One of Brooke's stories that resonated with me a lot was her experiences with the hospital in Wausau. Brooke described how she received the job essentially on the spot, being offered a nurse manager position as well. While this seemed like a positive thing at the time, this ended up being a huge burden for her. Everyone came to her to solve problems she was not qualified to solve or did not have adequate information to offer solutions. The system had several "broken links," or as a systems thinker would interpret, missing feedback loops. There was a weak relationship between Brooke and the people who came to her for help, as there were missing pieces of information and intermediaries to assist in getting the proper information to the proper people. Brooke could not provide a feedback loop back to her peers to allow them to resolve issues, thus the system failed to accomplish its purposes.

The lesson I learned from this story is that a system should have established parts and relationships that can provide adequate feedback loops to achieve the system's purpose. You can have a brand new hospital building with innovative technology and state-of-the-art equipment, however, without knowledgeable people to understand the uses of the technology and to operate the equipment, the system suffers. A system as complex as a hospital needs people who work in different areas and who have the knowledge to do their job to the best of their ability. It needs communication between parties lower in the system gradually making its way up to the manager, not to mention a manager who is capable of handling all of the issues to be resolved.

In my life, I have dealt with this fundamental systems issue on countless occasions. Namely, I once worked as an intern at a food-testing company in high school where this issue was present. My supervisor ran the panel of evaluators who scaled the texture, aroma, and taste of different food products to report their findings to food production companies. The panel subsystem functioned rather seamlessly, as the scores from evaluators translated directly to the supervisor who then transferred the data to the data recorders who summarized and saved the results of the panel. It was the larger system that failed to operate; the raw scores sent to the food production companies could not be interpreted or

used to change/improve their foods since there was no intermediate to understand or explain the meaning of the data. Similar to how Brooke, the manager, could not solve the hospital's issues without adequate provided information, the food production companies could not solve their food-related issues.

This finding produces a lot of unanswerable questions. Should the hospital invest in providing Brooke with more tools for understanding the presented issues, or should it invest in hiring more lower-level workers who can solve more of the issues on their own? Should the food-testing company choose to test the products of companies where the data presents more obvious findings, or should it hire people to compile, interpret, and explain the meaning of data? Or, on a more macro level, should the system have been established with the necessary parts and relationships to avoid running into such issues to begin with? While I suppose once the hospital is up and running there is really no point in considering this last question, there is also no telling whether adding new parts to the system will have the desired effect. Perhaps this would only overload the system and create an even larger web of relationships that becomes confusing and overwhelms a manager like Brooke even further. Maybe adding employees to interpret the data would result in conclusions not at all helpful to the food production companies. It seems as though when established systems have flaws as fundamental as missing parts, it is very difficult to reconfigure that system to achieve the desired purpose.