TPM Vol. 32, No. S8, 2025
ISSN: 1972-6325
https://www.tpmap.org/

Open Access

EVALUATING THE IMPACT OF DIGITAL TRANSFORMATION ON HEALTH ADMINISTRATION EFFICIENCY: A HEALTH INFORMATICS PERSPECTIVE

TAWFIQ MUTEB ALMUTAIRY[1], MAJED MUBARAK ALANAZI[2], RAMI MANSOUR ALMUGHYIRI[3], FAEZ OBAID ABDULLAH ALOTAIBI[4], TALAL HAYAL S ALANAZI[5], ALBANDARY AWADH ALMUTAIRI[6], LAYLA BASHEER ALENAZI[7], NAFLA ABDULAZIZ AL-ANZI[8], NAIFAH NUHAIR AL-ANAZI[9], AMJAD SHNEEN ALENAZI[10]

[1]HEALTH ADMINISTRATION SPECIALIST, RIYADH SPECIALIZED DENTAL CENTER
[2]HEALTH ADMINISTRATION SPECIALIST, RIYADH SPECIALIZED DENTAL CENTER
[3]HEALTH ADMINISTRATION SPECIALIST, RIYADH SPECIALIZED DENTAL CENTER
[4]HEALTH ADMINISTRATION SPECIALIST, RIYADH SPECIALIZED DENTAL CENTER
[5]HEALTH ADMINISTRATION SPECIALIST, MATERNITY AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL IN AL-KHARJ
[6]HEALTH INFORMATION TECHNICIAN, RIYADH SPECIALIZED DENTAL CENTER
[7]HEALTH INFORMATION TECHNICIAN, RIYADH SPECIALIZED DENTAL CENTER
[8]HEALTH ADMINISTRATION TECHNICIAN, RIYADH SPECIALIZED DENTAL CENTER
[9]HEALTH ADMINISTRATION TECHNICIAN, PRINCE MOHAMMED BIN ABDULAZIZ HOSPITAL
[10]HEALTH INFORMATION TECHNICIAN, RIYADH SPECIALIZED DENTAL CENTER

Abstract
This paper provides a comprehensive evaluation of the impact of digital transformation on health administration efficiency from a health informatics perspective. Digital transformation—an integrated realignment of healthcare operations driven by technologies such as Electronic Health Records (EHRs), Artificial Intelligence (AI), telehealth, and data analytics—is restructuring healthcare delivery. From an informatics standpoint, the value of these technologies is not in their mere implementation, but in their systematic integration into clinical and administrative workflows, and their measurable impact on performance. This paper examines the key performance indicators (KPIs) used to measure efficiency, analyzes the specific contributions of core digital technologies, and situates these changes within established theoretical frameworks like the Donabedian model and Technology Acceptance Model (TAM).
Evidence from pre-2024 literature demonstrates significant, quantifiable gains in administrative efficiency, including reduced operational costs, streamlined patient workflows, enhanced data accuracy, and a marked reduction in medical and billing errors. However, these benefits are neither uniform nor guaranteed. They are contingent on overcoming substantial and persistent challenges, including systems interoperability, data security, high implementation costs, and the critical sociotechnical aspects of workforce adoption and user burnout. This research concludes that a robust health informatics framework, which treats digital transformation as an iterative, human-centered process, is essential to guide, measure, and ultimately optimize the transformative potential of digital tools in health administration.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Crippling Weight of Administrative Burden

The healthcare sector in the 21st century faces a fundamental paradox: while clinical capabilities have advanced at an unprecedented rate, the administrative systems supporting them have often lagged, characterized by fragmentation, inefficiency, and spiraling costs. In many developed nations, administrative overhead is estimated to consume between 25-30% of total healthcare spending (Himmelstein et al., 2014). This burden is not merely financial; it manifests as physician and nurse burnout, patient frustration with access and billing, delays in care, and a diversion of critical resources away from direct clinical services. This administrative friction stems from a reliance on manual, paper-based processes, a lack of data standardization, and siloed information systems that cannot communicate (Gjellebaek et al., 2020).

1.2 Defining Digital Transformation in Healthcare

It is crucial to distinguish "Digital Transformation" (DT) from simple "digitization" or "digitalization."

