

The Art of Ethics

→ COMPLETION OF THIS EVALUATION IS REQUIRED FOR CME/CEU ←

CONFERENCE EVALUATION Plenary Sessions

May 11, 2010

Please score the value of Dr. Nuland's Keynote presentation to clinical ethics consultation.

Poor				Excellent
1	2	3	4	5
4%	6%	18%	32%	40%

- Great way to begin the conference.
- Thought provoking but very medicine-centered. Perspectives of other disciplines would be helpful.
- Excellent speaker.
- Appropriate for the theme of the conference.
- Comment about French bathing culturally insensitive.
- You had so many well-spoken people at your conference. His comments and jokes as the first speaker made me think that the rest of the speakers would be like this.
- Humanism in medicine is essential as it is about the relationship. I can't see the IOM during such a large-scale review though as a consultation it would be interesting.
- Dr. Nuland's keynote was excellent and inspiring.
- Overly "physician-o-centric". Insensitive to other health care roles. Good historical background. Good story-telling.
- Interesting and timely presentation as healthcare has lost the caring behaviors.
- The concept of physician as healer rather than the technician is important to share over those in training. Failure to recognize our role may prevent the most appropriate care of the patient.
- Insulting tonight to nurses and non-physicians, the French, Muslims...
- I highly enjoyed the talk.
- Valuable insight. Re: import of relationship building and the need to involve humanities when caring for patients.
- Historical perspective. History of medicine was fascinating.
- Excellent way to begin the conference.
- Excellent history to share with us. The speaker was very focused on physicians, but with a multidisciplinary audience this came across as entitled, paternalistic, superior. I plan to read his book and enjoyed his talk very much.
- Evoked interesting discussion. I say "no" to technology. Art of medicine is lost.
- A bit long but interesting.
- I am amazed at the history and the fact he delivered without notes. I was captivated! Excellent speaker.
- Very disappointing keynote speaker; did not address the subject of the title. Typical doctor perspective. Where was his humanity?
- Good overview of historical development. Good introduction.
- Found the overview narrowly focused on physicians and North American context.
- Although not connected to clinical consultation directly, an important message delivered very well.

- I appreciated that he distinguished between physicians and nurses and also mentioned that some academics are lacking in humanity qualities.
- Very interesting. I enjoyed the historical overview of development in medicine, and evolution of virtue ethics in the field. One of the best, more peaceful, imaginative (the setting) less frenetic and professionally organized conferences that I've ever attended. Thanks! It was nice timing, starting at 8:30am and ending at 4:30 so I could explore the city!
- Enjoyed the historical overview.
- Effectively stimulated discussion.
- Excellent and thoughtful overview of this important issue.
- A bit rambling; tended to place MDs in a separate ethical category.
- Loved the range of his storytelling.
- Interesting, but basically 1970's mindset on physicians.
- Inspiring presentation!
- Good to start the conference with clinical ethics in a tutorial context.
- His comments were arrogant and self-serving.
- Good, but not the level of engagement a keynote could be.
- Content was interesting, presentation was good, but not really oriented toward clinical ethics.
- Although Dr. Nuland's title was "Goodness of Healer...", in fact his focus and interest was physicians. He also has had limited experience in ethics consultation. His narrow focus and limited experience in the field seems an odd choice for opening speaker for this multidisciplinary conference.
- Pro-I was thrilled to hear the quote from Hippocrates on the goodness of the physician and encouraged to hear him frame the issue as a "calling" to health care; Con-the physician-centric world view.
- We are fortunate he was here to present to us.
- I loved hearing some of the history of medicine through the lens of bioethics-great speaker.
- A little more time for questions and answers.
- Loved how he tied the arts together and the historical.
- Evidently Dr. Nuland is well-respected in the ethics community. However, his focus was quite narrow for the population of varied people.
- Very interesting and informative, but we need to see the role and responsibility of physician through the new bioethics lens.
- One's attention was held throughout the lecture, despite the non-use of power point.
- Great overview. Nice kickoff to a great event.
- While some of Dr. Nuland's comments were excellent and inspiring, I found it to be tainted with a degree of paternalism.
- Good style but substance was very superficial, and at times erroneous. This was an example of a scholar of reputation coasting on his reputation.
- Very medically focused. Issues affecting other health care professionals not included.
- Great way to start the discussion. He did a nice, concise job of overviewing the transition to hands-off providers.
- Great way to kick off the conference.
- Didn't find it very engaging. Lacked humility, was rambling.
- Interesting perspective.
- I very much enjoyed the talk, especially the portion about how we now practice microbiology and we need to remember to heal the patient.

