

There is No “I” in Team: A Quality Improvement Survey

Ian Osburn

Lehigh Valley Health Network, Ian.Osburn@lvhn.org

Jennifer Chevinsky BS

USF MCOM-LVHN Campus, jennifer.chevinsky@lvhn.org

June Leland MD

James A. Haley Veterans' Hospital

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarlyworks.lvhn.org/select-program>



Part of the [Medical Education Commons](#)

Published In/Presented At

Osburn, I., Chevinsky, J., & Leland, J. (2012, April 26). *There is no "i" in team: A quality improvement survey*. Poster presented at: The Community-Based Clinical Mentoring - Action Research Project, University of South Florida, Tampa, FL.

This Poster is brought to you for free and open access by LVHN Scholarly Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in LVHN Scholarly Works by an authorized administrator. For more information, please contact LibraryServices@lvhn.org.



THERE IS NO "I" IN TEAM: A QUALITY IMPROVEMENT SURVEY

By Ian Osburn and Jennifer Chevinsky

Team Development Measure

The Team Development Measure (TDM) was designed by the Center for Implementation Practice & Research Support chartered by the Systems Redesign Steering Committee (Part of the Systems Improvement Subcommittee). The TDM has been implemented in 86 Veterans Integrated Service Networks across the country.

The TDM indicates the degree to which a team has and uses the components needed for highly effective teamwork. The four components of teamwork include Cohesiveness, Communication, Role Clarity, and Goals-means Clarity. Each of the four components can be evaluated as an independent entity as well as a marker for team development progression.

Cohesiveness is the social glue that binds the team members together as a working unit. Communication involves a full range of topics including decision-making and problem-solving. Role clarity ensures that all members are aware of clear role definitions and expectations. Goal-means clarity presents an agreement on the team's goals and the strategies to achieve them.

The measure also reveals two levels of solidification of the team, 'in place' and 'firmly in place.' The two levels of solidification along with the four components form the eight stages of team development (see below). Movement from one stage to the next is more of a flow in the development of a team than it is a distinct step up the ladder of team development.

The report score indicates where the team is on the scale of team development, which of these four components are in place, and how firmly they are in place.


STAGE	SCORE RANGE	COMPONENTS	SOLIDIFICATION
Pre-team	0-36	None to Building	---
1	1-46	Cohesiveness	In Place
2	47-54	Communication	In Place
3	55-57	Role Clarity	In Place
4	58-63	Goals-means Clarity	In Place
5	64-69	Cohesiveness	Firmly In Place
6	70-77	Communication	Firmly In Place
7	78-80	Role Clarity	Firmly In Place
8	81-86	Goals-means Clarity	Firmly In Place
Fully Developed	87-100	Everything	Firmly In Place

Methods

The Team Development Measure, an anonymous survey, was delivered via email to the James A. Haley VA Home Based Primary Care team. Of the 46 members, there were 40 respondents for a completion rate of approximately 87%. The team members were given three weeks to fill out the survey. The survey consists of 31 statements with four response categories ('strongly agree,' 'agree,' 'disagree,' or 'strongly disagree'). The results were sent directly to the VA for analysis. A team report was generated and distributed to all members of the team. The report was reviewed by the team leadership and the 9 responses that generated at least 15% dissatisfaction will be openly discussed with the HPBC team at an upcoming team meeting.

Background

The Tampa VA HBPC (Home Based Primary Care) team delivers high value care by an interdisciplinary team consisting of physicians, nurse practitioners, social workers, kinesiologists, pharmacists, psychologists, physician assistants, dietitians, and a geriatric psychiatrist. Each geographic team (Tampa, Pasco, Lakeland) cares for a largely geriatric population of veterans, many of whom are homebound, chronically ill, and nearing the end of their lives. Care is directed at patient and caregiver goals for primary and palliative care, and the management of serious and often life-limiting illnesses.



Discussion

The Tampa VA HBPC scored a team average of 64, falling within stage 5 (Cohesiveness Established, Firmly in Place). This leaves room for development in the categories of Communication, Role Clarity, and Goal-means Clarity.

The most positive responses came from the Cohesiveness component. The two statements with 98% agreement are: "I enjoy being in the company of the other members of the team" and "As a team we come up with creative solutions to problems."

Role Clarity is the component with the most negative responses. The lowest rated item in this category, with 35% agreement, is "Some members of this team resist being led." Discussion with the leadership reflected that this finding might be a result of staff recruitment strategy, with a focus on independence. Each member of the staff must be able to autonomously practice in a high-risk environment.

The potential area of most concern was found in the communication component, with 40% feeling that "Team members talk about other team members behind their back." This item will be brought to the attention of the team for open discussion on methods to rectify this issue.

The results of this survey reflect the point in time of the assessment. A meeting will be held in the near future where ideas will be shared as a team in order to process the TDM results, pinpoint broad areas of improvement, and identify realistic action steps to support momentum in each. With the base line marker provided by the TDM, the Tampa VA HBPC will be able to evaluate their progress over time.


Acknowledgements

June Leland, MD
Darlene Davis, MHA
Tampa VA HBPC

Results


COHESIVENESS

All team members feel free to express their feelings with the team




COMMUNICATION

Team members talk about other team members behind their back




The team openly discusses decisions that affect the work of the team before they are made




ROLE CLARITY


Roles and responsibilities of individual team members are clearly understood by all members of the team




All team members place the accomplishments of the team ahead of their own individual accomplishments




All team members define the goals of the team as more important than their own personal goals



Some members of this team resist being led





On this team the person who takes the lead differs depending on who is best suited for the task



GOALS AND MEANS

The team has agreed upon clear criteria for evaluating the outcomes of the team's effort



Team Avg = 64 Stage 5 64 - 69 Cohesiveness Established