

1 Electronic data review, client reminders, and expanded clinic hours for improving cervical
2 cancer screening rates after COVID-19 pandemic shutdowns: a multi-component quality
3 improvement program

4

5 Sue Ghosh MD MPH^a, Jackie Fantes MD^a, Karin Leschly MD^a, Julio Mazul MD^a, and Rebecca
6 Perkins MD MS^b

7

8 Author Affiliations

9 ^aEast Boston Neighborhood Health Center, East Boston, MA

10 ^bBoston Medical Center, Boston, MA

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

Abstract

Objective: To improve cervical cancer screening (CCS) rates, the East Boston Neighborhood Health Center (EBNHC) implemented a Quality Improvement (QI) initiative from March to August 2021.

Methods: Staff training was provided. A 21-provider team validated overdue CCS indicated by electronic medical record data. To improve screening, CCS-only sessions were created during regular clinic hours (n=5) and weekends/evenings (n=8). Patients were surveyed on their experience.

Results: 6126 charts were reviewed. Of the list of overdue patients, outreach was performed to 1375 patients to schedule the 13 sessions. A total of 459 (33%) of patients completed screening, 622 (45%) could not be reached, and 203 (15%) canceled or missed appointments. The proportion of total active patients who were up to date with CCS increased from 68% in March to 73% in August 2021. Survey results indicated high patient satisfaction, and only 42% of patients would have scheduled CCS without outreach.

Conclusions: The creation of a validated patient chart list and extra clinical sessions devoted entirely to CCS improved up-to-date CCS rates. However, high rates of unsuccessful outreach and cancelations limited sustainability. This information can be used by other community health centers to optimize clinical workflows for CCS.

59 Funding: All funding was internal from EBNHC Adult Medicine, Family Medicine, and Women’s
60 Health Departments.

61

62 **INTRODUCTION**

63

64 Nationwide closures at the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic led to decreases in breast,
65 colorectal, and cervical cancer screenings between 86% and 94% compared to three-year
66 averages (Mast, 2022). The postponed screenings have led to backlogs that health care systems
67 will need to address as operational changes continue with evolving COVID-19 rates. Federally
68 Qualified Health centers (FQHCs), which primarily serve low-income and minority communities,
69 have been particularly impacted by the pandemic. Low-income and minority communities had
70 disproportionately high cancer incidence and mortality prior to the pandemic (Du, 2011); and
71 now could have increased disparities due to reduced access to screening because of COVID-19
72 (Maringe, 2020).

73

74 East Boston Neighborhood Health Center (EBNHC) is the largest federally qualified health
75 center (FQHC) in Massachusetts. It was established in 1970 and has approximately 170,000
76 patient visits annually. Its catchment area includes 270,000 patients. Over 70% of the patient
77 population is Latinx. During the first year of the COVID-19 pandemic, most non-urgent in
78 person medical care was postponed, including cervical cancer screening (CCS). A quality-
79 improvement project was initiated at EBNHC in March 2021 to improve CCS rates. The multi-
80 component intervention utilized best practices as recommended by the Center for Disease
81 Control and Prevention’s (CDC) Community Preventive Services Task Force community guide
82 including interventions to increase community demand (client reminders), interventions to

83 increase community access (extended hours), and interventions to increase provider delivery of
84 screening services (provider assessment and feedback) (CDC, 2019). This manuscript describes
85 the project's background, lessons learned, and new initiatives EBNHC will use to improve CCS
86 rates in the future.

87
88

89 **METHODS**

90
91
92

91 **Preparatory work: Demonstrating project need**

93 An EPIC work-bench report (WBR) was run to identify active EBNHC patients (defined as at least
94 1 visit to a primary care department in the past 18 months) whose health record stated that
95 CCS screening was overdue. This list had over 7000 patients as of January 2021. The provider
96 tasked with examining EBNHC's overdue CCS issue reviewed 1600 charts and noted that over
97 80% were correctly identified as overdue. These data were presented to EBNHC clinical and
98 administrative leadership in February 2021. A proposal was made to 1) validate the overdue
99 CCS list, 2) create CCS-only clinics, and 3) improve clinical and electronic CCS workflows. This
100 project was approved by the Project Steering Committee March 2021. This manuscript reports
101 efforts on chart validation and CCS-only clinics.

