Table of Contents

Purpose

To validate Provider interface (UI) designs, reveal friction points, and uncover opportunities to improve overall user experience. The scenarios were created to test the information maintenance experience and user behaviors around new flows.

Executive Summary

Major Findings:

- Participants gave positive feedback overall and rated the application highly at an average of 7 (10, 4, 7, 7).
- The participants shared positive comments such as:
  "Easy to use," "With a little help, It's OK," "Everything is centralized," "It's clean," "I can see all better," "I like everything," "Easy to use," "Everything is right here," "Fairly well. It's laid out nice," "Consistency is there. The card is nice," "Pretty intuitive. Ease of use was a plus," "Navigation is pretty intuitive," "It's less click."
- Avg. Success Rate for Standard Scenario Script Tasks: **86%**
- Avg. Success Rate for Standard Scenario Script Participants: **91%**
- 4/4 of the participants provided positive feedback about the search flow and the provider summary view.
- 2/4 of the participants struggled with finding the 'view more' options in the card due to unfamiliarity.
- 2/4 of the participants struggled to find the required information when going through the cards.
- 2/2 of the participants were unfamiliar with provider group application functionalities and appeared to represent management and not actual daily users, thus skewing the test results.

Next Steps:

- User training to assist in learning the card behavior and using the 'view more' options.
- Possibly schedule at least three more participants to evaluate the new UI further as two participants were not credible users. For a usability test to be valid, five users must be tested.
- Potential considerations:
  - Review the metaphor used for viewing more networks at a time.
  - The label text 'Termination' in the header, considering how it would look if the provider had many specialties.
  - Reconsider the labeling on the address card. Consider the possibilities to display the many addresses and networks as the participants like to see more at once.

Participants

There were six UX Eval sessions completed. All participants used the TMS video conference. The facilitator and one note-taker monitored each participant's interaction with the Web application. Other observers watched the sessions through TMS as well. The eval sessions were recorded upon participants' approval.

#	Date / Time EST	Clients	Participants	Position / Role in Company	Monitor Resolution	Links
1	03/14/22 (1:30PM)	BCBST	Rhonda/Teri	Business Analyst	1920x1080	Webex (Pass: ZmyV5ZXU) Notes
2	03/15/22 (1:30PM)	MODA	Jeanette Williams	Business Analyst	1920x1080	Webex (Pass: 4vVwBk42) Notes
3	03/17/22 (1:30PM)	BSC	Shelly McFarland	Business Analyst	1920x1080	Webex (Pass: MzeMkjn6) Notes
4	03/24/22 (1:30PM)	Caresource	Mouli	Business Analyst	1920x1080	Webex (Pass: Kkf3ArDa) Notes

User Impressions

Below are participant responses to Post Hands-On Questions. BSC (Participant 3) responded to a slightly different set of questions – their unique questions/answers can be found below.

Q	Post Hands-On Q's	Participant Responses
1	What are your initial thoughts on how the application performed for the tasks just completed?	(1) Actually, liked it. Everything is centralized, located in one view rather than clicking on many tabs. I can see all better. It is clean. Rhonda agrees. In general, very intuitive. Every screen seemed logical with the task and lots of information on each screen. (2) Fairly well. It's laid out nice. Takes eyes some getting used to. (3) Thought it worked well. Knows there is functionality that is coming. "Pretty intuitive. Ease of use was a plus." "When looking at networks (card), just like Amy pointed out, it's not a full view. Would be nice to know if a provider has a close panel. Would help someone who's assigning a PCP" "When it comes to addresses, I didn't see effective dates – must be available in View more info" (4) With a little help, being for the first time to use it, it is OK

