

The Art of Ethics

➔ COMPLETION OF THIS EVALUATION IS REQUIRED FOR CME/CEU ➔

GENERAL EVALUATION

Please score the overall organization and administration of the conference.

Poor				Excellent
1	2	3	4	5
0.5%	0.5%	2%	21%	76%

Comments:

- Super job!
- No printed abstract book, poor lay-out of program, no thematic focus of sessions.
- Would like more focus-specific or profession-specific breakout sessions (ie. Pediatric topics, nurses in ethics topics).
- Outstanding punctuality.
- Wonderful. Best conference EVER, but too many choices!
- Professional, well organized, helpful volunteers, respectful small group facilitators.
- Flawless.
- I heard many positive comments from participants.
- Very well run, smooth.
- Learned a lot.
- The evaluation forms could be broken out by speaker!!
- Great variety. I really appreciated that events started and ended on time with equitable allocation of time in sessions, even if that meant some hot topics didn't get enough discussion time.
- Terrific setting and administration. Audio visuals were excellent and well-placed.
- Too many sessions. Overall attendance at each session extremely small.
- Wonderful organization. You made it easy to understand all conference details.
- Fabulous venue! Great food. Everything very organized.
- Excellent conference. Thank you.
- Everyone was so very helpful. Beautiful setting.
- This conference was very well organized and administrated. Food was excellent. Surroundings were wonderful.
- Excellent.
- Conference ran smoothly and efficiently.
- Setting was excellent. Food and music, excellent. Keeping us on time, a 5. Sunny weather, a 10. Nice prayers Father Tuohey! Grouping of topics, 4. Variety was nice, wish some could be taped or repeats. I fear I missed many good people and info.
- Fantastic venue. Great food. Loved the cellist from Cambodia.
- Excellent conference. Very thought provoking, but very academic.
- Excellent. Good variety.
- One of the best I've been to!
- Very well-organized. Enjoyable. Good networking, conversations.

- Very efficient and professional. I really liked not having bells and time-keepers herding us all the time. Made it more relaxing and enjoyable. Would have preferred topics being grouped better in sessions.
- Ran very smoothly.
- Excellent conference well organized. Well worth the expense and travel. People were helpful on site and I always felt well cared for.
- Wow. Love the venue, love the diversity of plenary speakers, love the cases!
- Two issues-1. signage would have been helpful in directing us to buildings; 2. concurrent sessions were too time constrained and disparate/scattered.
- Facilities, organization, and running were outstanding!
- Food was very good. It would have been preferable to have some snack items during the breaks-eg: whole fruit to grab and go or granola bars etc. Organization was overall very good though, and staff were very friendly and helpful.
- Well-planned and great venue!
- The program scheduling process was frustrating in that the submission descriptions were not honored, i.e. major papers were not plenary sessions. One note though, it was well administered.
- Wonderful setting, organization of conference flowed well.
- Fantastic attention to detail. The Museum context was wonderful, hosts were always available and helpful, food was excellent, music was a great humanizing touch.
- Very impressed with the venue and the quality of presentations and the diversity of attendees.
- One of the best I have ever attended in my 43 years working experience.
- Very impressed with the organization and getting people to the right places.
- Everyone was hospitable and helpful!
- Excellent work. Helpful staff. Thanks a lot!

Please score the pre-conference registration process.

Poor				Excellent
1	2	3	4	5
0%	1%	7%	24%	68%

Comments:

- Smooth and easy.
- I found the website easy to navigate. The women at the other end of the phone line were sweet and helpful.
- Easy.
- Easy to follow. Nice all online.
- Easy online registration of appropriate number of emails.
- Very competent.
- Website difficult to navigate where to register. Early bird price not advertised well.
- Organized faculty.
- Done well.
- This was completed by my own staff but I think worked well.
- Very easy and helpful.
- Easy.
- Quick and easy.

- Very helpful. Nice to have a real person answer the phone. Very efficient.
- Painless, questions were answered promptly.
- Easy to register. Great follow-up from the registration staff. Good reminders prior to conference starting.
- A bit slow, no feedback. I had to call and confirm that my registration and payment went through. An automatic confirmation email might have been helpful.
- Very accommodating.
- Very easy. Kept well-informed.
- Very simple.
- It would have been nice to have it done in an automated form versus e-mailing it and waiting days for a receipt and confirmation.
- Easy!
- I found it quite easy and uncomplicated.
- The email reminders were great!

