Population
Health

Experience
of Care

Per Capita
Cost

Pursuing *Transformational Change* for Better Student Well-Being

Key Learnings From Eight Universities

BY ALLISON SMITH, CATHERINE CRAIG, AND CARLO CIOTOLI

IHI *Triple*Aim

Through their participation in Pursuing the Triple Aim in a Higher Education Setting: A Learning and Action Collaborative, eight higher education institutions generated important insights about what it takes to advance transformative changes in the higher education environment to improve college student health, mental health, and well-being outcomes.

Developed by the Institute for Healthcare Improvement (IHI), the concept of simultaneously achieving better population health, better health care, and lower per capita cost, referred to as the Triple Aim, has become an emboldening framework for health system transformation and improvement worldwide.

In October 2018, New York University (NYU) convened eight universities for a multiyear collaborative to test the applicability of the IHI Triple Aim framework to achieve improved population health and well-being; better experiences (including satisfaction, quality, and access) with programs, services, and conditions that influence well-being; and better stewardship of health resources in higher education settings. With financial support from Wellfleet and cosponsorship from NASPA, IHI provided subject matter expertise and together with NYU led the first-of-its-kind Collaborative in higher education.

How the Collaborative Worked

The IHI Triple Aim served as a north star, a provocation, and a collection of methods to guide the eight universities in their pursuit of transformational change. The Collaborative provided a community and structure with a highly sequenced set of activities. Partnering universities established core teams of four to eight people to engage in Collaborative activities and coordinate the work within their universities. Teams actively tested changes, identified what did and did not work, tracked progress, shared data, adapted ideas, built relationships and trust across universities, and focused on group problem solving.

The eight teams worked with the NYU-IHI Hub Team to develop a foundation for the Triple Aim

work; the Hub Team provided teams with learning opportunities, tools, and coaching to build each university's infrastructure, skills, data, and strategy to manage the respective student populations. These opportunities were offered to teams during a virtual onboarding call series, in-person learning sessions, power sessions, monthly Collaborativewide calls, and monthly coaching calls—all of which enabled teams to act locally and reflect, learn, and refine. Formal academic knowledge was bolstered by the practical voices of peers: "We had the same challenge; let us tell you how we solved it."

Ten Key Learnings to Catalyze Transformational Change

Change agents, including vice presidents for student affairs (VPSAs) and other senior leaders, can learn from the key themes that emerged from the experiences of the eight participating universities. These experiences and learnings are likely applicable to the norms, structures, and processes change agents can use to catalyze improvement across diverse student education, well-being, and equity outcomes.

Start by exploring the question: "What groups of students are disproportionately not thriving?" Answers to this question help institutions to identify and acknowledge important differences in outcomes, experiences, and unmet needs across and within different groups of students. This question facilitates a focus on students who are disproportionately not being served effectively by standard institutionwide approaches.

Reorient changemaking from single-outcome priorities to population-focused improvements.
Reframing goals and design challenges from a broad question (e.g., What changes can our institution implement to improve students' mental health?) to a focused question on a specific population that is disproportionately not thriving (e.g., What needs to change to enable more trans and nonbinary students to flourish? What needs to change to enable more students returning from a health leave of absence to thrive?) shifts an institution's ability to identify and address why a particular group of students struggles more than others and what flourishing means to that group. At the start of the Collaborative, many teams did not embrace focusing systems change work on specific populations. Eventually almost all teams wished they made the shift to population-focused improvement earlier.

Build an understanding of the institution's existing norms, processes, and structures by learning about students' holistic lives.
Shifting the methods used to identify and understand the root causes that shape group outcomes can generate more holistic, actionable insights using less staff effort and time. Although all eight universities have a large volume of diverse student data, these existing data were often difficult to obtain or insufficient to generate actionable insights.

A Three-Part Data Review was introduced to rapidly gather a broad and deep swath of information on specific populations, including: easily accessed quantitative data; interviews with up to 10 staff who frequently interact with the specific population of students to gain knowledge from their observations and interactions with these students; and interviews with up to 10 students about their lives, hopes, and challenges.

The Three-Part Data Review represents a fundamental shift from traditional approaches, such as exhaustive student use and satisfaction assessments, to simply asking for information, such as: Tell us about a typical day for you. What gets in the way of your well-being? Tell us about a time you felt supported (or did not feel supported) at this university. This type of direct engagement with students and colleagues led to generative relationship-building, which supports future collaboration and more effective actions. Key to this process was setting a review deadline of only several weeks to learn holistically about a group of students and develop an initial set of actionable insights.

