Health Apartment Working Group

October 27, 2021

* Meg: Fine point on where health apartment is intersecting with your work and how to best collaborate.
* Jeff S.: excited to drive this partnership (CEO MO Studio) – Veteran
  + Lauren S. – handing over PM role to Jeff
  + Jared C. – Vet Front-End Engineer
  + Paula M. – Scrum Master and UX Designer
  + Nadya – FE Developer
* Meg: still building and hiring for the apartment team on the federal end.
* Meg: Kudos to VAOS team on their work on the health apartment.
* Lauren: hope to engage with everyone to work through dependencies and challenges, looking for feedback and connections of other parts of VA that may need to be involved.
* Theresa H.: overarching leadership workgroup?
* Charles: smaller group had identified the health apartment as an approach to attempt and scheduling would be the first thing to start working with. Has been work underway to get contract in place get team onboard and this is where we are at now.
* Theresa: VANotify – that work will now come down to this level?
* Meg: we intend for those folks to keep working, but will bring that work to the team
* Meg: leadership sessions ended; this working group is taking over. Appointments group is still working. Want these sessions to be like the Mobile Working Group sessions.
* Theresa: reason this is monthly is because you are still solidifying the team?
* Meg: yes, we are building the team.
* Leanna: what exactly are you building?
* Meg: starting with a MVP and looking to define it, could be a beta site separate from VA.gov – bringing certain functionality into it and creating pathways. Starting with a smaller sampling (opt-in) and then a larger (opt-out) – then a tipping point on when the apartment would be placed in VA.gov.
* Lauren: we recognize that this project touches so many of your work, this is a quilt not a bunch of silos. We are going to be intentional about designing with Veterans and SME, in a thoughtful way. Trying to solve for the apartment POC or MHV might not be as successful.
* Meg: we are open to ideas – this is an exciting challenge and want to communicate regularly about that and set expectations and get feedback.
* Samara: what steps have been taken and what is still up for discussion?
* Meg: we are doing a POC first and then will do an MVP – have spoken a lot about appointments (big four). We are iterating as we go!
* Samara: moving appointments? They already exist in VA.gov?
* Meg: have VA.gov, MHV and VAOS – so it would be consolidating into VAOS, that is the first step that can happen independently and then we need to create a linking strategy. As we take functionality off of MHV we need to be able to get Veterans to where they need to go.
* Barry: linking strategy and user experience – navigating between the two, if we have them both look similar. On the MHV side we haven’t received any guidance to start rowing in that direction.
* Meg: that is separate from the work we are doing – that could be explored but need to weigh the benefits that MHV would be eventually inside of VA.gov.
* Chris: one of the things that we hope comes to the surface during the research we plan to do - would existing MHV team to implement and would need to work with the MHV team to implement. Had something previously drawn up – interim experience.
* Leanna: would we be bringing MHV and VA.gov closer together while we are working on the apartment and then the “big four” would eventually be migrated.
* Charles: appointment feature duplication between MHV and VAOS – if we could make it so there were not two different scheduling tools. Delivered in a way that would not be disruptive to the MHV users, need to work through the design. Health Apartment is our attempt to solve for this experience for the Veteran. Health tools development would involve changes to both VA.gov and MHV. Zero in on how we deliver the appointment experience and can use that moving forward as a use case.
* Nancy: trying to orient myself to this new team structure – and talked about appointments – we said John Murphy would be one of the leads from the Office of Connected Care. This meeting is not inclusive – feels like we are here to observe and not actively engage.
* Lauren: John was invited to this and has been separately included in other meetings –
* Nancy: core team doesn’t include anyone from OCC.
* Lauren: I understand, we are hoping to identify all of the right people – and balance everyone’s time.
* Nancy: maybe some of the people haven’t talked to aren’t represented here.
* Charles: if there are people who can work on this please let us know.
* Nancy: the ask was for “full time” and that isn’t realistic, shouldn’t be all or nothing.
* Charles: we will be happy to work with whatever model would work best for you.
* Meg: were planning to meet with Theresa soon, but can give you all a chance to have that conversation first and then will look for time on your calendars early next week.
* Theresa: I saw UCD – group, content, and information architecture, but didn’t hear anyone talk about requirements in particular.
* Meg: as we built and test our ideas we will develop what is required, to pull them off.
* Theresa: is your intent to go with the “as is” state? Two sides – Veteran side and VA staff side. From past experience that requirements has been a topic that OIT builds something and doesn’t necessarily engage SME and business side for the requirements. What I want to avoid is not dotting the “I” and cross the “T” and we don’t know what we don’t know. Want to make sure we take into consideration everything we are going to need.