Please score the overall impression of the website for accuracy, ease of use, content and design.

Poor				Excellent
1	2	3	4	5
0.5%	1%	15%	37.5%	46%

Comments:

- Fairly easy to use-but the design and links were not as smooth or sophisticated as they could be in 2010.
- Great.
- Accurate.
- Done in a timely fashion.
- I found the online program (and the print version for that matter), difficult to manipulate.
- Again, this website provided information, aesthetic appeal and accessibility.
- Pleasant, simple, clear, complete.
- The website was a little cumbersome to navigate.
- Could register online when the site died. Does not appear to be secure and I did not wish to give credit card details by email.
- Easy.
- Hoping that presentation slides will be available.
- Great to include tourism info. Very nicely designed.
- The only difficulty I had was in having to pick each abstract separately.
- Good information, relatively easy to navigate.
- If the conference schedule could have been in a single pdf with abstracts, that would have been enormously helpful. It was difficult having to click on everything and required need to be on internet always.
- Only issue was accessing abstract to decide which concurrent sessions to go to was difficult.
- If the abstracts could be linked to the program or have all abstracts in one file, it would have been much easier to see them.
- Nice and easy to get information. Would have liked PowerPoint presentations or handout notes available at class.

- The best site that I have ever saw. Congratulations!
- The graphical layout of the program could have been a little bit clearer.
- Easy and great design.
- The building (Museum) directions would have been nice to access ahead of time on the website.
- Great! Thanks!

Please score the groupings of sessions by diversity of topics/country rather than by topic.

Poor				Excellent
1	2	3	4	5
11%	10%	15%	36%	28%

Comments:

- The grouping of sessions did not appear to have clear threads or themes. This made session selection very difficult.
- This is paternalistic. Thematically focused session would have been better.
- Felt that I was missing applicable sessions due to groupings.
- It will be helpful to list abstracts by topic, then will facilitate posting review of abstracts.
- I would have liked more topics on mental health experts involved.
- I would like to see more perspectives from different cultural backgrounds (people of color).
- Broad. Easy to find something of interest in each grouping.
- I think I prefer topic grouping.
- Liked this –although some condensed themes were present. Found this interesting and provided information on trends in ethics today.
- Challenging job! Wanted to mix and match but the flow was well done.
- Not a fan. Topic is better.
- It can be good to be encouraged to stretch our interests, but I would have preferred thematic organization.
- I don't agree. Much better group presentation by topic: the public will be more homogenous
- I would prefer by topic rather than by country.
- Presentations on the same or similar topics should be placed on the same panels. For example: panels should not contain a variety of topics.
- Very diverse but I would suggest some sessions centered around a central topic.
- Nice idea, but some pairings caused a problem.
- I found that I missed sessions in very important areas of interest. It diminished how much value I was able to get out of the conference. Please group by topic and theme.
- Good. Nice variety.
- “We are all in this together”. Amazing perspectives.
- A wide variety of topics to choose from.
- Helped the diversity and the ability to hear so many discussions per session.
- A little muddled up should have divided according to topic. Why was non resuscitation of a newborn mixed in with setting up an ethics program in Holland?
- Swings and roundabouts! It meant I missed some papers I would have liked to have heard, but also heard some interesting papers I would not have otherwise heard.

