

## Procuring with Style...for the Long Term

*Chris Y. Thomas, Jr., M.D.-General Surgeon:* [barbtommy@aol.com](mailto:barbtommy@aol.com)

### **The Challenge:**

The Midwest Procurement Bank provides organs and tissues for transplantation. There are five different departments: laboratory, tissue procurement, organ procurement, education, and administration. The Medical Director is an M.D.

In spite of several seminars, there seemed to be lingering interpersonal and communications challenges between the different departments. Another persistent issue became apparent: The tissue and organ procurement teams were often perceived by the hospitals they retrieved from as “unwelcome invaders” The education team who went into intensive care units to encourage organ donation and leave brochures was often treated with indifference. This resulted in a continuing low morale problem.

### **The Approach:**

The group was split into two groups of 16 and experienced a whole brain program that emphasized communication, conflict issues and understanding of others. Everyone received their thinking styles personal data as part of the process.

### **The Results:**

The teams working with hospitals learned to position their requests with credibility (rather than being intimidated as before), provide facts on the distribution of donor organs and developed empathy for the hospital staff that they worked with. They learned that noticing and complimenting hospital staff would go a long way in building relationships and rapport. The education group learned to better interface with potential donor families in times of crisis. Confidence and morale improved as the medical director reinforced the concepts learned in the program.

A bonus outcome emerged in the banks’ interface with the 18 person board of directors (all highly technical doctors and surgeons). They learned that by selling their requests “scientifically” for new purchases, changes in procedures or personnel, they made it nearly impossible for the board to mount a challenge! All that was left was to say “yes”.

A study of remaining staff 5 years later showed the following long term moderate to significant effect\* of this initiative (learning about thinking preferences):

- Attitude change about others
- Behavioral change toward others
- Changed interaction with colleagues
- Makes me a better listener
- Alters my approach to conflict
- Helped me understand my “fit” with others

\*Scale range: Highly significant, Strong effect, Moderate effect, Noticeable effect, No effect, No opinion