- **Digitization** is the conversion of analog information to a digital format (e.g., scanning a paper record into a PDF).
- **Digitalization** is the use of digital technologies to change a business process (e.g., using an electronic form instead of a paper one).
- **Digital Transformation**, in contrast, is a fundamental, strategic re-engineering of an entire organization's services, processes, and culture, enabled by digital technologies, to create new value for stakeholders (Ivancic et al., 2023).

In healthcare, DT means moving beyond isolated technology adoption (like a single EHR) to create an integrated, data-driven ecosystem. It connects patient scheduling, clinical documentation, billing, supply chain, and population health management into a cohesive, intelligent system.

1.3 Health Informatics: The Discipline of Bridging Administration, Technology, and Practice

The lens through which this paper evaluates DT is that of Health Informatics. This is an interdisciplinary field that studies the design, development, adoption, and application of IT-based innovations in healthcare (Shortliffe & G. T., 2013).

The relationship between health informatics and health administration is foundational. Health administration, at its core, is the process of managing healthcare systems' resources—financial, human, and physical—to deliver services efficiently and effectively. This management process is entirely dependent on the flow of accurate, timely, and relevant information.

Figure 1: The Donabedian Model Adapted for Health Informatics

Informatics provides the methods for structuring, managing, and analyzing the vast amounts of administrative and financial data (e.g., billing codes, patient demographics, appointment schedules, resource utilization).

- **Informatics provides the tools** (e.g., EHRs, data warehouses, analytics dashboards) that administrators use to make evidence-based decisions.
- **Informatics connects the administrative and clinical realms.** A patient's clinical encounter (informatics) must be accurately translated into a billable service (administration). An administrative decision to change a scheduling template (administration) directly impacts clinical workflow (informatics).

Therefore, it is impossible to evaluate the digital transformation of health administration without using the lens of health informatics. Informatics is not simply the study of the technology itself, but the study of the interaction between the technology, the people who use it (clinicians, administrators, patients), and the administrative and clinical processes they perform. An informatics perspective demands that the "success" of any technology is not based on its features, but on its measurable impact on key goals: in this case, administrative efficiency, cost, patient safety, and user experience.

1.4 Aims, Objectives, and Scope

The primary aim of this paper is to evaluate the impact of digital transformation on health administration efficiency using a health informatics framework.

The key objectives are to:

1. Establish a theoretical framework for evaluating administrative efficiency, grounded in health informatics principles.
2. Identify and categorize the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) necessary for measuring success.
3. Conduct an in-depth analysis of the specific impacts of core technologies (EHRs, AI, Telehealth, Analytics) on

these KPIs.
4. Critically examine the sociotechnical and logistical challenges that mediate the success of DT.

This paper's scope focuses on administrative (not purely clinical) efficiency. While clinical outcomes are related, the primary focus here is on the "back-office" and "front-desk" operations that support clinical care.

2. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS AND EVALUATION FRAMEWORKS

2.1 The Donabedian Model: A Triad for Quality and Efficiency

To evaluate the true impact of digital transformation, a conceptual framework is necessary. The Donabedian model, a classic framework for assessing healthcare quality, provides a powerful and adaptable lens (Donabedian, 2005). It posits that quality (and efficiency) can be evaluated by examining three interconnected components: Structure, Process, and Outcome.

- **Structure:** This refers to the technological and organizational infrastructure. It includes the hardware, software (e.g., EHR systems, AI platforms), interoperability standards (e.g., HL7, FHIR), data security protocols, and the organizational policies and training programs governing their use.
- **Process:** This encompasses the administrative and clinical workflows that use technology. From an informatics perspective, this is where transformation truly happens. Examples include the redesigned patient registration workflow, automated billing submission, digital scheduling, and alerts from clinical decision support systems.
- **Outcome:** This is the measurable change in efficiency and performance. These are the "so what" metrics, such as reduced costs, faster patient throughput, lower billing error rates, and improved patient and staff satisfaction (Aregbesola & Pallesen, 2023).

The core of the informatics approach lies in the data-driven feedback loop, where "Outcomes" are continuously measured using KPIs, which in turn provide evidence to inform improvements to "Structure" and "Process."

