK
rebecca.randell.1@city.ac.uk

Geraldine Fitzpatrick

VP, Authoring
Authorship Holdings, Ltd.
Authors Square
Authorfordshire, UK AU1 2JD
author2@author.ac.uk

Stephanie Wilson

Centre for HCI Design
City University
London, EC1V 0HB UK
steph@soi.city.ac.uk

Lena Mamykina

YetAnotherCo, Inc.
123 YetAnother Ave.
YetAnothertown, PA 54321 USA
author4@yetanotherco.com

Charlotte Tang

Department of Computer Science
University of Calgary
Calgary AB Canada T2N 1N4
char.tang@ucalgary.ca

Abstract

New technologies for supporting the provision of healthcare are increasingly pervasive. While healthcare computing previously referred to a desktop computer within the consulting room, we are now seeing an ever broader range of software, hardware and settings. This workshop is concerned with how to conduct evaluations which allow assessment of the overall impact of technology. The workshop will explore challenges and approaches for evaluating new interactions in healthcare. In this paper we outline the goals for this workshop and summarize the issues and questions it intends to explore.

Keywords

Healthcare, evaluation

ACM Classification Keywords

H5.m. Information interfaces and presentation (e.g., HCI): Miscellaneous.

Introduction

New technologies for supporting the provision of healthcare are increasingly pervasive and we are now seeing an ever broader range of software, hardware

Copyright is held by the author/owner(s).

CHI 2009, April 3 – April 9, 2009, Boston, MA, USA

ACM 978-1-60558-247-4/08/04.

and settings. For example, while previously IT was predominantly based in the consulting room, clinicians now have access to an increasing amount of information, including electronic patient records (EPRs), via devices such as PDAs, computers-on-wheels (COWs), and tablet PCs (e.g. [5, 8]). The mobility of these devices means that they can be accessed on wards, by the patient bedside and during ward rounds. Healthcare technologies are also making their way into patients' homes, e.g. as telecare and assistive technology packages, to enable them to take greater control of their health, including in the management of chronic diseases such as chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD).

While previous evaluations of healthcare technologies have focused on certain aspects of the technology, such as specific user interface features, or the impact on certain aspects of individual or group behaviour, such as the time taken to complete a task or communication within a clinical team, or on clinical outcomes, this workshop is particularly concerned with how to conduct evaluations which allow assessment of the overall impact of technology in its context of use. User acceptance is an enduring problem for the introduction of healthcare technologies, suggesting a need for evaluation techniques that allow us to demonstrate to potential users a clear benefit. Additionally, in a policy environment in which resources are finite and scarce, policy makers need data that allow them to decide how best to use those resources.

The introduction of healthcare computing applications involves a number of components – technological, social and organisational. If the results of an evaluation are to inform wider implementation, it is necessary to

not only know whether or not an application brings benefit but also to know the nature of the components and the specific context in which it was introduced. As healthcare computing increasingly moves away from the desktop, into hospital wards and patients' homes via mobile technologies, additional challenges to evaluation arise. For example, current evaluation reports on homecare technologies focus largely on clinical outcomes [3] but ignore aspects of the live experience of the technology and its social acceptability and fit into domestic life [2]. While progress has been made in HCI in developing evaluation methods for such challenging settings (e.g. [6]), we are interested in how these can be incorporated into a coherent evaluation methodology which allows assessment of the overall impact of healthcare technologies. Lack of recent discussion of evaluation methodology within CHI has been noted [1]; we hope this workshop will reignite debate on this topic within the specific context of new healthcare technologies.

Workshop goals

The goals for this workshop are as follows:

- To provide an opportunity for HCI researchers to share and learn from each other's experiences of evaluating new healthcare technologies.
- To elaborate the challenges in the evaluation of new healthcare technologies.
- To understand how these issues play out in different settings, e.g., hospital and home.
- To explore how existing methods of HCI evaluation could be adapted and expanded.
- To work towards an agenda for the evaluation of new technologies in healthcare, identifying key

components of the intervention to be studied, appropriate processes and outcomes to be reported, and methods for doing so.

- To develop a community of HCI practitioners to take the agenda forward.
- To draw together the discussions that emerge from the workshop to be disseminated to the HCI community through a special journal issue.