2	Please describe your experience with identifying provider information.	(1) It is less click. In classic, you must click on each tab to find data. In here, all is one place. Less work for me. The shortcut is used for classic, and here everything is centralized. Search is more user-friendly than the classic. The view is cleaner, and easier to identify the provider ID quicker than the classic. Do not use PCP, but do use COB. Copy function is very awesome – being able to Copy in Sub/Fam is very helpful. Great feature *(2)* From networks perspective, less than ideal because you can't see more info at once. Seeing as much as possible is ideal for my team. When dealing with many rows, it's helpful. Same for the Addresses – like to see more at once. (3) "In [Classic], I have to go to the right application – here, you can do search and you get all. That's helpful. I would like to be able to say 'I only want to see facilities' or search by additional parameters or combinations of parameters. (Tax ID + Address, Phone # for example)" "There are some limitations or concerns, but I do like being able to see more, without necessarily having to go through a bunch of different screens." "Navigation is pretty intuitive" (4) This one, if we are really looking right now, the info is similar to what we have in Facets now, except a couple of new screens. Similar experience but this is more provider-centric.
3	Do you think the creation and design of an 'Inquiry only' Provider application has benefits to you as a user and your plan? If so, why?	(1) I think so because I can see more info at once glance. I can see all cards in one screen rather look at them in more tabs in classic. It is a huge benefit to see all details in one screen than click in multiple tabs to see different information. (2) Not for my team. Maybe for Customer Service or Claims reps? Depends on the functionality. The search is limited. Perhaps need Tax ID#. When doing searches, what networks are they part of? Can we see that in the search results? (3) "I think that Inquiry Only functionality will likely be used more by other departments. Even doing some root cause analysis, it's just a matter of 'down and dirty'. In provider operations area, I might need to update something." (4) It may not be significant, we can just pull info from the backend right now. If just to query info, this is igs good to see, but we already get this from facets now.
4	What did you like most about this web application?	(1) Pretty much was said. Everything is right here. Easy to use. *(2)* It flows in nearly the same manner as the other new versions. Consistency is there. The card is nice for the addresses. (3) "If Provider Address is termed, will it show somewhere on here? Or will I have to go into View More? Important from root cause analysis perspective." On addresses card – unsure what these labels are referring to. *(4)* Easy to use, someone, need to be trained to lessen mistake

5	What, if anything, did you like least about this web application? If there is one thing you could do to improve the user experience, what would it be?	*(1)* A little more contrast, maybe – just being nit-picky. I don't see anything that needs to be changed at this point. I like everything – that relationship tab is great. (2) It would be good if there was an indicator if there were other addresses beyond the primary. People might assume that's all there is. Primary (more ->) Today we can't tie network rows to addresses. We have to keep perpetuating those and tie networks to address all the time. (3) For Shelley – Search parameters, primarily. Also was curious about languages, ethnicity information. For PCP assignment, making sure we can see full list of languages would be helpful. (4) Depends upon who the user is to be, so depends upon who the resource using it
6	Lastly, we'd like you to rate this web application as it is on a scale of 1-10, with 10 being very usable and 1 being not usable at all. How would you rate it?	(1) 10, 10, I agree. (2) 4 from my team's perspective. (3) 7 – Quite good. Would like to improve search and improve certain things in Networks. "Existing info is not enough. Are they accepting new patients? Would influence whether PCP could be assigned." (4) 7/10. The functionality that I use today since we are being closely monitored – more things to be thought of – credentialing contract, enter a contract with the provider, start to use, then application comes in. The biggest disconnect resided in the environment in multi-application from the market, then transferring from one application to another. I suggest that it starts with contracting, credentialing, and then the provider's setup for payment. These applications should sync together.

Detailed Findings

During the Hands-On portion, participants completed tasks related to viewing member records and switching member instances. BSC (Participant 3) responded to a slightly different set of questions marked as such below. For the Success Rate metrics, we define – 0: Not completed; 1: Completed with difficulty or help; or 2: Easily completed.

<u>Scenario I - Search</u>

Task 1. Scanning the home page, determine what search options are available to conduct a search?
Task 2. Conduct a search using the Provider ID. You have been provided the Provider ID: **CORE**. How many providers were returned in the search results?
Task 3. Scanning the search results, what is the entity for the Provider ID: **CORE123**?
Task 4: What is Common ID for Provider ID: **COREPR67**?