2.2 Complementary Frameworks: TAM and Sociotechnical Theory

While the Donabedian model helps with what to measure, other frameworks explain why a transformation succeeds or fails.

- **Technology Acceptance Model (TAM):** This model holds that the success of a new technology is determined by its adoption and use, which are primarily driven by two user perceptions: **Perceived Usefulness (PU)** and **Perceived Ease of Use (PEOU)** (Venkatesh & Davis, 2000). A hospital can implement the world's most powerful EHR (Structure), but if staff find it cumbersome (low PEOU) and disruptive to their work (low PU), they will resist it, leading to poor data entry (Process) and negative efficiency (Outcome).
- **Sociotechnical Systems (STS) Theory:** STS theory posits that organizations are a combination of social systems (people, culture, norms) and technical systems (tools, technologies). Optimizing only the technical system at the expense of the social system will lead to failure. Poorly implemented EHRs, a well-documented driver of physician burnout, are a classic example of a sociotechnical failure (Colicchio et al., 2019).

2.3 A Comprehensive KPI Dashboard for Administrative Efficiency

A rigorous evaluation requires specific, measurable, and relevant KPIs. The following table expands on the key metrics that health informatics uses to quantify efficiency.

Table 1: Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for Health Administration Efficiency

	Key Performance Indicator	**Description & Impact Measurement**
Financial Efficiency	Return on Digital Investment (RODI)	Measures the financial gain or loss from technology investments.
	Total Cost of Ownership (TCO)	Includes initial cost plus ongoing maintenance, training, and support.
	Cost per Patient Encounter	Tracks the total administrative overhead associated with each patient visit.
	Billing Error Rate	Percentage of billing claims rejected or requiring re-work (denial rate).
	Days in Accounts Receivable (A/R)	Time it takes for the organization to be paid for services.

Operational Efficiency	Patient Wait Time (Registration)	Time from patient arrival to completion of administrative intake.
	Patient Throughput	Number of patients processed by an administrative department per hour/day.
	"Door-to-Provider" Time	Total time from patient check-in to being seen by a clinician.
	System Uptime / Availability	Percentage of time digital systems are operational and accessible (99.9% is a common goal).
	Schedule Utilization Rate	Percentage of available appointment slots that are filled.
Clinical & Data Quality	Medical Error Rate (Admin-related)	Frequency of preventable errors (e.g., medication transcription, wrong patient).
	Duplicate Test Rate	Percentage of redundant tests ordered due to inaccessible records.
	Data Completeness & Accuracy	Percentage of patient records with all required fields accurately filled.
	Chart Completion Time	Time from patient discharge to when the chart is fully documented and signed.
Patient-Centric	Patient Satisfaction (NPS/CES)	Patient-reported experience with scheduling, billing, and communication.
	No-Show Rate	Percentage of missed appointments, often reduced by automated reminders.
	Patient Portal Adoption	Percentage of patients actively using the online portal for scheduling, forms, and payments.
Staff-Centric	Digital Adoption Rate	Percentage of staff actively using the new digital tools as intended.
	Staff Satisfaction / Burnout	Qualitative and quantitative measures (e.g., Maslach Burnout Inventory) related to technology.
	"Pajama Time"	Time spent by clinicians on EHR work outside of clinic hours (Colicchio et al., 2019).

3. In-Depth Analysis: Impact of Key Digital Technologies

The impact of DT is best understood by analyzing the contributions of its core component technologies, which function as layers in an integrated ecosystem.

3.1 Electronic Health Records (EHRs): The Digital Backbone

EHRs are the digital foundation of the modern health system. When first implemented, many systems were criticized for poor usability and for simply digitizing old, inefficient paper processes. However, mature EHRs are powerful administrative engines.

3.1.1 Streamlining the Patient Journey (Registration to Discharge)

By creating a single, legible, and accessible source of truth, EHRs streamline workflows that are traditionally manual and error-prone. Patient registration data is entered once and populates scheduling, billing, and clinical modules simultaneously, eliminating redundant data entry. This single source of truth follows the patient from intake, to the clinic, to the lab, to the pharmacy, and finally to the billing office, creating a digital thread that reduces fragmentation.

