# Invisible Virtual Care Must Be Measured Effectively

**us.hitleaders.news**/core-categories/editors-picks-and-featured-content/48998/invisible-virtual-care-must-be-measured-to-earn-trust-and-investment

Jason Free July 2, 2025

Editor’s Picks & Featured Content

Viewing: 0

Jasmine Harris, Contributing Editor

Kent Dicks's insights on making virtual care technology "invisible" offered a compelling vision for health systems one week ago. Today, the conversation evolves. Executives and policy leaders must now ask how these seamless systems translate into measurable outcomes: clinical, operational, and financial. If invisible technology disappears into the background, its effectiveness must still be visible in key performance indicators that matter to healthcare IT, policy, and strategy audiences.

An invisible system serves its purpose by reducing friction. The true test comes when performance metrics reveal the degree to which disengagement declines, proactive care increases, or disparities narrow. Data from the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality demonstrates that integration of remote patient monitoring into care protocols can reduce hospital readmissions by up to 30 percent. To validate Dicks's philosophy, systems must embed outcome measurement frameworks that track both utilization and health impact.

Health systems should implement continuous performance measurement. A practical example is tracking 90-day readmissions for patients using invisible virtual care platforms. This aligns with CMS value-based programs, which reward reductions in preventable readmissions and prioritize rehabilitative support, metrics that can now be driven via RPM. If invisible technology triggers timely clinical alerts and leads to fewer admissions, that connection must be clear, documented, and policy-aligned.

Another critical area is clinician efficiency. As Dicks pointed out, invisible systems surface actionable insights without overloading providers. But when scheduling, triage, and documentation are handled in the background, health systems must quantify time saved. Research from McKinsey & Company shows that automation of administrative workflows can reduce clinician documentation time by as much as 30 percent. Hospitals should measure this in minutes per patient encounter and aggregate time savings per clinician FTE. That data informs staffing strategies and supports claims of efficiency in negotiating future contracts or reimbursement models.

Equity outcomes demand attention as well. Invisible technology must not only be seamless, but inclusive. According to the Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology, while RPM adoption has grown by over 80 percent since 2020, disparities persist for older adults and rural populations. Follow-up data should include device usage rates across demographic cohorts, successful connectivity percentages, and avoidable care gaps closed through virtual care. If older or rural patients engage less, programmatic adjustments should follow.

CFOs and revenue leaders have a unique role in translating invisible care into financial strategy. Savings from reduced inpatient stays, fewer emergency visits, and decreased no-shows can be modelled alongside cost reductions from administrative task automation. Health systems can evaluate return on investment by projecting net savings per cohort and comparing against software license costs, equipment depreciation, and support overhead. This financial narrative strengthens the business case for scaling invisible RPM platforms and positions virtual care as a revenue-positive strategy in both fee-for-service and value-based contracting.

The policy implications are abundantly clear. CMS and state Medicaid programs increasingly require quantifiable evidence of impact for continued reimbursement. The Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act (MACRA) includes RPM and telehealth in quality reporting. Systems that fail to measure engagement, outcomes, or equity will struggle to maintain payer support. Conversely, organizations that demonstrate utility and return on invisible care may attract grant funding or participate in shared-savings models.

Looking ahead, the trajectory for invisible virtual care is toward interactivity and adaptability. Systems must evolve beyond passivity. They must learn and self-optimize. Automated device onboarding, context-aware alerts, and bidirectional patient-clinician dialogue are the building blocks of a smarter infrastructure. The endgame is not just invisibility; it is intelligent presence, a virtual care ecosystem that delivers measurable value and continually adapts to population needs.

The lifecycle from invisible technology to impact measurement and adaptive intelligence offers a roadmap for healthcare leaders. The discussion with Kent Dicks provided foundational thinking, but the next step requires operational metrics that demonstrate invisible tools are not unseen. They are effective, efficient, and equitable. Health systems that embed performance data into their virtual care strategy will not only justify the investment; they will set the standard for what digital health should accomplish.
Life365, MACRA, Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act, virtual care