102
103
104

103 **Data Validation: Creation of outreach list**

105 Starting in March 2021, a 21 provider team was created to review 6126 charts from the work-
106 bench report generated by the Epic EMR system for overdue CCS. The team consisted of nurse
107 practitioners, physician assistants, and physicians from Adult Medicine, Family Medicine, and
108 OB/GYN departments. The team was trained on how to review charts to confirm need for CCS
109 by the project lead during a one hour teaching session. One hundred medical record numbers

110 from the overdue CCS list were sent approximately every two weeks to each provider to review.
111 A new list of patients was sent to the providers once they reviewed the previously given list.
112 This was completed from April 30 – June 29, 2021, until the entirety of the overdue CCS list was
113 reviewed. All providers received overtime pay from their respective departments for the hours
114 used to review these patient records. A messaging pool was created in the electronic medical
115 record (EMR) for providers to ask gynecologists questions about CCS necessity or frequency
116 during the validation process. Three staff gynecologists volunteered for this task. A validated
117 list was created of patients overdue for CCS.

118
119 **Staff training: Increasing awareness among clinicians**

120
121 The importance of the problem, magnitude of the deficit, and goals of the QI project were
122 presented to all staff during quarterly staff meetings by the Chief Medical Officer.

123
124 **Patient services: CCS-only Clinics**

125
126 To address the backlog of patients overdue for CCS, screening-only clinics were created. To
127 maximize accessibility for patients, two different time blocks were used: regular clinic hours
128 and evenings/weekends.

129
130 **Regular clinic hours:** From March – April 2021, the OB/GYN department organized five CCS-only
131 clinic sessions during regularly scheduled clinical hours. The OB/Gyn staff (medical assistants
132 and front desk staff) outreached to patients from the validated list. Because these clinics
133 occurred during regular clinic hours, the normal workflow for patient outreach and scheduling
134 was used and no additional staffing or training was required. The patients outreached for these
135 clinics all had a history of abnormal CCS.

136
137 **Evenings/weekends:** From May – July 2021, eight additional CCS-only clinic sessions were
138 organized outside of regularly-scheduled clinical hours (evening/weekends). To organize and to
139 run the evening/weekend CCS- only sessions, an operations team was created. The team
140 consisted of the CCS project lead, the OB/Gyn clinical leader, operations managers from
141 OB/Gyn and Family Medicine, and the OB/Gyn clinical supervisor. Weekly meetings were held
142 from April 2 – July 23, 2021. A dedicated outreach team was also created from the OB/Gyn
143 department: an outreach lead (OB/Gyn clinical supervisor), a medical assistant, and two front
144 desk staff. The outreach team was responsible for calling patients from the validated list to
145 schedule and to keep track of outreach outcomes. A smart phrase was created for these
146 outreach calls. Staff also placed CCS clinic reminder calls one day before the scheduled CCS-
147 only clinic. If a patient preferred to have her CCS done by her primary care provider, the
148 message created by the new smart phrase was forwarded to the appropriate departmental
149 pool to inform them to call the patient. The IT department created a new resource schedule in
150 the Family Medicine department for these clinics. The data management and analysis were
151 done by the outreach and project leads.

152
153 The staffing for the evening/weekend CCS-only clinics was organized by the project lead. Two
154 rotating OB/Gyn front desk staff were used for front desk staff. Six rotating medical assistants
155 and fourteen staff providers (NPs, PAs, and MDs) from OB/Gyn, Family Medicine (FM), and
156 Adult Medicine (AM) departments were used. Three FM MD residents and two FM NP residents
157 also participated. All clinic staff were paid overtime for the hours spent in the clinic (residents
158 are not clinic staff and did not receive overtime pay). An orientation document regarding the

159 CCS-only clinics was created by the project lead and emailed to participating providers several
160 days before the clinic to review. A smart phrase for a CCS-only EMR note was also created for
161 those providers who wanted to use it.