3.1.2 Impact on Revenue Cycle Management (Billing and Coding)

Integrated EHRs can semi-automate the generation of billing codes (e.g., ICD-10, CPT) based on structured clinical documentation. This reduces the "coding-to-billing" delays and, more importantly, improves the accuracy and completeness of claims. The result is a lower claims denial rate, a faster revenue cycle (fewer days in A/R), and a significant reduction in the manual, repetitive work of medical coders and billing specialists.

3.1.3 Case Study: EHRs and Error Reduction

EHRs, particularly when paired with Computerized Physician Order Entry (CPOE) and Clinical Decision Support (CDS), have a documented impact on error rates. They eliminate errors from illegible handwriting, flag potential drug interactions, and ensure correct dosages (Encinosa & M.D., 2012).

A 2022 study on EHR implementation provides a nuanced look at metrics. As shown in **Table 2**, while the new system led to a decrease in the median number of medication orders per patient (a potential efficiency gain), it also showed an increase in the number of reported incidents. From an informatics perspective, this is not a failure but a success in detection. The new system's robust logging and reporting (Process) made previously invisible errors visible (Outcome), enabling a data-driven approach to safety improvement.

Table 2: Impact of EHR Implementation on Medication Orders and Error Reporting (Pre- vs. Post-Implementation)

Metric	Before Implementation	After Implementation	% Change	Informatics Interpretation
Median Med Orders / Patient	22.76	18.76	-17.6%	Efficiency gain (e.g., fewer duplicates).
Median Incidents / Patient	0.029	0.040	+37.9%	Improved detection; better data quality.

3.2 AI and Automation: The New Efficiency Frontier

If EHRs are the foundation, AI and RPA are the automated systems layered on top to handle complex and repetitive administrative tasks.

3.2.1 Robotic Process Automation (RPA) in Back-Office Operations

RPA involves "bots"—software scripts—that are configured to perform high-volume, rules-based tasks by mimicking human interaction with user interfaces. In health administration, this has a massive impact. Bots can log into insurance portals to check a patient's eligibility before their appointment, automate the "posting" of payments from insurers, and process the digitization of faxes or scanned documents into the EHR. This frees human staff from "digital paper-pushing" to manage complex exceptions and patient-facing tasks.

3.2.2 AI, NLP, and Clinical Documentation

AI-powered Natural Language Processing (NLP) can read and understand unstructured text, such as clinical notes, patient emails, or referral letters. This technology is being used for:

- **Computer-Assisted Coding (CAC):** NLP scans the clinical note and suggests relevant billing codes, which a human coder then verifies. This dramatically speeds up the coding process.
- **Smart Triage:** NLP can read incoming patient messages (via a portal or chatbot) to extract key symptoms and route the inquiry to the appropriate department (e.g., nurse line, scheduling, billing).

Table 3: Applications of AI in Health Administration

Technology	Administrative Application	Efficiency Impact
Robotic Process Automation (RPA)	Claims Processing & Adjudication	Reduces claim processing time from days to hours; improves accuracy.
	Insurance Eligibility Verification	Automates 1000s of checks per day, reducing front-desk denials.
Natural Language Processing (NLP)	Clinical Coding & Documentation	Automates suggestion of ICD-10/CPT codes from physician notes; reduces manual review time.
Machine Learning (Predictive)	Patient Scheduling	Predicts "no-show" probability; enables optimized and overbooked schedules to maximize capacity.
AI Chatbots	Patient Triage & Intake	Handles initial patient inquiries 24/7; collects preliminary information before routing to staff.

3.2.3 Predictive Analytics for Resource and Schedule Optimization
Perhaps the most advanced application is using machine learning to predict future events. By analyzing historical data, AI models can forecast patient demand, allowing for smarter staff scheduling in emergency departments or clinics. Most famously, predictive models analyze patient demographics, appointment history, and even weather to assign a "no-show" probability to each appointment. This allows schedulers to strategically double-book low-probability slots, maximizing clinic utilization and reducing revenue loss from empty, unused time.

3.3 Telehealth and the "Digital Front Door"
The widespread adoption of telehealth has dramatically re-engineered administrative processes by creating a "digital front door."