- It took me a day to get used to heading to 3 different locations. Sometimes the 3 papers were well tied together. Others could have each had ½ hour so that people could pick and choose. Just advertise before.
- Difficult call. I did miss things I would have liked to hear, but understood the difficulty in pleasing all.
- I appreciated the variety and being exposed to topics I might not have typically selected, however, in terms of meeting my own interests I would prefer “themed” session around a particular topic. Perhaps having only one day with a variety and the rest in “themes” would be beneficial.
- Diversity was enjoyable. It is more valuable and useful to have similar or related topics and allow for some “crossover” diversity.
- It must be very challenging to organize such a conference, but I would like to have seen the sessions with more mixed nationalities when possible.
- Didn’t enjoy this. It’s ok for plenaries (I enjoyed 2-3 shorter talks rather than 1 larger one), but I could have attended many more sessions that I was interested in if they’d been grouped better/more closely by topic. Was nice though to have the more arts-based talks interspersed throughout.
- This was challenging. I saw a greater variety of papers, but missed seeing others because they weren’t grouped together.
- I feel that there was some content that I missed due to the structure.
- Generally good. There were some sessions that were concurrent on same topic where a choice had to be made.
- I had mixed feelings about this. Definitely need book of abstracts to help to decide on sessions.
- I applaud your efforts to mix it up, but it was frustrating to not have similar situations grouped.
- Not sure- sometimes common themes emerged and sometimes I ran around to listen to different parts of each one.
- Generally I think it worked well-but there were those sessions that felt too disjointed. I don’t know that this is a solvable issue!
- I did not like loss of focus by shifting from one general topic to another because it’s impossible to address nuances.
- It was sometimes difficult with 3 sessions because there might be 1/3 that I wanted to attend in several rooms at the same time. I know that for logistics, more than 1 per room is easier, but could we have maybe only 2 per room to decrease this problem.
- Grouping by topic makes it easier to network, and makes it more enjoyable for attendees.
- At times was great. But is it possible to ‘pre-select’ courses ahead of time and those that may be popular and in conflict at another area?
- The groupings seemed random, often wanted to hear papers in different rooms/buildings, but very little time to get from place to place. I ended up missing beginnings and endings. I’ve been to other conferences and they’ve managed this better by providing short periods of time before talks.
- I did not like this format. It made it difficult to draw similarities among the presentations and frequently a majority of people were in attendance for one talk, three would dominate the Q&A’s.
- Avoided overlap and gave one the opportunity to be exposed to a wide range of topics.
- Very diverse, extremely well rounded.
- Well, it was interesting but hard to organize as a listener. I prefer the more traditional grouping.
- Enjoyed the diversity of countries, but I think grouping by topics might still be useful (while preserving diversity of speakers).
- I liked the style of groupings. Very innovative.
- There were so many nice touches; i.e. food, coffee, etc. meeting and welcome was personal and caring.
- When I went to sessions that were grouped it was redundant, when I went to diverse ones I heard papers that weren’t pertinent. Either way someone’s not happy.

- Would have preferred similarity of topic in groupings. Every grouping had something of no interest at all so it was hard to select.
- Made it difficult to choose which group to go to.
- Networking by theme would be nice, but the decision brought diversity into sharp relief.
- I liked this. There was one occasion where I thought that the presentation I would not have attended (I went for the other one) was the excellent talk.
- It might have been helpful to group them by potential audience, e.g. academic (theoretical vs. sessions for people new to the topic and looking for more information)

Please score the value of the audience response devices in facilitating case discussions.

Poor				Excellent
1	2	3	4	5
0%	0.5%	8%	28%	63%

Comments:

- Loved the opportunity to participate and to see the diverse responses by this group. Would have been interesting to identify each by discipline.
- Nice addition and interactive component.
- A helpful opening session utilization might be to poll for demographics-country of origin, job (ethicist, clinician, etc).
- Great tool.
- We needed more time for group discussion and time for questions.
- Terrific!
- Like those clickers.
- Like the clickers-Interesting to see the percent of variety of decisions.
- This was the best. This is excellent in engaging audience more. Would like more of this!
- Clickers very engaging.
- Would like to have had "lots" more of that over the discussion and then revote again. Learned from this process is informative and fun. Engaging.
- Although sometimes fun, their use is sometimes a bit time-consuming.
- Competent and surprising, but submitting information from these devices not clear.
- Nice mix; shows the flow of a talk.
- Love them. Like to see what others are thinking.
- I would continue to utilize these.
- Enjoyed the participation. Amazed at the diversity.
- Fun tool.
- This was most rewarding. I love this, we could spend an entire day doing this as an intentional group and then have audience make up a panel to discuss their process in decision making.
- Loved the clicker discussions.
- Very interesting to see how others voted.
- Great!
- Sometimes we would have needed more time for discussion and questions.
- Requires the presenter to pose clear, meaningful questions. Didn't work so well with Dr. Vaswani.