162
163 The evening/weekend sessions were done at different times to evaluate optimal timing and
164 staffing for possible future permanent CCS clinics. All clinics were held in the Family Medicine
165 clinic due to many exam rooms. A total of 4 Wednesday clinics were held from 5:20 – 8:00 pm;
166 each included 48 appointments. Staff for Wednesday even clinics included six providers, four
167 medical assistants, and one front desk staff. A total of 4 Saturday morning clinics were held
168 from 8:00 am – 12:00 pm. Staff included five providers, 3 medical assistants, and one front desk
169 staff. The first two Saturday clinics had 72 appointments. The last two Saturday clinics were
170 overbooked with 73 and 79 patients respectively based on the number of missed
171 appointments.

172
173 **Patient Satisfaction**

174
175 The operations team wanted to collect patient satisfaction data on the evening/weekend CCS
176 clinics to improve clinics in the future. A patient survey was created with leaders of the CCS
177 project operations team, the director of clinical compliance and risk management and the
178 Crossroads Group survey company. The survey was created in English and Spanish and was
179 handed out to patients when they were being roomed. Following their visits, patients placed
180 the completed surveys into a marked box, and the surveys were subsequently sent to The
181 Crossroads Group for data analysis.

182

183 The Project Steering and Patient Care Committees at EBNHC gave ethical approval of this
184 quality improvement project. Permission to report de-identified aggregate data and
185 operational details were given by the Chief Medical and Chief Quality Officers.

186
187 **RESULTS**

188
189 **Data validation/Reason for missed CCS**


190
191 Because all active EBNHC patients had at least one visit in primary care the past 18 months, all
192 had theoretically one or more opportunities for CCS. Therefore, 118 charts were randomly
193 selected for a closer review to evaluate why CCS was not done. Among these 118 patients, 20%
194 did not need a CCS: 14% due to incorrect CCS frequency in the health care gap; 3% of patients
195 had CCS done at an outside clinic which was not seen in patient EBNHC chart; 3% of patients
196 were not part of the EBNHC active patient panel; 1% of patients were > 65 years old or was
197 status post a hysterectomy and did not have CCS health gap turned off. Among those who were
198 due for CCS, several reasons were identified for not completing the screening. In 30% of
199 encounters, the overdue CCS was not noted by the provider, while in 16% of encounters, the
200 overdue CCS was noted but not addressed due to other medical concerns. Patient-related
201 issues were noted in the remaining 54% of cases: not emotionally ready (23%), desired
202 gynecologist (14%), on menses (9%), desired female provider (6%), and physical and cognitive
203 impairments (2%).

204
205 **CCS results and rates**

206
207 A total of 459 CCS's were done during this project. This included 126 CCS during regular clinic
208 sessions, 287 done during evening/weekend clinics, and 46 done by EBNHC PCPs during the

209 project period. The results were as follows: 380 (83%) NILM HPV neg; 16 (3%) ASCUS HPV neg ;
210 20 (4%) NILM HPV +; 11 (2%) ASCUS HPV+; 5 (1%) LSIL HPV neg; 10 (2%) LSIL HPV +; 1 (<1%)
211 HSIL HPV + HPV 16 neg; 10 (2%) Insufficient; 3 (<1%) not resulted; 3 (<1%) ordered but not
212 done; 1 (<1%) not done (FIGURE 1).


213
214 FIGURE 1: CCS RESULTS
215



216
217
218
219 The percentage of all active patients at EBNHC defined as having had a primary care visit in the
220 past 18 months who were up to date with cervical cancer screening was 63.5% (36,824 active
221 patients up to date on CCS /57,965 active patients who are eligible for CCS) in October 2020
222 (nadir of the pandemic), and 68.2% at the start of the project in March 2021 (36,432 /53,457).

223 Following the months of the data validation and CCS clinics, the up-to-date screening rate in
 224 August 2021 increased to 72.7% (39,040/53,678) (FIGURE 2).