Institutionwide change is catalyzed by a core team—like bonfires are created from kindling.
Establishing a small core team (four to eight people) is essential to support and catalyze systems changes across the institution. The role of kindling in sparking large, impressive bonfires is analogous to the function of small core teams in catalyzing broader partnership, activation, and systems change work across an institution.

FACTORS THAT MAXIMIZE THE IMPACT OF CORE TEAMS

➤ **Diversity of departments.** Teams with people from at least two different departments were better able to move work forward than those with only health staff. Core teams with at least two different departments represented had greater capacity to keep the work moving forward during challenging times and greater collective power to facilitate changemaking.

➤ **Identification of key functions.** Team members should include those who hold varied positions such as subject matter knowledge expert, data lead, portfolio manager, improvement advisor, and a sponsor on the institution's leadership team.

➤ **Shared leadership.** Critical to teams' effectiveness is a shift away from hierarchical leadership toward a model of shared leadership and a focus on what needs to happen collectively to improve well-being. Teams learned intentional effort is needed to help members view themselves as equal coleaders working together toward the shared purpose of improving outcomes for specific groups of students. The person or group that is the initial convener must pay extra attention to power dynamics and create the space, opportunity, norms for agency, autonomy, and shared leadership.

Building bridges across historical silos involves shifting from transactional to transformational collaborations.
All participating teams had long-standing track records of collaborating with students and departments throughout their universities. By the end of the Collaborative, there was a greater appreciation that shifts in how teams identify, inspire, learn with, and move partners to join in action are key parts of the transformational change to achieve better student well-being outcomes. At the core is shifting from a reliance on positional power and transactional collaboration to movement-building and forging deep, integrative relationships that build agency, power, and investment in systemic change at all institutional levels.

➤ **Identifying partners.** Teams found the process of systematically identifying all potential assets through the vantage point of a population of focus helps identify both formal institutional resources (e.g., infrastructure) as well as individual or associational informal strengths and resources (e.g., specific skills or relationship connections). This mapping process helps to prioritize relationship-building efforts by starting with those individuals or assets "within reach." Power and influence is grown using a collective of allies to champion the work within their own spheres of influence. Ultimately, the network of people involved with improving student well-being is expanded.

➤ **Inspiring partnership.** Teams discovered that presenting a strategy and a specific ask was often insufficient to mobilize and inspire people to

Pursuing the Triple Aim in a Higher Education Setting
A Learning and Action Collaborative

CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY

Case Western Reserve University's (CWRU) goal is for students to become well and stay well so they can grow, learn, and succeed. The starting point was to improve support at times of transition—when students enter the university, return from a significant medical or mental health event, or leave the university. Early projects aimed to improve access to clinical services. The team learned valuable lessons from small-scale testing, which ultimately enabled two sustainable improvements: Incoming new students with significant medical or mental health histories received early, proactive outreach and support with transitioning their care, and wait times for psychiatry appointments were reduced to no more than 10 days with a goal of further lowering that number.

CWRU participation in the Triple Aim generated a key design principle: Better student outcomes require reimagining and redesigning CWRU norms, structures, and processes. The CWRU team learned deeply about significant health inequities on campus, and work has evolved to prioritize equity and mental health and to take a population-focused approach involving the broader campus to support students experiencing key transitions. Other important lessons: Improvement requires close and consistent listening to the system—starting with one another. It is easier to start small—in terms of both beginning with a specific segment of students and the scale of the changes—and to fail fast. The sooner an innovation begins, the faster to see what actions do—and do not—improve the health and well-being of students.

Triple Aim Collaborators: Naomi Drakeford and Sara Lee

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

Cornell University's primary focus was to improve the experience of students who take a health leave of absence (HLOA), a process known to be over-complicated and not serving students well. Using the methods of the Collaborative, the team learned about students' experiences, needs, and preferences. Both big and small changes were tested. For example, Cornell created a single point of contact for students seeking to come back to campus rather than requiring the student to interact with multiple campus partners. The team was successful in this approach, in part, due to the relationships team members began building with campus partners to prepare for the Collaborative.

The team worked with the registrar's office to create a data dashboard to collect better information and streamline the process of taking and returning from a leave. The relationships and learnings also improved processes and standards for data sharing beyond the HLOA work. The team learned about creating systemic change at Cornell, which

has been influential in how improvement work with future partners is approached. The team learned they need to see the Triple Aim model through their campus partners' eyes to fully understand their concerns. The team also learned about the value of investing time at the start of new collaborations with key campus partners to determine a shared vision.

