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Telemedicine Visit Volume Trends
Monthly Comparison

Total COVID Volume: 956,989

Total FY'20 Pre-COVID Volume: 539
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Telemedicine Visits vs. In-Person Visits

Total Ambulatory Volume

- Telemedicine volume peaked in April / May
- Stabilized over last 6 months
- Total volume remains around pre-COVID projected volume (to date, telemedicine substitute and not additive)

*Note: Orange (in-person) and blue (Telemedicine, including both video and audio-only visits) are stacked (not overlapping)
Telemedicine vs. In-Person Visits
Ambulatory Volume

- When excluding “telemedicine insensitive” areas (i.e., Lab, Radiology), telemedicine visits have been approximately **28%** of “telemedicine sensitive” ambulatory care so far in CY 2021
- Care remains distributed across multiple primary care and subspecialty verticals

*Note: Excludes “telemedicine insensitive” visits, such as lab, radiology.*
Out of State Continuity of Care and Telemedicine

- Telemedicine encounters to states other than MD, FL, DC*: 68,449
- Represents ~9% of total completed telemedicine encounters through Feb’21
- Out of state Telemedicine encounters in 4 border states (85% of total OOS):
  - VA: 27,693 (40%)
  - PA: 20,140 (29%)
  - DE: 6,198 (9%)
  - WV: 4,086 (6%)

*Note: As of February 2021
Patient and Provider Expectations
Patient Satisfaction with Telemedicine

**Satisfaction with Provider?**
- ✔ Rating JHM providers 94/100 in nearly 72,000 surveys in the last 12 months

**Recommend to Friends / Family?**
- ✔ Median response 9/10 (where 10/10 = Extremely Likely)

**Important to Have Video Visit Options?**
- ✔ 88% stated would be moderately, very, or extremely important

*Based on 674 responses from 1,935 surveyed patients*
Provider Expectations around Telemedicine

- Provider telemedicine survey sent to ~3,600 providers who have completed a telemedicine visit in last 12 months

- After 2 weeks “in the field”, 1,342 responses (37.5% response rate)

**How often** do you feel you can provide **clinically appropriate, high-quality care** via **telemedicine** in comparison to in-person visits?
  - New patients: Mean 41%, Median 31%
  - Established patients: Mean 60%, Median 70%

- What percentage of your **schedule template** would you like to have open for **telemedicine** visits?
  - Mean: 40%
  - Median: 30%
Provider Expectations around Telemedicine (cont’d)

Assuming you had the necessary equipment, where would you prefer to conduct most of your telemedicine visits after the COVID-19 pandemic? (multiple responses permitted)

- Your home: 67%
- Your clinical location on campus: 50%
- A non-clinical location on campus (e.g., office): 41%

What statement best describes how you would prefer to conduct telemedicine visits after the COVID-19 pandemic?

- Dedicated telemedicine / virtual only: 44%
- Mixed - with restrictions (i.e., only beginning or end): 31%
- Mixed - no restrictions (i.e., can alternate, etc): 26%
Provider Expectations around Telemedicine (cont’d)

What barriers have prevented you or your patients from using the Cisco platform? (multiple responses permitted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patient internet connectivity issue</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisco video connection issues</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisco audio connection issues</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient does not have a MyChart account activated</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient had trouble completing the MyChart eCheck-in process</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient preference for telephone</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient preference for other video technology</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisco missing functionality (e.g. chat, screen share limitations)</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Telemedicine Equity
Telemedicine Equity Working Group

1. Identify populations experiencing telemedicine access disparities?
2. Develop and implement plans to promote more equitable delivery?
3. Measure impact on equity and outcomes?

- Use telehealth equity impact assessment framework/toolkit
- Develop and Review Telemedicine Equity Dashboard
- Develop 1-2 target populations/SMART aims
- Present aims to quarterly telemedicine equity leadership steering committee
- Track implementation/progress
- Discuss scholarship opportunities
Telemicine Equity | Percent Total of Encounters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Video</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>818,736</td>
<td>178,254</td>
<td>996,990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Preferred Language**

- **English**: 82% (909,239)
- **Spanish**: 75% (18,403)
- **Chinese (Mandarin)**: 80% (1,098)
- **Korean**: 78% (1,046)
- **Arabic**: 70% (955)
- **American Sign Language**: 82% (469)
- **Other**: 96% (544)
- **Russian**: 79% (421)
- **Vietnamese**: 61% (344)
- **Urdu Pakistan**: 88% (312)

**Race**

- **White or Caucasian**: 85% (575,268)
- **Black or African American**: 75% (284,597)
- **Asian**: 90% (40,276)
- **American Indian or Alaska Native**: 69% (2,402)
- **Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander**: 80% (1,002)

**Encounters by Age Range**

- **Less Than 1 Year**: 90% (7,534)
- **1 Year - 3 Years**: 95% (68,110)
- **4 Years - 11 Years**: 93% (44,079)
- **12 Years - 17 Years**: 87% (115,667)
- **18 Years - 20 Years**: 85% (276,190)
- **21 Years - 64 Years**: 78% (242,995)
- **65 Years - 74 Years**: 76% (148,395)
- **75 Years +**: 71% (89,440)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payor</th>
<th>Video</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>246,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>251,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Payor</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>5,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>480,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Pay</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>13,660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Phone Visits by Patient Zip Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient Zip Code (10 digit group)</th>
<th>Phone Visits</th>
<th>Total Encounter Count</th>
<th>% of Phone Visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21222</td>
<td>12,768</td>
<td>35,723</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21224</td>
<td>11,344</td>
<td>37,174</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21213</td>
<td>6,480</td>
<td>16,203</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21206</td>
<td>9,341</td>
<td>19,875</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21205</td>
<td>4,636</td>
<td>13,276</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21218</td>
<td>4,920</td>
<td>18,770</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21221</td>
<td>4,746</td>
<td>15,667</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21215</td>
<td>3,641</td>
<td>10,509</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21221</td>
<td>8,380</td>
<td>12,315</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21220</td>
<td>3,379</td>
<td>13,383</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21284</td>
<td>8,084</td>
<td>14,039</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21217</td>
<td>2,247</td>
<td>8,926</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21202</td>
<td>2,044</td>
<td>15,129</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21227</td>
<td>2,216</td>
<td>8,945</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21216</td>
<td>2,130</td>
<td>5,807</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21229</td>
<td>2,127</td>
<td>7,904</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21212</td>
<td>1,989</td>
<td>9,159</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21229</td>
<td>1,826</td>
<td>6,227</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21307</td>
<td>1,728</td>
<td>6,545</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21214</td>
<td>1,651</td>
<td>6,852</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21301</td>
<td>1,645</td>
<td>5,776</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21222</td>
<td>1,579</td>
<td>4,231</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21236</td>
<td>1,401</td>
<td>9,386</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1: Access to wired broadband by census tract, 2019
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