-Wonderful!

-Not directed to the nature of the audience attending this conference.

-Good to have "overview" on history of medicine and how we got to needing ethics today. Also agree a big change needs to happen but how and what! I think the movement is heading in the right direction, but too timely as most of life's challenges.

-Dr. Nuland said his topic was about physician's. The program title was "healers". He could not see beyond MDs to other health care providers-social workers, clergy, nurses, ethicists.

-His experience is fantastic. And he spoke in a very coherent and engaging manner.

-Part of his comments was controversial. His historical summary was ethnocentric. (Confucious, women?)

-I enjoyed his historical overview, but I found the presentation overall to be focused on MD and would have preferred a broader perspective. He is a very good speaker though.

May 12, 2010

SESSION A - Plenary

Please score the value of this session to clinical ethics consultation.

Poor				Excellent
1	2	3	4	5
0%	2%	8%	40%	50%

Comments:

-Case discussions especially helpful.

-Interactive case study discussion was a highlight very interesting, engaging and informative.

-The first two presentations were similar in content. The case study was excellent and more of these from different cultural backgrounds would be very useful.

-Case study was great.

-Great use of bringing case studies and participation by the audience.

-Amazing! I learned so much using this format.

-Very practical. I enjoyed hearing about the difference between a "new" smaller program and the larger "established" program.

-Case study was excellent.

-Variety, informative, practical application. Great!

-Liked the 3 different presentations. Always like case studies.

-Great case!

-Interesting case discussion.

-Especially E. Milligan!

- Nice overview. Loved the case study!! Reading made me think...

-Somewhat interesting but not very relevant.

-Excellent. I appreciated the discussion and questions involving the participants.

-Amazing presentations. Clear concise. Knowledgeable. Good Q&A's.

-Stimulating.

-Case study was an excellent learning experience.

-Australia QLD experience great. Italy session #151 was good. Case of 88-year-old Martha outstanding discussion.

- Enjoyed case study best.
- Eleanor Mulligan is articulate, knowledgeable, and progressive. I am so impressed that she built her ethics program from the roots up.
- Interesting to hear perspectives from Australia and Italy.
- Loved the case study.
- Loved the case study and following discussion. Great presentations.
- Interesting to hear international perspectives. Case study was useful but somewhat limiting in terms of inadequate context to make a meaningful recommendation.
- Milligan was interesting. The value was there for those in similar circumstances. The case was good. Could have drilled down more to discuss the vast differences in our "votes".
- Helpful ideas. I will take the information back to ethics committees. I will need slides if presenters are willing...
- Liked hearing how both had set-up and were working on ethics support in both countries.
- Use of clickers provided an interesting illustration of the effect of discourse.
- Generally very good. While it maybe costs more, having handouts of the plenary speakers would be helpful.
- Good talks; clicker technology very good.
- I liked the case study with voting.
- Enjoyed the i-clicker.
- Excellent and varied presentations. It was great to see the exposure of the "electoral voting" method and its application to ethics discussion. Very good!
- I thoroughly enjoyed the case study and discussion this ensued. The two other presentations (the first two) were more and less of interest to my particular role at this time.
- Interesting to hear about an Australian experience. I really enjoyed the case study, but it would have been nice to have a speaker address a more general CEC issue on something thought provoking.
- It is both troubling and rewarding to see ethicists don't agree.
- Loved Eleanor's accent. Enjoyed the case study-very interesting!
- Ethical discussion about the care request is clinically irrelevant and illegal! Unnatural death=investigation of the attorney.
- Medical error-one of the options was "double effect", this option was illegitimate because we weren't dealing with an intentional act. This is basic ethical theory.
- Case study was an interesting exercise. Experience of building clinical ethical practice was useful.
- Very eye-opening on the variety of opinions.
- Good to learn about differences across different countries.
- Good sense of international issues and methodologies. As a pharmacist, I especially found that case of the medication error particularly compelling.
- Both talks presented well, giving glimpse to each country's state of CEC. Case study discussion was fascinating, mostly as reflection of us as community. The use of audience response system was good, but could turn discussion explicitly toward what audience is doing by shifting views after discussion.
- I found the Australian speaker very well versed in her subject, and able to clearly answer questions. Well done. Found the Italian presentation a little harder to follow, but appreciated the information.
- Milligan was helpful to show the progression of implementing an ethical committee.
- Case study presentation is very helpful, especially the group voting results. Excellent!
- Case was very interesting. First two presentations were not terribly interesting and didn't seem to rise to the occasion of a plenary.
- I especially liked the interactive process used in the medical error segment-very interesting!