Triple Aim Collaborator: Leslie Meyerhoff

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

New York University (NYU) focused its Triple Aim work on the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer-plus (LGBTQ+) community, a decision informed by campuswide survey data that demonstrated profound health disparities among the LGBTQ+ community, particularly trans and nonbinary students.

The Student Health Center (SHC) and LGBTQ+ Center came together to identify how the two offices could reimagine NYU's pursuit of LGBTQ+ health equity. The journey started with engaging the broader NYU community in the Three-Part Data Review to learn about the experiences of LGBTQ+ students and the structures, processes, and norms causing health inequities. The team learned: access to support did not explain health inequities; the experience of being misgendered or deadnamed was harming trans and nonbinary students' well-being; and LGBTQ+ students' network of support across campus was often disjointed. The SHC and LGBTQ+ Center established a universitywide LGBTQ+ Health Equity Coalition and guided dozens of changes across campus to improve LGBTQ+ students' experiences.

The team partnered with nearly 400 trans and nonbinary students through a weekly, five-question survey to continuously learn about when, where, and how students are misgendered and deadnamed at NYU. At the start of this work, some 30 percent of participating students experienced deadnaming; that number decreased to some 10 percent. The team conducted a small scale "five times approach" pilot to test a collective of reimagined and redesigned systems and processes of support and to learn what it takes to meet the healthcare and holistic well-being needs of trans, nonbinary, and gender expansive students. The work on systemic change provided many learnings on the importance of: partnerships between systems-facing and people-facing leaders; a team of people to support change management with large-scale, systems-level changes; building capacity and leadership across the university toward a shared goal while leading work in individual areas connected to central leadership; and identifying strategies for communicating change work to all constituents.

Triple Aim Collaborators: Chris Woods and Allison Smith

join in action, and intentionality is needed to capture both hearts and minds. Data and a shared theory of change can be effective in shifting minds. Eliciting an emotional response through storytelling and appealing to shared values and purpose can motivate potential partners to want to take action. This process often takes time and involves getting to know potential partners as human beings—building transformative collaboration involves authenticity, vulnerability, and learning what matters to potential partners.

➤ **Moving partners into action.** Core teams learned that effectively partnering with people in different areas of the institution involves disrupting the ease with which people stay in the discussion, planning, and ruminating phase and requires intentionality to move people from discovery and planning to action. "Asks" and "offers" can be effective approaches to leveraging strengths and assets. The "ask" taps into individual strengths and assets, and the "offer" extends each person's strengths and assets to others. Not all partners need or want to understand the big picture or overall theory, and participation in a committee or structured gathering may not be needed. Experimentation using small-scale, rapid-cycle testing can generate objective, real-world evidence about what works and what still needs improvement. Innovation and movement to action are enhanced when partners, including students, feel agency and a sense of ownership as they codesign, try new ideas, and resolve issues.

Use data to drive transformational change.

There are no standard metrics in the field to inspire and support effective improvement of student well-being. A list of initial metrics was selected through a participatory process of rating and ranking by a diverse set of higher education stakeholders. The goal was for all teams to collect and report on the full list of metrics.

Initially, most teams were concerned about student survey fatigue and preferred trying to leverage existing data in university systems. In practice, information system-sourced metrics were difficult to generate or did not provide sufficiently actionable insights. Instead, counter to initial predictions, five of eight teams found frequent, repeated surveys—using a newly developed survey instrument that ultimately evolved into the Wellbeing Improvement Survey for Higher Education Settings (WISHES)—easy to administer. The surveys elicited overwhelmingly positive feedback from students. The WISHES data motivated partners, generated important insights about where to focus action, and provided the ability to rapidly assess changes. Two teams linked their WISHES data to demographic data, program utilization, and academic data obtained from university information systems. This link proved to be exceptionally powerful in understanding connections between students' identities and circumstances, experiences across the institution, well-being, and academic outcomes.

Several teams plan to continue to administer WISHES multiple times throughout the academic year. WISHES is freely available to all colleges and universities at anew.nyu.edu/wishes.

Learning across historical silos involves a shared theory of change, common measures, experimentation, intentional reflection, and an open sharing of key learnings.