#	Success	Notes/Observations
1	2	Easily completed
2	2	Easily completed
3	2	Easily completed
4	2	Easily completed

Scenario II – Summary Page - Header

You have been tasked to answer questions about the Provider with the Provider ID: **CORE**. Determine how to view more information about Provider **CORE**. The application has opened on the summary page. Take a moment to scan the page layout, identify some of the fields and sections you see.

Task 1. Focusing on the header of the page, what is the **NPI**?
Task 2. Does the Provider have a **Secondary Specialty**? If so, what?

#	Success	Notes/Observations
1	2	Easily completed
2	2	Easily completed
3	2	Easily completed
4	2	Easily completed

Scenario III – Provider Summary - Sections

Task 1. How many tabbed sections do you see? What are they?
Task 2. Focus on the **Indicative** tab. Locate the **addresses** card. What is the **primary address**? Which **services** are at this address?
Task 3. Locate the **Networks** card. How can you view more Network IDs?
Task 4: There is another feature within the card that will allow you to view more information, scan the card for an option to view more information.
Task 5: For Network ID: **Platinum Network A** do they auto assign PCPs?
Task 6. Dismiss the dialog.

#	Success	Notes/Observations
1	1	Required a little help on the use of three dots.
2	1	Task 2: Took a moment to find the services. Clicked the ellipses and found them there. “That was not incredibly intuitive…” Was directed to it in the address box. “I did not see that” Task 3: More Networks – “Can we see more than 5 at a time?”
3	2	Easily completed but skipped address task and was briefly guide to answer task 5.
4	1	Requires some prompting to go through the task. Typical senior personnel who test the environment who is not a Casual user.

Task 7. Locate the **Relationship** tab. Locate the **Provider Groups** card. Determine which **Provider Group** the facility belongs to. What is the **name**?

Task 8. Locate the **Capitation** tab. Find the **Global Capitation** card. What is the **Relation Type** for the Network ID: **Silver Network**?

Task 9: There is another feature within the card that will allow you to view more information, scan the card for an option to view more information. Task

10: For Network ID: **Silver Network**, what is the **Pool ID?**

Task 11. Dismiss the dialog.

#	Success	Notes/Observations
1	2	Easily completed
2	2	Easily completed
3	2	Easily completed
4	2	Easily completed

Scenario Highlights

- **Search**
  - 4/4 Participants determined the search option and completed the user flow by searching by provider ID
- **Provider Summary - Header**
  - 4/4 Participants could be able to go through the summary page and find the required value by viewing it.
- **Provider Summary - Sections**
  - 2/4 Participants struggled to find the required information by going through the cards.
  - 2/4 Participants struggled with the way of finding the view more options in the card due to unfamiliarity.

Success Rates

Participants were given a success score for each task completed, defined as – 0: Not completed; 1: Completed with difficulty or help (Partial Successes); or 2: Easily completed (Successes). The following average success rates were calculated using the following equation from Nielsen Norman Group: Success Rate = [# of Successes + (# of Partial Successes * 0.5)] / # of Attempts.

Some variables to note: All participants are proficient computer Participants but may range in proficiency levels; User 1 had previous exposure to the Member app.

Average Success Rates:

- Avg. Success Rate for Standard Scenario Script Tasks: **86%**
- Avg. Success Rate for Standard Scenario Script Participants: **91%**

Key Insights:

- Participants were successful with search, Provider summary header
- Participants had lowest success rates of 0.44 with the Provider summary tasks 2 - 5

Breakdown of Success Rates at Task-Level:

1. All Participants

Task	User 1	User 2	User 3	User 4
Search	2	2	2	2
	Success Rate: 1			
Summary Page - Header	2	2	2	2
	Success Rate: 1			
Summary – Sections Task 1-6	1	1	2	1
	Success Rate: 0.44			
Summary – Sections Task 7-11	2	2	2	2
	Success Rate: 1			
Success Rate Per User	0.88	0.88	1	0.88