225
 226 FIGURE 2: CCS RATES AT EBNHC
 227
 228



- 229 • Blue Line: Mean 68.8%
- 230 • Red Lines: Upper Control Limit 75.4% and Lower Control Limit 62.3%

231
 232
 233 **CCS-only Clinics**


234 The CCS-only clinics were effective in addressing the backlog of patients. However, they
 235 involved a significant investment of clinic resources for staffing and outreach, and many
 236 patients could not be reached or missed their scheduled appointments.
 237

238
 239 **Regular Clinic Hours**

240

241 The newly created Patient outreach team initially called 220 patients all with a history of
242 abnormal CCS. In total, 126 (57%) patients had CCS done. 49 CCS were done during CCS-only
243 clinics in the Gynecology Department. The remaining 77 patients were seen by various
244 Gynecology providers during their regularly scheduled clinics. 82% of patient attended
245 scheduled appointments (126/153). Anecdotally, patients and providers felt the CCS clinics
246 were done efficiently. Fifteen percent of patients wanted to discuss other gynecologic issues
247 during their CCS visit which was accommodated. Among the 94 patients who did not complete
248 CCS, 22% patients were not reached, and a letter was sent, or a voicemail was left, 27 (12%)
249 canceled or missed their appointments, 3% declined screening, 3% had their CCS done at an
250 outside clinic, 1% moved, and < 1% of patients wanted to have their CCS done by their PCP.
251 (FIGURE 3)

252
253 FIGURE 3. CCS CLINIC OUTREACH IN GYNECOLOGY DEPARTMENT
254




255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270

Evening/Weekend

A total of 1155 patients were called from the validated overdue CCS list, which included patients with and without prior abnormal results who were overdue for CCS. These patients were scheduled into one of 8 extra clinical sessions. Of these, 24% of patients completed their CCS, 50% were not reached, 15% canceled or did not show up for their appointment, 4% had the CCS done at an outside clinic, 3% wanted their PCP to do their CCS, 3% declined screening, and <1% had moved.

FIGURE 4. CCS CLINIC OUTREACH FOR EVENING/WEEKEND SESSIONS




271
272 Footnote: For the patients who wanted their CCS to be done by their PCP, we created a workflow where the
273 patient outreach team member could send a message in the EMR to the PCP department to notify them of the
274 patient's desire for a CCS appointment. The PCP clinical team would then reach out to the patient to schedule it.
275 Review of this workflow revealed 34 messages sent to PCP departments. 25 (74%) CCS were completed by PCPs:
276 14 AM patients and 11 FM patients. For the 15 patients who did not have CCS done, in Adult Medicine 3
277 letters/call were done; 4 patients were not outreached, and 6 patients declined CCS. For Family Medicine, 4
278 patients did not have CCS done: 1 letter/call; 2 patients were not outreached, 1 patient declined. For Pediatrics,
279 the 2 patients had both physical and mental disabilities which would make a CCS difficult and the ongoing
280 discussion about CCS will continue.

281
282
283 Among the 462 patients with scheduled visits, approximately 62% completed screening and
284 38% canceled or did not show up to their appointments. We examined whether there was a


285 pattern for the missed appointments at each time slot to decide whether modifying the
286 number of patients per time slot would improve attendance. Examining the evening and
287 Saturday morning missed appointments did not show a pattern. (FIGURE 5-7)

288
289 FIGURE 5: % CCS COMPLETED DURING EVENING/WEEKEND CLINICS*
290




291
292 *CCS completion rates are reported among the patients who were scheduled into the
293 evening/weekend clinics

294
295 FIGURE 6: DISTRIBUTION OF NO-SHOW PATIENTS BASED ON TIME SLOT: EVENING CLINICS
296



297
298
299
300

FIGURE 7: DISTRIBUTION OF NO-SHOW PATIENTS BASED ON TIME SLOT: SATURDAY AM CLINICS



301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314

Patient Satisfaction

Patient satisfaction scores were 83% excellent (121/146 surveys) and 17% good (n=25/146 surveys). Patients largely rated their interactions as excellent with phone attendants (86%, 166/193) and healthcare providers (85%,162/191), and (77%, 146/190) found the test to be convenient. Nearly all, (93%, 168/181) reported that their expectations were met, and 95% stated they were very likely to make another CCS appointment in the future (95%,134/141). Only 42% (69/166) stated that they would have scheduled a CCS appointment without EBNHC outreach. Note that denominators are different as not every patient who turned in survey answered all the questions or the same questions.