- How choices were "framed" was confining and somewhat counter to the notion of being open to other possibilities. Discussion helped to broaden the discussion.
- Very cool-thanks!
- Great-just would recommend more clarity in questions posed. Perhaps ask before voting if anyone needs clarification of a response option.
- Very interesting and useful. Interactive and engaging. We don't often get to "work" together as ethicists. Sad to miss the Thursday afternoon case study discussion. That was a shame and I think people were disappointed that it was skipped.
- Nice to have something different to engage participants.
- This was an excellent tool in assessing the values of the audience and stimulating debate.
- This was a great feature.
- New research possibilities.
- Nice to see how audience "thinks" about cases.
- It wasn't just devices-it was discussion afterwards that also was helpful. The explanation of answers...
- Great use of this technology! Would like to see more use of this.
- Excellent-engaged everyone and fascinating to see changes in responses after discussion.
- Interesting when they worked.
- Not enough for everyone but useful and engaging.
- Enjoyed hearing comments of others and how presentations made them think.
- That's a great thing for interacting with such a large group.
- Love the immediacy and interaction. Kept me engaged.
- The hosts did a good job curtailing side-bar conversations.
- Really cool-far better than raising hands!!
- Would be nice to take the opportunity to process the use of technology as a group after we use it.

How important was the ability to gain CME/CEU in deciding to attend this conference?

Unimportant					Important
1	2	3	4	5	
20%	10%	18%	21%	31%	

Comments:

- Not applicable as I am a foreigner.
- Does not matter to me.
- 70%. A rich source of credit for recertification.
- Very important, but not main motivation.
- A lot.
- Not important.
- Absolutely important. The second or third reason for attending. However a certificate of attendance may also work.
- Was not the motivation to attend conference.
- Need CEU's for clinical ladder.
- Very important.
- Personally, I have already gained enough for my license requirements.

- Need this!
- Not a factor in my decision.
- Needed for LCSW!
- Bonus!
- In official manner, not important for me as I'm just entering the realm of clinical ethics, but continuing education as for any profession is always important!

Please score the conference venue.

Poor				Excellent
1	2	3	4	5
0%	0%	2%	10%	88%

Comments:

- Museum was a SUPER venue-thank you! The Arlington venue was problematic-elitist, unwelcoming to people of color (w/ all the white rich guys hanging on the wall.)
- Was beautiful!
- Concurrent session rooms are too far apart; not conducive to attending different panels.
- Wonderful.
- Beautiful location.
- Over the top. Beautiful. Even parking was easy.
- Very comfortable and beautiful.
- Arlington Club-nice, but a bit cramped. Also, could have used portable microphone.
- Wonderful spaces associated with museum.
- Wow!
- Lovely, well-appointed.
- Amazing venue. I wish all meetings were in such lovely surroundings.
- Most comfortable setting.
- Convenient, comfortable. Excellent choice.
- Love this place and free admission to art gallery. Thank you!
- Loved it! Very classy!
- Environment was conducive to inspiring dialogue and reflection.
- Gorgeous. I enjoyed every aspect, especially the art museum access.
- Excellent, except sunken ballroom had kitchen background noise.
- Beautiful setting. It was nice to move between buildings and see different rooms and get outside a bit. Great to be amongst art for the art theme and for us and our interest and imagination as a nice break from all the spoken words! I also liked the more relaxed atmosphere; not having bells ringing to get you to the next room, etc. It was nice to sit in one room for concurrent sessions although it did mean missing some that we wanted to see. There were very friendly and nice people running and hosting the conference. Staff was very professional, amiable, humorous, helpful, etc.
- I really enjoyed the museum location. Good rooms and fun getting to see the exhibits as well.
- The West Conference room was frequently too small but otherwise the venue was lovely.
- Excellent location that provided participants with a less "sterile" educational environment.
- Beautiful buildings etc. but rooms often too large.

- Beautiful setting. I have lived in Portland all my life and this is the first time I have been to the Portland Art Museum.
- It was wonderful not to be in "sterile" hotel conference rooms.
- I had no idea what this would be like-art museum? But the venue was comfortable, spacious, and a welcomed respite in the art from the intensity of conferences like this.
- Loved the venue-conference rooms were wonderful, main meeting area was perfect, access to museum and gift shop was wonderful.
- Great venue, except the distance between rooms makes it impossible to switch mid-session.
- Beautiful, comfortable.
- It's my second time that I have had an ethics conference at an art museum and it's great.
- Beautiful setting; excellent sounds and projection of power points.
- I live here; it's always nice to brag.
- Beautiful! Great neighborhood with a lot of diversity.
- Smaller rooms on 2nd floor made it cramped, but overall a wonderful, beautiful and great representation of Portland.
- Brilliant to hold conference in art museum!