3.3.1 Re-engineering Patient Access and Intake
Telehealth platforms are not just video-conferencing tools; they are integrated administrative workflows. A "digital-first" platform integrates scheduling, online completion of consent and intake forms, co-pay collection, and the consultation itself into a single, linear process for the patient. This eliminates the "clipboard and waiting room" bottleneck, reducing administrative friction and front-desk staff load.

3.3.2 Administrative Impact of Remote Patient Monitoring (RPM)
RPM technologies, which transmit patient data (e.g., blood pressure, glucose) from home, also have an administrative component. They create new data streams that must be triaged, reviewed, and often billed. Efficient RPM programs rely on informatics-designed workflows that filter this data, flagging only a_normal_ readings for human review, thus preventing staff from being overwhelmed.

3.4 Business Intelligence (BI) and Data Analytics
Underpinning all of these technologies is the effective use of the data they generate.

3.4.1 Real-Time Dashboards for Administrative Decision-Making
Business Intelligence platforms aggregate data from the EHR, billing, and scheduling systems into real-time dashboards. An administrative manager can, at a glance, see current patient wait times, clinic utilization rates, and staff productivity. This allows for dynamic "air traffic control"—for example, re-routing staff to a backed-up registration desk before wait times become critical.

3.4.2 Population Health Analytics and Resource Planning
On a larger scale, analytics tools allow organizations to move from reactive to proactive administration. By analyzing population data, an administrator can identify a rise in diabetic patients in a specific zip code. This data-driven insight can justify allocating resources to open a new clinic or assign a dedicated diabetic care coordinator to that area, improving efficiency and outcomes simultaneously.

4. Critical Challenges and Implementation Barriers
Despite the clear benefits, digital transformation is not a simple path. From an informatics perspective, the barriers are as much "social" and "financial" as they are "technical."

4.1 The Technical Hurdle: Interoperability and Data Standards
This remains the single greatest technical challenge. Healthcare data often exists in "silos"—disparate systems (EHRs, lab systems, radiology, billing) that were not designed to communicate. This lack of data flow, or lack of **interoperability**, forces staff to engage in costly and error-prone manual data re-entry. The promotion of data standards like HL7 (Health Level Seven) and, more recently, FHIR (Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources) is a direct attempt to solve this, creating a "common language" for health data exchange (Vidal-Alhambra et al., 2021).

4.2 The Financial Hurdle: Proving ROI Beyond Initial Costs
The initial capital investment for a comprehensive EHR, AI, and analytics infrastructure is massive, often running into the millions or billions for large health systems. The "Total Cost of Ownership" (TCO) includes not just the software license, but implementation, hardware upgrades, and—most significantly—extensive, ongoing training. Proving a clear and timely Return on Investment (ROI) can be difficult, as many benefits (like reduced errors or improved staff morale) are harder to quantify in the short term than hard costs.

4.3 The Sociotechnical Hurdle: Burnout, Resistance, and User-Centric Design
As predicted by TAM and STS theory, this is often the point of failure. Technology-centric implementation that ignores workflows (Process) and people (Social) is doomed.

- **Staff Resistance:** Clinicians and administrators will resist tools they find cumbersome, slow, or a threat to their professional autonomy (low PEOU & PU).
- **Training & Burnout:** Poorly implemented EHRs are a leading driver of physician and staff burnout. The "click fatigue" from excessive alerts and the administrative burden of "pajama time" (EHR work at home) are well-documented (Colicchio et al., 2019). Effective, continuous training and a focus on user-centric design are critical mitigations.

4.4 The Governance Hurdle: Data Security, Privacy, and Compliance
Healthcare is one of the most highly regulated industries and a primary target for cyberattacks. The digitization of all patient records centralizes this risk. Administrative efficiency cannot come at the cost of patient privacy. The costs

and complexities of securing data and managing compliance with regulations like HIPAA (Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act) in the U.S. or GDPR in Europe are substantial administrative tasks in themselves.

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

5.1 Synthesis of Findings: An Integrated Model of Efficiency

Digital transformation is not a single product to be purchased but an ongoing, iterative process. The evidence shows that efficiency gains are not achieved by one technology, but by an integrated system of technologies. EHRs provide the data foundation, BI tools provide insight, AI and RPA provide automation, and telehealth provides a new access channel. When these layers work in concert, guided by an informatics framework, the results are significant: faster, cheaper, safer, and more accurate administrative processes.