315 Varying levels of work were needed to fulfill the objective of the project: improving CCS rates. A
 316 summary of this and future areas of work are in Table 1.

317
 318 TABLE 1: EFFORT VS VALUE SUMMARY FOR OVERDUE CCS PROJECT
 319

320

	LOW VALUE	HIGH VALUE
LOW EFFORT		<p>Number of overdue CCS for the clinic, per department, & per provider pulled from an overdue CCS report in EMR</p> <p>Sample overdue CCS list to evaluate why CCS are not being done. Use results to focus areas of improvement</p> <p>Utilize resident clinics for overdue CCS's</p> <p>Prioritize patients for outreach (prior abnormal, > 5 year overdue, etc)</p>
MEDIUM EFFORT		<p>Patient satisfaction surveys</p> <p>CCS clinics during regular hours</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New providers or providers who are returning from leave <p>Utilize EMR patient outreach abilities to automate and centralize outreach for overdue CCS's</p>
HIGH EFFORT	<p>Evening and Weekend CCS-only clinics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Telephone outreach to >1000 patients • Unable to reach ~50% of patients • Overtime providers pay 38% average no show rate among scheduled patients 	<p>Single designated provider makes list of all patients overdue for CCS and review for accuracy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over 6000 charts reviewed by 21 providers • Increases provider awareness of scope of problem leading to increased CCS's done on own • Educates providers on how to review chart to find all aspects of cytology/HPV

		<p>result/pathology needed to confirm overdue CCS</p> <p>Data collection, management, and analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase buy-in of clinical and administrative leaders by presenting data <p>Cervical Cancer Navigator</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Centralize review and outreach of abnormal cytology, HPV, & pathology results • Centralize data collection and analysis • Utilize population health department if present <p>Patient Education Campaign on CCS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grants for community health centers, cancer screening catch-up after pandemic, high risk populations
--	--	---

321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331

DISCUSSION

EBNHC’s ability to increase the proportion of our active patient population up to date with CCS by 4.5% during the COVID-19 pandemic was multi-factorial. Validating overdue patient lists removed 15% of patients inaccurately flagged as needing screening, which created an accurate denominator to determine up-to-date status. Creating directed outreach and implementing CCS-only sessions led to completion of 459 CCS. In addition, return of patients to primary care as preventive services re-opened in after widespread COVID-19 vaccination in 2021; increased

332 awareness among PCPs of the importance of CCS due to both direct staff outreach and
333 participation in the chart validation; and support from clinical leadership may have led clinicians
334 to capitalize on opportunities to perform CCS when patients presented for clinical care.

335
336 The CDC Community Preventive Services Task Force Community Guide recommends
337 multicomponent interventions to increase cancer screenings (CDC, 2022). The main
338 components of our intervention focused on increasing community demand (client reminders),
339 interventions to increase community access (extended hours), and interventions to increase
340 provider delivery of screening services (provider assessment and feedback). Establishing the
341 intervention had several steps. First, we had to establish buy-in from leadership. Our patient
342 population is > 70% Latinx. The Latina population have the highest incidence of new cervical
343 cancer cases and the second (to black women) highest incidence of cervical cancer deaths in
344 the US (CDC, 2019). We therefore felt this issue was a priority for our patient population. A
345 single provider's review of the overdue CCS list showed high rates of overdue screenings, which
346 led to the buy-in from the clinical and academic leaders to proceed with the project.
347 Understanding the scope of the issue and catching up with the CCS rate was important to
348 prevent an increase in cervical precancer and cancer in our community.