Short-term projects need to be balanced with the long view of changing institution norms, structures, and processes while improving understanding of how different, often disjointed, efforts across an institution impact students' well-being. In addition to the correct small core function team, the following are essential:

➤ **Answers to the question: "What are we trying to accomplish?"** Many teams expressed surprise at the significant diversity in responses—even on well-established practices such as embedding counselors in different schools and departments and gatekeeper interventions—which highlighted the need for conversations on purpose, theory, and expected outcomes and for boundaries around the scope of change.

➤ **A mindset biased toward action and learning.** This mindset represents a fundamental shift for many teams. It is key to acknowledge no one has all the answers, and more data collection, talking, and planning based on untested assumptions will not necessarily help reach a better solution.

➤ **Coordination.** There is a difference between coordination of learnings versus coordination for consensus-building and creating control over work that can and cannot be advanced. The latter inhibits transformational change, the former facilitates it. The greater the number of people with the autonomy, agency, and willingness to experiment with change, the more learnings can be generated and at a faster pace. In addition to a single "theory of change," methods should be shared to test, implement, and scale-up promising solutions. The right infrastructure—core team, theory of change, metrics, methods for changemaking, and communications systems—can facilitate collaboration, data sharing, learning, and resources.

➤ **Tools.** A theory of change that considers the holistic experience of a group of students that is disproportionately not thriving—versus a theory and work within a single division, department, or project within the division—is necessary. A driver diagram tool helps to facilitate codesign with potential partners and to analyze, develop, communicate, and iterate that theory of change. The driver diagram, which promotes learning by doing, is a graphic framework representing the proposed aim, the best guesses for the key factors ("drivers"), and associated change strategies to achieve improvement.

ROCHESTER INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Rochester Institute of Technology's (RIT's) Triple Aim work focused on a population of students enrolled in one of its colleges, which allowed participants to learn deeply about the interconnectedness between the academic experience and students' mental health and well-being. Baseline WISHES data revealed 65 percent of students could identify a professor whom they believed cared about them. Inability to identify such a person was associated with negative well-being outcomes such as academic risk, psychological distress, fair or poor mental health, and not flourishing. These data helped to galvanize support from key stakeholders within the college for a more emergent approach to supporting students' evolving needs and experiences.

Tools, such as a driver diagram and the Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) cycle, facilitated action-oriented collaboration by offering structure and methods for rapid cocreation, cotesting, and iteratively improving changes directly with faculty and students. The use of sequential PDSA cycles revealed discrete areas for improvement of the Syllabus Statement Project, which aimed to improve proactive help-seeking and normalize the experience of academic difficulties. The team conducted several tests of acceptable language and delivery based on students' feedback, which contributed to a version of the statement that landed well with students of early-adopting professors. However, once the team tried to scale the statement to more faculty, student feedback revealed the Syllabus Statement was experienced as disingenuous and inauthentic with some professors, running counter to professors' actual behavior when approached by struggling students.

This process of iterative testing led to new information, prompting new avenues for future improvement work such as deepening the team's partnership with academic affairs and codesigning programs with faculty to improve their response to help-seeking students. Starting with a small group helped to avoid investing significant resources in interventions with uncertain potential impact. Starting small allowed methods to be tweaked early and to build momentum from early positive stories. New streams of collaboration were based on what was discovered through this process of "learning by doing."

Triple Aim Collaborators: Lindsay Phillips, Jennifer Maltby, David Reetz, Megan Jaros, and Wendy Gelbard

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

The Stanford University team's primary goal was to improve flourishing for all students by improving aspects of campus culture; reducing complexities that impacted students' ability to effectively navigate and access the comprehensive network of available resources; and increasing student leaders' ability to support students in distress and promote flourishing.

The driver diagram became a very powerful tool for the team, and it is now used to guide improvement of other universitywide health priorities. The process of developing a driver diagram helped the team think as one university with a single theory of change, representing many projects involving diverse stakeholders and thousands of discrete changes to improve flourishing. It also functioned as a concise communication tool to engage partners in purpose and action-oriented collaboration.

Initial work focused on developing commonalities in language, values, and standard approaches, starting with developing an in-person curriculum and a companion web resource—the Stanford Red Folder—for Stanford community members who have frequent contact with students. The team learned members could not simply develop and implement a resource. Instead, the process must involve proactive engagement and working with stakeholders interactively to make the resource more useful. The Collaborative prompted contemplation about each active project: To what extent does this project widen or narrow equity gaps? Answers to this question allowed team members to see segments of students, particularly those with historically marginalized or excluded identities, may not benefit as much from some projects as majority students. The team conducted a Three-Part Data Review with Native and Indigenous communities of students, which led to the generation of eight discrete areas of improvement that team members will be working with students to address.