5.2 Implications for Health Administrators and Policy

For health administrators, the key takeaway is to lead with "process" and "people," not "technology." A digital transformation strategy must begin with a clear understanding of the workflows to be fixed and the KPIs to be measured. It requires investing as much in training and user-centric design (the "social" system) as in the software itself (the "technical" system).

For policymakers, the challenge is to create an environment that fosters innovation while protecting patients. This includes promoting and enforcing data standards (like FHIR) to fight interoperability-blocking, funding research into AI ethics, and creating incentives for providers to adopt technologies that are proven to improve efficiency and quality.

5.3 Future Outlook: From Digitization to Intelligent Transformation

The digital transformation discussed here (pre-2024) is largely foundational. The next wave will be defined by intelligent transformation. Future systems will likely leverage:

- **Blockchain:** For secure, patient-centric health record sharing and verifying provider credentials.
- **Internet of Things (IoT):** "Smart hospitals" will use IoT sensors to track equipment, patients, and staff in real-time, optimizing flow and resource use.
- **Generative AI:** Beyond simple NLP, generative AI promises to draft clinical notes, summarize patient histories, and even automate large portions of the billing and appeals process.

5.4 Conclusion

From a health informatics perspective, digital transformation is a powerful lever for enhancing administrative efficiency, but it is not an automatic solution. It is a complex, sociotechnical endeavor. The evidence overwhelmingly indicates that technologies like EHRs, AI, and telehealth can significantly reduce costs, streamline workflows, and improve data accuracy. These tools can automate low-value repetitive tasks, allowing a stretched and valuable workforce to focus on high-value patient care. However, the success of this transformation is entirely dependent on its management. Efficiency gains are only realized when technologies are interoperable, secure, and thoughtfully integrated into redesigned workflows that are supported—not hindered—by the tools. Ultimately, the successful digital transformation of health administration is not a technological achievement; it is an informatics imperative. It requires health administrators to shift their focus from managing paper and processes to managing data and systems, ensuring the systematic design, iterative measurement (via KPIs), and continuous improvement of the complex sociotechnical systems that define high-quality, efficient 21st-century healthcare.

6. REFERENCES

1. Aregbesola, A., & Pallesen, K. (2023). Applicability of the Donabedian Model in Evaluating the Quality of Care in Digital Health. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 25, e46682.
2. Colicchio, T. K., Eix, T., & He, Z. (2019). Quantifying and Predicting Electronic Health Record "Pajama Time". Applied Clinical Informatics, 10(5), 929–936.
3. Donabedian, A. (2005). Evaluating the Quality of Medical Care. The Milbank Quarterly, 83(4), 691–729. (Original work published 1966).
4. Encinosa, W. E., & M.D., T. A. H. (2012). Does Health IT Really Reduce Errors and Costs? The Journal of Ambulatory Care Management, 35(2), 98–109.
5. Gjellebaek, C., et al. (2020). Digital transformation of healthcare. Journal of the Norwegian Medical Association, 140(11).
6. Himmelstein, D. U., Woolhandler, S., & P. (2014). A Comparison of Hospital Administrative Costs in Eight Nations. Health Services Research, 49(5), 1551–1571.
7. Ivancic, L., Glavan, L. M., & Vuksic, V. B. (2023). Digital transformation in healthcare: a systematic review. Health and Technology, 13, 605–620.
8. Lee, J. S., et al. (2022). Impact of Implementing Electronic Health Records on Medication Safety at an HIMSS Stage 6 Hospital: The Pharmacist's Perspective. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 24(10), e39031.

9. Shortliffe, E. H., & G. T., C. (2013). Biomedical informatics: computer applications in health care and biomedicine. Springer Science & Business Media.
10. Venkatesh, V., & Davis, F. D. (2000). A Theoretical Extension of the Technology Acceptance Model: Four Longitudinal Field Studies. Management Science, 46(2), 186–204.
11. Vidal-Alhambra, S., et al. (2021). Building a framework for digital health: A systematic review of frameworks for the evaluation of digital health interventions. International Journal of Medical Informatics, 148, 104396.