349
350 Second, we had to determine which patients needed screening. There was an estimated 15% of
351 the overdue CCS list which was incorrect based on random chart sampling. Our chart review of
352 over 6000 charts created a validated list to use for focused electronic outreach in the future. It
353 also created a greater understanding for providers of how to confirm and overdue CCS and to
354 increase CCS during their clinics. Third, we had to raise awareness of the problem and of the

355 goals of the QI project among clinic staff. Fourth, we had to develop efficient processes for
356 completing overdue CCS. The evidence-based components chosen from the Community Guide
357 included interventions to increase community demand (client reminders) and interventions to
358 increase community access (extended hours) (CDC, 2019). After establishing the validated list
359 and presenting the project at staff meetings (provider assessment and feedback), we provided
360 client reminders (outreach) to patients as part of normal clinic workflows or via a newly created
361 outreach team. To increase access (extended hours), we tried the following: 1) creating new
362 CCS clinics during regular clinic hours in the Gynecology Department; 2) creating new CCS clinics
363 during evening/weekend hours; 3) scheduling CCS during regular clinics in Gynecology
364 Department. This included patients' first scheduled appointments and rescheduled visits
365 following missed appointments for the new CCS clinics or if patients called to schedule CCS
366 after CCS clinics were finished. We also created workflows to communicate with Adult Medicine
367 and Family Medicine Departments when patients preferred CCS to be done by the primary care
368 provider.

369
370 We found that CCS-only clinics that focused on patients with prior abnormal results and were
371 performed during regularly scheduled clinical hours were effective. The majority (57%) of
372 patients who received outreach from the Gynecology department for CCS-only clinics during
373 regular clinic hours had their screenings done. The success of these clinics may have occurred
374 in part because all these patients had a history of abnormal CCS and may therefore have been
375 more knowledgeable regarding the purpose and importance of CCS. These clinics were an
376 effective way both to increase the CCS rate and to have new providers and providers coming
377 back from leave ease into clinical work. Resident clinics were another way to improve CCS rates

378 while teaching pelvic exams and being financially prudent. Surveying patients was a valuable
379 tool for obtaining patient opinions for use in improving CCS clinics and workflow. Importantly,
380 we found that fewer than half of patients would have scheduled CCS without outreach,
381 underscoring the importance of increasing community demand, especially in safety-net
382 settings.

383
384 There were aspects of this project which were less effective. Most surprising was that our
385 attempts to increase access by offering CCS appointments during evening/weekend were not
386 successful. Evening/weekend appointments had a much lower attendance rate (62%) compared
387 with appointments during normal clinic hours (82%). Not all patients outreached for
388 evening/weekend clinics had a history of abnormal CCS, therefore some may have been less
389 knowledgeable regarding the importance of screening. Additional reasons for low attendance
390 may have been lack of a direct recommendation for screening from their healthcare provider,
391 fear of pain, and low perceived need especially during a pandemic. Ogebyte *et al* showed that a
392 nurse contacting 120 patients overdue for CCS in a small practice in northwest England
393 increased CCS rates versus texting, but the effort required to achieve this increase was
394 unsustainable (Ogebyte, 2021). Another study of 260 patients showed a 8% increase in CCS for
395 pregnant and postpartum patients by introducing a package of CCS information, targeted
396 education, and widening access to screening appointments (Coleridge, 2022). Other research
397 on CCS during the COVID-19 pandemic used different changes in workflow to improve
398 screening rates. Martellucci et al. changed CCS appointment times from flexible scheduling for
399 many patients in one time slot to strict 15 minute appointments for one patient only. This led
400 to similar screening rate to pre-COVID and higher provider satisfaction (Martellucci, 2021).