Triple Aim Collaborators: John Austin, Sandra Villafan, Colin Campbell, and Jim Jacobs

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

The Triple Aim created the opportunity for Texas A&M University (TAMU) to broaden the scope and scale of improvement from clinical settings to applying new approaches to improving holistic well-being. TAMU developed an overarching theory of change and identified projects to increase retention of first-generation students. The most catalytic and transformative accomplishment was a new collaboration between Student Health Services and Student Affairs Planning, Assessment, and Research (SAPAR) to adopt WISHES, develop a robust analytics infrastructure, and use improvement science to drive action in student affairs and academic affairs.

TAMU began a small-scale pilot in 2019 by administering paper surveys to several hundred students. In 2021, they transitioned to an online survey three times per semester of the entire 60,000-plus student population split into randomly generated samples. Upon survey completion, students received a detailed list of campus resources to support well-being. The team chose to administer the survey with a student identifier so they could link the WISHES responses to other university data sources, which ultimately improved the utility and actionability of the data for university stakeholders. SAPAR built an interactive dashboard for stakeholders to visualize students' WISHES data in digestible chunks over time along demographic lines for comparisons and connect

GET INVOLVED

The work of the Collaborative is important and meaningful, and for many students it has been life changing. The outcomes have inspired the creation of The Action Network for Equitable Wellbeing (ANEW), a community of changemaking individuals, higher education institutions, and related organizations. To learn more and get involved in ANEW and to access a free copy of the Wellbeing Improvement Survey for Higher Education Settings, visit anew.nyu.edu.

Start small, learn, and iterate before going to scale.

The Collaborative teams consistently mention the value of "starting small" and learning from "failing fast." Teams were encouraged to start with a single population of focus for their intensive systems change work, and to test new programs, strategies, or changes on a small scale.

While it is often the temptation—and sometimes the leadership desire—to implement a great idea on a large scale, teams came to appreciate the inherent risks and limitations of that approach: commitment of resources to an unproven idea means a greater chance of failure, fewer opportunities for improvement, and a higher psychological and motivational bar to initiate a project. Teams learned that trying a change on a small-scale, modifying based on lessons learned, and continuing this approach with small-scale, rapid, iterative cycles of change allow for improving practices and outcomes, minimizing failure risk, and increasing engagement, buy-in, and support for the change—and ultimately increased the likelihood the change results in improvement when implemented on a large scale.

Collaboration with other institutions accelerates local and national improvement.

The Collaborative was grounded in a basic principle: More can be accomplished together than even the best institution can accomplish alone. Key features that make cross-institutional collaboration valuable and impactful include: open, honest conversations about challenges and failures; embracing shared values, language, and methods; exchanging successes and key learnings; and peer accountability and support.

What Triple Aim Collaborative Participants Say

"My relationships with teams from other schools became so essential to my work."

"A big implication was the power of peer collaboration and the accountability that comes with that…We would not be as far along as we are if it were not for the connection and accountability to all of you for showing up and doing the work, as imperfect as it was at every step."

"Reflecting on our peer relationship…I do not want to say like-minded because we're not like-minded per se, but it's people functioning at the highest level of professionalism engaging on related topics. Unlike going to a conference, where there are hundreds of people and many do not connect as well to the particular topic, this was so focused. [The Collaborative] allowed a level of efficiency that isn't common when putting professionals together in a room. That's part of what attracted us to the peer meetings and what made them so rewarding. We're all speaking more or less the same language, and we all are experiencing a lot of the same challenges, opportunities, problems, and successes. And though we're at very different institutions, there's a lot to learn from each other."

If done right, this work should create joy.

Accepting and taking on the "burden of improvement" that transformative change requires, particularly during the COVID-19 pandemic, felt at times to be overwhelming. However, teams learned they could have fun and generate joy while engaging in this hard, transformative work.

The fun manifested itself in nontraditional professional development and community-building activities, such as learning about Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) cycles from paper airplanes; and exploring growth mindset, design thinking, and partnership using games, balls, and through other activities. Not only fun, this "professional play" contributed to creating a relaxed environment that sparked creativity, novel thinking, and innovative ideas.