While the specific issues the workshop will address will be determined by the paper submissions, below we outline some potential issues to explore, arranged according to the broader questions of how, who, what and where.

Workshop questions

How?

The choice of evaluation methodology must arise from and be appropriate for the problem or research question under consideration [4]. CHI is currently dominated by quantitative empirical evaluations, followed by qualitative evaluations [1]. Another common approach is the combining of qualitative and quantitative methods. Which of these is most appropriate for our purpose? What is the relevance of expert evaluation, and who constitutes an 'expert' in this context? Are there methods from other domains that could be usefully adapted for the evaluation of new healthcare technologies, e.g. from health services research?

Who?

New healthcare technologies may be designed for either clinicians or patients, or they may be designed for clinicians and patients to use together. Where

technologies designed for clinicians are used when interacting with patients, to what extent should we be paying attention to the experience of the patient and the impact on interaction and communication? Are there other groups of 'users' that we also want to consider? For example, if a technology is being used in the home, the extended family is likely to be involved.

What role do we want to give users in the evaluation? For example, do we want to provide users of homecare technology with dynamic feedback to enable them to provide narratives of the reasons for changes in clinical outcomes [7]? Where we have multiple users and multiple interpretations of the system, how do we draw these together to provide an overall assessment?

A review of CHI evaluations highlights a decrease over time in the number of subjects in quantitative empirical studies [1]. What are the challenges in recruiting participants to evaluation studies of new healthcare technologies and how could these challenges be overcome? How do we determine an appropriate 'sample size' for such evaluations?

What?

The components of a healthcare technology intervention include the type of hardware, the functionality provided by the software, particular interface features, the physical configuration of the hardware, the aesthetic design of the device, the training provided, and the organisational culture. Is it necessary to explore the impact of all of these components? If not, which should take priority? What other components should we consider? How can we understand the impact of these different components? Should we be testing multiple designs in order to, for

example, understand the benefits of different interface features [9]?

Looking at the impact of the technology, how do we determine appropriate process measures and patient outcomes for systems, such as EPRs, that do not have an easily visible and quantifiable relation to patient care? Or that have a clear quantifiable relation to patient care but more subtle yet critical experiential aspects that are critical to their acceptability and success?

Where?

What are the challenges of evaluating technologies in home settings and what approaches can we use to overcome these challenges? When mobile technologies are used in a ward setting, observing their use can also present challenges; how can we adapt current evaluation methods to overcome these challenges?

What is the potential of lab based studies for evaluating new healthcare technologies? Traditional HCI evaluation is appropriate for settings with well-known tasks and outcomes [4]; how do we develop appropriate tasks and how can we judge their success?

Acknowledgements

??

References

- [1] Barkhuus L, Rode JA. From Mice to Men - 24 Years of Evaluation in CHI. *ACM CHI'07 - AltCHI* (2007).
 [2] Blythe M, Monk AF, Doughty K. Socially dependable design: The challenge of ageing populations for HCI. *Interacting with Computers* 17, 6 (2005), 672-89.

[3] Department of Health. Supporting self care - a practical option: Diagnostic, monitoring and assistive tools, devices, technologies and equipment to support self care; 2006.

[4] Greenberg S, Buxton B. Usability evaluation considered harmful (some of the time). *Proceeding of the twenty-sixth annual SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems*, ACM (2008).

[5] McLoughlin E, O'Sullivan D, Bertolotto M, Wilson DC. MEDIC: Mobile Diagnosis for Improved Care. *Proceedings of the 2006 ACM symposium on Applied computing*, ACM (2006).

[6] Palen L, Salzman M. Voice-mail diary studies for naturalistic data capture under mobile conditions. *Proceedings of the 2002 ACM conference on Computer supported cooperative work*, ACM (2002).

[7] Sengers P, Gaver B. Staying open to interpretation: engaging multiple meanings in design and evaluation. *Proceedings of the 6th conference on Designing Interactive systems*, ACM (2006).

[8] Tang C, Carpendale S. Support for Informal Information Use and its Formalization in Medical Work. *21st IEEE International Symposium on Computer-Based Medical Systems* (2008).

[9] Tohidi M, Buxton W, Baecker R, Sellen A. Getting the right design and the design right. *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human Factors in computing systems*, ACM (2006).