- Good start to conference day and good variety.
- Like that you started with someone not from the USA.
- Eleanor's presentation would have been better in a concurrent session than plenary. Renzo's was helpful, case study was great.
- Very much enjoyed the discourse in the case and opportunity to vote (engage). Also I really enjoyed #135 very much.
- Excellent-loved the approach of teaching. Both speakers presented different views of ethics.
- Both presenters were solid. I appreciate the use of technology/polling with the case study. Very compelling.

May 12, 2010 (Cont.)

SESSION E - Evening

Please score the value of this session to clinical ethics consultation.

Poor				Excellent
1	2	3	4	5
1%	1%	14%	34%	50%

Comments:

- I enjoyed the presentation on bioethics in Latin America. Cultural differences can be a major cause of conflict.
- Dr. Beca's methodology was clear. Awareness of cultural differences is vital. The situation in India is frightening.
- Thank you! Very stimulating.
- Important topics but less relevant to my consultative practice. Great session but in terms of the questions asked, less.
- The Chilean MD was excellent, as was Dr. Pessini.
- Dr. Vaswani was very entertaining and thought provoking.
- Fantastic to learn about Brazil, Chile, and India.
- Interesting international perspective.
- Presentations were well done. Good information but not widely valuable.
- Very relevant and practical.
- Our dinner took too long to arrive and so we couldn't make it back in time, unfortunately. Would like to see the slides, if available...
- Each speaker provided important insight into the four issues they presented. Dr. Vaswani was particularly compelling, but all were excellent.
- Very interesting. Dr. Vaswani was excellent. Great to hear the principles of other countries.
- Well versed. Good variety, opened up more questions for me to pursue.
- Grateful the presenters have a good amount of literature on the slides-sometimes difficult to understand, although I love the accents and appreciate the diversity.
- An excellent presentation over a range of subjects.
- Interesting mix of topics. I particularly enjoyed Voell's dissection of the meaning of dignity and Vaswani's questions.
- Loved hearing about the different regions ethics progresses. Very helpful to show where the countries are located.

-Perfect amount of time for each presenter very engaging and interesting topics!

May 13, 2010

SESSION F – Plenary

Please score the value of this session to clinical ethics consultation.

Poor					Excellent
1	2	3	4	5	
0%	2%	15%	34%	49%	

Comments:

- Removed ethics is not the topic of this conference. Placebo case discussion was good.
- Presentation by Barbara Bennett Jacobs was particularly excellent, moving on a personal level as well as professionally relevant.
- #8 excellent, fascinating. #108 the best! Absolutely fantastic.
- Speakers were engaging and very interesting, but different issues.
- Very profound artwork and poems of nursing students. Brings more emotional and humane perspective.
- The challenges of Latin America are compelling.
- I like Dr. Jacob's presentation and the placebo's case study.
- #8 off-subject (off topic). #108 was excellent.
- The viewpoint from Columbia was thought provoking. Jacob's presentation-best of conference so far.
- Really liked the art pieces. But not clear how it was relevant to clinical consultation.
- Loved Barbara's talks especially.
- Presenter #1 very interesting. #2 interesting, but not sure what she does best, much to do with consultation.
- Both Dr. Barrera and Dr. Jacobs were excellent.
- Very good. Loved the interactive case study at the end. The speaker who talked about art was entertaining but it seems that it went off on a tangent not related to ethics.
- Thought Barbara's talk was really good.
- Very different presentation stimulating, lots of thought.
- Art and case study were excellent.
- Love the case studies most.
- Too bad ethics in organ procurement not done. Too many questions from audience. They should write them down during the program and give to presenters to answer if pertinent.
- Again very much enjoyed the case study and the ability to "vote".
- Enjoyed presentation from Columbia. Artistic connection is excellent. Case study was interesting.
- Interesting-however, I was really looking forward to the case study "I'm not dead yet".
- Though interesting, the point on our research ethics was of less importance to my practice. I liked the presentation of Mrs. Bennet Jacobs.
- Visual examples of suffering very effective.
- Uneven. Case awkward.
- Very creative. Provided alternate perspectives with which to consider and view and feel ethical priorities.