Teams also came to experience joy from directly engaging with students to discover what is most important to them and to correct broken systems to improve students' lives and make team members' professional lives easier. Having fun and generating joy was important to keep people engaged in the work, allow for psychological safety, and build trust—all critical factors for long-term success. Improvement work is predicated on testing and occasionally failing; having fun facilitates learning from those failures. **LE**

The Collaborative is based on the Institute for Healthcare Improvement's Breakthrough Series Model and The Model for Improvement, an improvement methodology developed by Associates in Process Improvement. See anew.nyu.edu for more information.

Allison Smith is director, health strategy and outcomes at New York University.

Catherine Craig is a member of the faculty, Triple Aim for Populations at the Institute for Health Improvement.

Carlo Ciotoli is vice president for campus health and executive director, Student Health Center at New York University.

it to other data sources such as participation in extended orientation, Greek life, and other programs. SAPAR also plans to connect WISHES data to retention and grade point average. The associations between specific student affairs programs and services and well-being outcomes have enlightened many student affairs department heads, for the first time, about the important and direct roles they play in the well-being of TAMU students. The associations have led to requests for tailored WISHES data reports throughout student affairs and for other new actions to improve well-being. SAPAR plans to continue using WISHES and linking to other datasets to inform ongoing improvement work across student affairs priorities. SAPAR staff members, who consult on some 300 student affairs-related assessment projects annually, are now coaching departments through "analysis paralysis," using incremental change methods based on assessment data results.

Triple Aim Collaborators: Martha Dannenbaum, Kelly Cox, Robert Tirso, Megan Cullers, and Jim Fish

UNIVERSITY AT ALBANY–STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Team members at the University at Albany (UAlbany) worked to develop a collective theory of change for a well-being campaign using the driver diagram tool. This foundational work allowed them to see the multilayered changes necessary to address well-being at UAlbany while helping determine where to start. The team identified the student "connection" driver as a high priority, leading to a focus on first-year students at higher risk of homesickness and low sense of belonging. At the Collaborative's first convening, UAlbany learned about New York University's Bridging Academic and Social Experiences team meetings, in which resident assistants have one-on-one conversations with members of their community to foster connection, problem solving, and resource navigation. This initiative inspired UAlbany to leverage three existing peer programs to integrate one-on-one proactive outreach, support, and resource navigation at pivotal times. Summer orientation leaders called incoming students prior to the start of classes. In the first month of classes, resident assistants had brief one-on-one conversations with each resident. Peer assistants proactively called first-year students who noted homesickness on a survey six weeks into the semester.

Resident and peer assistant proactive conversations have become standard practice and were expanded during the COVID-19 pandemic. The learnings from these peer contacts were instrumental in designing programs and support to more directly address students' most common questions, concerns, and priorities. For example, upon hearing from students who did not have the technology to access remote classes, UAlbany sent computers to those students to provide access to remote instruction. UAlbany's work within the Collaborative prior to the COVID-19 pandemic prepared the team to handle challenges by emphasizing the importance

of campus partnerships and small, rapid-cycle testing to evaluate changes and scale what works to continuously improve systems of support. The relationships built across campus organizations contributed to the development of a campus Well-being Collective, which uses many Triple Aim tools and methods.

Triple Aim Collaborators: Karen Sokolowski, Joyce DeWitt-Parker, Dolores Cimini, Robert Cardom, and Doug Sweet

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

At the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), multiple factors have contributed to an increased demand for access to Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) and the Ashe Student Health Center (Ashe), which have experienced financial and resource allocation challenges in addressing the behavioral health needs of students. Through its Triple Aim work, the UCLA team strived to improve systems integration between behavioral health, medical services, and campus programs to provide the best possible care for students. Over the course of the Collaborative, Ashe and CAPS staff built relationships and collected data, created process maps, built driver diagrams,

> *"Through its Triple Aim work, the UCLA team strived to improve systems integration between behavioral health, medical services, and campus programs to provide the best possible care for students."*

used the plan, do, study, act methodology, and developed a prioritization matrix. Project goals were refined to focus on: reducing the touch points a patient goes through between Ashe and CAPS; assessing Ashe provider comfort level with and training on behavioral health; using Ashe experience to support CAPS transition to online scheduling; and implementing suicide screening at Ashe.

Success depended on the ability of team members to participate in regular meetings; gain support of senior leadership; and work together to try new ideas. Team members learned the hard way that systems change work is a continuous process, and redundancy and diversity in the team is essential to continue the work during periods of hardship (i.e., extreme staff shortages, change in leadership, COVID-19). These conditions led to halting all improvement projects. However, UCLA plans to restart its Triple Aim work in the next year using the tools gained in the Collaborative.

Triple Aim Collaborator: Bettina Pedone