401 Castanon *et al.* demonstrated modeling recovery strategies for CCS emphasizing increased
 402 access and patient messaging (Castanon, 2021).
 403
 404 Table 2 describes the lessons learned from this project that may be useful for other community
 405 health centers.
 406

TABLE 2 LESSONS LEARNED
HOW MANY OVERDUE CCS’S DOES YOUR INSTITUTION HAVE?
- Examine details about the numbers: # Overdue CCS/provider and # Overdue CCS/department to see if education is needed regarding screening guidelines or clinical workflows
- Identify high risk groups to target patient outreach: no CCS for > 5 years, history of abnormal CCS, first CCS overdue
WHY IS CCS NOT BEING DONE?
- Random sampling of overdue list and deep dive into chart and identify why the CCS’s were not done and change workflows accordingly. Changes in workflow should consider CCS-only clinics for new providers or providers coming back from leave. Evening/weekend CCS clinics are not necessarily the best use of resources.
IF YOUR CLINIC HAS A HIGH NO SHOW/CANCELLATION RATE FOR CCS, WHY?
- Electronic outreach and education, language specific messaging to these patients
- Survey these patients to see why they are not coming in for CCS
- Create a targeted Cervical Cancer Awareness campaign if possible
EDUCATE CLINICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE LEADERS
- Use data from your clinic’s overdue CCS list to obtain buy-in from strategic stakeholders who can support changes in clinical and electronic workflows
STANDARDIZE WORKFLOWS FOR RESCHEDULING PATIENTS WHO DECLINE/PROVIDER WHO CAN’T GET TO CCS DURING CLINIC VISIT
HAVE A CERVICAL CANCER NAVIGATOR/POPULATION HEALTH MANAGER TO OVERSEE ELECTRONIC OUTREACH AND DATA COLLECTION/ANALYSIS

407
 408 Future efforts to improve CCS at EBNHC will include automated electronic targeted outreach to
 409 specific patient groups (e.g., initial screening, screened > 5 years ago, and history of abnormal

410 CCS). Optimizing the utilization of the features of an EMR system can reduce the need for work
411 hours needed and improve the efficiency of data management and analysis. Instead of a single
412 provider reviewing the overdue CCS EMR list, having a population health manager or grant-
413 sponsored volunteer do the data management and analysis as a Cervical Cancer Navigator can
414 be more efficient. Care navigation has been shown to increase cancer screening rates (Nelson,
415 2020). We also want to survey patients who would not schedule CCS or missed CCS
416 appointments to create a community-specific Cervical Cancer Screening Campaign, including
417 evaluating the role of social determinants of health. To reduce the number of patients requiring
418 CCS each year, EBNHC has also recently updated their CCS screening guidelines to every three
419 years for 21-24 year-olds with cytology only and every 5 years for 25-65 year-olds with
420 HPV/cytology co-testing, consistent with American Cancer Society's 2020 guidelines (Fontham,
421 2020). This will allow the extension of screening intervals from 3 to 5 years for most patients.
422 Eventual self-screening HPV testing could increase rates while optimizing resource allocation.
423 We are currently not continuing CCS-only clinics due to the limited appointment access in all
424 adult departments stemming from the increased need for in-person visits since the
425 improvement of the COVID-19 pandemic. Restarting these clinics during regular hours in Family
426 Medicine, Adult Medicine, and the OB/GYN departments is a future aim.

427

428 This study has both strengths and limitations. Our experience working from a list of over 7000
429 patients is larger than similar QI projects reported in the literature. This is also one of the first
430 successful QI projects to our knowledge specifically addressing COVID-related screening deficits
431 in a safety net setting. However, as we describe the experience in one FQHC, our results may

432 not be generalizable to other settings such as rural clinics or those without EMR capabilities.
433 EBNHC has had a provider who has been able to lead the project from the initial review of the
434 overdue CCS EMR list to organizing the CCS clinic staffing and to create new clinical and
435 electronic workflows to use in the future. Having dedicated staff to manage CCS and cancer
436 screening may not be feasible for many community health centers.

437 438 **CONCLUSION**

439
440 During the project March – August 2021, EBNHC performed 459 CCS and increased the
441 proportion of our total patient population who were up to date with screening by 4.5% from its
442 nadir during 2021. The information gathered from our overdue CCS list was utilized to launch a
443 multidisciplinary effort to learn why CCS was not being done and to validate our overdue
444 numbers. We have increased the awareness of our overdue CCS issue and regarding the EMR
445 review needed to confirm and overdue CCS in three departments. The screenings done during
446 the CCS project plus increased provider awareness have contributed to our increased CCS rate.
447 We are also in the process of centralizing our CCS workflow to decrease charting errors and
448 make patient outreach more automated and efficient. If CCS-only clinics can be done during
449 regular hours or resident clinics, they have value. The lessons learned from our effort can be
450 used by other community health centers to improve CCS rates and decrease health inequities
451 for high-risk populations in the US.