- Mr. Rueda Barrera's talk was an eye opener. There is potential for abuses in many countries by U.S. pharmaceutical companies overseas if they are not held to the same U.S. standards.
- Very interesting art and reflection.
- Very interesting presentations; greater connection with the implications of the presentations with changes in research.
- Dr. Barrera presented a good overview of the issue of certification. Dr. Bennet Jacobs presented an amazing talk, and was compelling when presenting her topic and creative in her approach to pondering a useful approach to including lamentation into the consultation approach.
- Art of lamentation presentation was excellent.
- #108-would like greater connection in using art in ethics consultation. Approach more use of art therapy but not ethics.
- Very pleasant, sparse on information.
- Wonderful use of art with dying/grief. Columbia pitfalls are frightening.
- Discussion of aesthetic and ethical knowing by Dr. Jacobs was fascinating.
- Placebo is very difficult to resolve...Very concerning about clinical research in the third world...
- Barbara Bennet Jacobs was outstanding!
- Very interesting 1st talk, 2nd a bit preachy, case study again very interesting reflection of group dynamic.
- I loved the art connection.
- Presentation on art was fabulous. Comment on case study-what is the "double effect"? Father Tuohey made an assumption that the audience knew what this was. I didn't know.
- The case study was relevant.

SESSION I - Plenary

Please score the value of this session to clinical ethics consultation.

Poor				Excellent
1	2	3	4	5
0%	3%	12%	42%	42%

Comments:

- Gary Goldsand was particularly compelling and engaging in this presentation.
- Goldsand was excellent. Kipnis was okay.
- We need to understand the main goals and direction of medical ethicists.
- It would be interesting to follow the growth of this protocol.
- Crucial skills. Gary Goldsand was great. Certified clinical ethics-are the ethics of the ethicist being questioned? Do you need "professionalization" to prove you are ethical? I am not so sure you do.
- #170 had pertinent and concise information. #113, excellent presentation on the professional certification process.
- Though provoking topics. Goldsand's comments were particularly helpful for me.
- Found Dr. Goldsand's presentation to be fantastic.
- #170- excellent, but long. #130-excellent laying out of the issue.
- Goldsand-excellent! Kipnis was ok. Would have enjoyed the case discussion.
- 1st speaker very dry. Music would have been better at the end. Coffee was put away too quickly.
- Nice overview.

- Excellent presentations.
- Excellent presentations that supported the same goals! The music was exhilarating!!
- Very clear perspectives, poses many questions. I hope we don't become too exclusive. Chaplaincy is a good example of too many hoops.
- Dr. Schmidt on Dr. House was excellent.
- The first speaker was excellent-measured and quiet. The second speaker was frenetic, and his talk did not relate to my present practice.
- Perhaps needed more time to discuss the important topic of professionalization. Time allowed only for a fairly simplistic overview. I'm unclear if this is only a North American concern or if it applies more broadly. Also, it seems to only discuss consultation other than the broader field of health care ethics work (education, research, etc.).
- Good, provocative, thoughtful discussion regarding credentialing and professionalism.
- The discussion of professionalism is very important.
- Good quality of presentations. Nice discussion.
- Interesting and provocative; providing opportunity for small group discussion might have been useful.
- Dr. Goldsand gave a thoughtful overview of the characteristics/tracts that should be represented in ethics consultation. It was somewhat difficult to follow Dr. Kipnis and his style seemed to be flippant towards the issue.
- Disappointing to miss out on the case study! Presentations were ok, but a topic we've heard lots about in the field already.
- Bringing forth the question and challenge is important.
- More "specialists" is not the answer.
- Interesting: would have helped to have a speaker who did not support certification of ethics consultants-in order to "test" this theory.
- The cellist is fantastic! Thank you so much! Sorry we missed the case study planned for the afternoon.
- Interesting, but not pertinent to me. I'm not a CEC on an ethics board.
- #170 Extremely insightful. Would love access to power point as a reference. #113- a little fast but fabulous content!
- Goldsand was excellent!
- Very provocative. Great questions for the profession.