Please score the catering.

Poor					Excellent
1	2	3	4	5	
0.5%	2.5%	5%	31%	61%	

Comments:

- Veggies options would be appreciated.
- Hot lunch/meals good, sandwiches not. Minimal selection for vegetarian/dietary restriction options. Portions seemed uneven-sometimes leftovers, sometimes not enough.
- Good choice and variety; balanced and delicious.
- Well-staffed. Super. Quality food.
- The food was very good.
- Not impressive. No cold water.
- Please have options for dairy-free.
- Wow!
- Very good food!
- Great, except for the lunch where the main entrée was no longer available at 12pm.
- Thursday breakfast, ugh!
- Delicious.
- Great job.
- Great food, awful coffee.
- Sometimes no vegetarian main course.
- Food was fabulous, Portland flair. Donation to Blanchet House appreciated.
- Chicken would have been nice on the 2nd day lunch...Good fresh products is always a plus and appreciated! Thanks!
- Thank you for accommodating lactose intolerance.

- Nice meals. Nice not to have too much food (eg. normal meal amounts). Very healthy and interesting. A bit more food would have been nice (eg. Chicken on Thursday or small snacks at breaks).
- Very good food.
- Food was very good.
- I missed the toast with the "hot European" breakfast. It was an English breakfast.
- Wonderful lunch and hot breakfast. I would have done something different for the cold breakfast.
- Appreciate the conference's willingness to support local businesses and encourage participants to do the same.
- Very good food. Easily accessed.
- First evening, came in right before conference start and nothing was left! "American" breakfast was poor; lack of fruit and snack bars between sessions.
- Ok. Running out of food (chicken on May 13) is not appropriate.
- Lunch Thursday out of chicken before many participants had gone through the buffet.
- All meals were great.
- I was surprised of the rich offerings. Thanks.
- Good food and service. Nice to enjoy meals with other participants.
- A bit sparse on Thursday morning.
- Would have liked more/better non-meat options.
- Cold breakfast very limited.

Would you consider attending future ICCEC/ISCB events and/or recommending to colleagues?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	Maybe
96%	3.5%	0.5%

Comments:

- Maybe. There is no prominent focus on justice. This is particularly relevant for consultants in academic centers that serve poor, under-served patients. The ethical issues are situated by broader social justice questions (ie. Discharging patients to the streets, chronically mentally ill patients who are discharged without support, poor patients who use EDs as first degree care settings because they don't have access to first degree care).
- Depends on cost.
- Absolutely. Cost will prohibit going abroad-hope for U.S. or Canada location again.
- Especially if Tuohey was heading the conference.
- Best conference I have attended in a long, long time. I loved it so much. Thank you for all the hard work and commitment and time you put into this conference.
- Excellent venues/services/design.
- I would love to travel to Amsterdam next year.
- Absolutely.
- The size of the meeting, along with the type of sessions promote interactions with faculty. Very nice.
- Maybe in the next two years!!
- I love the case study sessions!
- See you in Amsterdam!
- Good for learning more about where the field is.
- Excellent conference with appropriate balance of presentation and discussion!
- The international perspective is a unique asset that is missing from most of the ethics consult discussions.

- Would need to change format.
- Eye opening to many perspectives. Engaging, wonderful access to presenters for more discussion.
- Well-organized, excellent mix of presentations.
- Only if they meet your excellent standards.
- A wealth of information-almost overwhelming! Great conversations, lots of opportunities to ask questions and discover.
- By far the most informative Ethics conference I've ever attended. And, the most bang for your buck. Well done.