452 453 **REFERENCES** 454

- 455 1. Mast, C. et al. (2022) *Troubling cancer screening rates still seen nearly two years into the*
456 *pandemic*, Epic Research. [Available at: https://epicresearch.org/articles/troubling-cancer-](https://epicresearch.org/articles/troubling-cancer-)

457 [screening-rates-still-seen-nearly-two-years-into-the-pandemic](#) (Accessed: November 20,
458 2022).

459

460 2. Du, X.L. *et al.* (2011) *Effects of individual-level socioeconomic factors on racial disparities*
461 *in cancer treatment and survival. Cancer*, 117(14), pp. 3242–3251. Available at:
462 <https://doi.org/10.1002/cncr.25854>.

463

464 3. Maringe, C. *et al.* (2020) *The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on cancer deaths due to*
465 *delays in diagnosis in England, UK: A national, population-based, modelling study,” The*
466 *Lancet Oncology*, 21(8), pp. 1023–1034. Available at: [https://doi.org/10.1016/s1470-](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1470-2045(20)30388-0)
467 [2045\(20\)30388-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1470-2045(20)30388-0).

468

469 4. *Cancer screening: Multicomponent Interventions Cervical Cancer* (2022) *The Community*
470 *Guide*. Available at: [https://www.thecommunityguide.org/findings/cancer-screening-](https://www.thecommunityguide.org/findings/cancer-screening-multicomponent-interventions-cervical-cancer.html)
471 [multicomponent-interventions-cervical-cancer.html](https://www.thecommunityguide.org/findings/cancer-screening-multicomponent-interventions-cervical-cancer.html) (Accessed: December 18, 2022).

472

473 5. *USCS data visualizations - CDC* (2019) *Centers for Disease Control and Prevention*. Centers
474 for Disease Control and Prevention. Available at:
475 <https://gis.cdc.gov/Cancer/USCS/#/Demographics/> (Accessed: November 20, 2022).

476

477 6. Oyegbite, A., Roberts, J. and Bircher, J. (2021) *Increasing the uptake of cervical screening*
478 *at Cornerstone Medical Practice, BMJ Open Quality*, 10(3). Available at:
479 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjog-2020-001126>.

480

481 7. Coleridge, S.L. *et al.* (2022) *Improving the uptake of cervical screening in pregnant and*
482 *recently postnatal women: A quality improvement project, BMJ Open Quality*, 11(2).
483 Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjog-2021-001709>.

484

485 8. Martellucci, C. *et al.* (2021) *Delivering cervical cancer screening during the COVID-19*
486 *emergency, BMJ Sexual & Reproductive Health*, 47(4), pp. 296–299. Available at:
487 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjsex-2021-201099>.

488

489 9. Castanon, A. *et al.* (2021) *Recovery strategies following covid-19 disruption to cervical*
490 *cancer screening and their impact on excess diagnoses, British Journal of Cancer*, 124(8),
491 pp. 1361–1365. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41416-021-01275-3>.

492

493 10. Nelson, H.D. *et al.* (2020) *Effectiveness of patient navigation to increase cancer screening*
494 *in populations adversely affected by health disparities: A meta-analysis, Journal of*

495 General Internal Medicine, 35(10), pp. 3026–3035. Available at:

496 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-020-06020-9>.

497

498 11. Fontham ETH, *et al.* (2020) *Cervical cancer screening for individuals at average risk: 2020*

499 *guideline update from the American Cancer Society*, A Cancer Journal for Clinicians.

500 70(5):321-346. Available at: [https://doi: 10.3322/caac.21628](https://doi:10.3322/caac.21628).

501

502

503

504