Other Comments:

- Conference was very well organized and the registrations staff were extremely helpful. Portland was a great venue! Please organize the breakout sessions more by themes-even broad themes.
- One of the best organized conferences I have been to in the last three years!
- This is the best ethics conference I have ever attended. Appreciated hearing from such diverse presenters. Appreciated meeting participants. GREAT! Clickers are great, Dr. Schmidt, wonderful.
- Dr. Schmidt- I liked the creativity of his presentation.
- Classy! There was lack of space to make it clear which workshop was chosen.
- As a topic next year; it would be interesting to me to be presented with an international approach of ideas about euthanasia, especially because Oregon and the Netherlands are known to allow it in some form.
- Could only attend one day-but thoroughly appreciated the experience. Excellent conference! Thank you!
- Great venue!
- Thematically grouping breakouts would have been preferred. I would love to have access to power points to review for sessions I could not attend. Too much to choose from.
- Thematic call for papers would have been more productive. Abstracts should be made available for consultation at the lobby. It would have been nice to a book display. Group presentations by themes.
- Please make sessions with related subjects!! It was very difficult to change from one room to another just to follow one single theme. The rest was great.
- The organizers did a wonderful job. Everything was well-organized and sessions well planned. A most valuable and pleasant meeting. Please distribute the slides to all attendees!
- Stimulating.
- A few lectures would have been welcome. IE. review of the Oregon experience with Physician assisted death and Washington state and that in the Netherlands.
- Thank you for the opportunity. Very thought provoking.
- “House” review excellent interest for next time. Social justice-different use in church setting from government definition. In America, we are by law about equal justice only. Basic care and moral distress in government run healthcare for E.C’s. Consideration of “Resources and allocation” in government healthcare. The rich go to a private hospital while everyone else gets basic. False scarcity of resources when government mismanages public funds. Government should not be in the health care business. Too much conflict of interest, too much influence. “Authority” overriding EC decisions?
- This is the 1st ethics event I have attended. WOW! I would love to go to Amsterdam. Too bad case study of B110 not done. Again, too many questions from audience, most of which were not pertinent.
- I would have preferred the sessions to hold with a common theme rather than diversity; eg. It is difficult to “discuss” 3 diverse topics in one Q&A at the end. John Tuohey did an outstanding job!
- Can’t wait for Amsterdam!
- I’m the kind of person who mostly decides on the concurrent session I’ll attend up until the last moment. I prefer to receive a printed copy of all abstracts. I support saving paper but not in this area. Also, I think there should be some introduction of who the speakers are-ideal to have in the book of abstracts.

-I appreciated the organizers desire to be green and not print all of the abstracts, however, it would have been helpful to have onsite a few copies of abstracts posted.

-Thank you for a wonderful conference.

-Sonny Thet was extraordinary. Thank you! Dr. Tuohey's presence and manner were a huge benefit. His closing-by bringing the architecture and art of the room into our awareness along with the spirit of peace was beautiful. Thank you!

-Great job! Might also recommend labeling sessions re: having basic or advanced treatment of topic (for example-review of moral distress=basic). Thank you!

-To avoid confusion and to facilitate interaction it is important that each participant be introduced by his title. For example, a nurse should have (RN) beside his or her name, just like a Father as Reverend or PhD is a doctor.

-Very difficult and time consuming having to look up the abstracts separately from our hotel rooms. Took a long time to open them and look them up, especially as they weren't grouped. It would have been much better to have them in a program. I appreciate the concerns about paper but it's a very useful resource and integral part of a conference. It gives you names of presenters, topics, and abstracts that you can learn from, take with you, and look back on and follow up on later.

-Overall well done and I appreciate all of the "behind the scenes" work that contributes to the conference going well. I really liked the cellist and jazz group too!

-My expectations were that there would be more hands-on, specific, and concrete examples of innovative strategies being used elsewhere to address particular issues, although I recognize the challenges involved in peer review.

-It would be very useful to have a book of abstracts so we can make better informed decisions about the sessions we want to attend. Nice venue but some rooms too cavernous for size of audience (ie. breakout/concurrent sessions). Should encourage questions after each presentation rather than after 3 presentations.

-I enjoyed very much. Thanks!

-Well done. Sensitive staff!

-Loved the cellist; loved the museum: PLEASE send us the abstracts in a book-it is more environmentally friendly to print in a book than print from my computer! Please group presentations by theme next time as it was impossible to move between sessions. More theoretical papers would bring a better balance.

-Cellist Sonny Thet was wonderful. Dr. Schmidt was inspiring.

-Very well organized and managed! John Tuohey did an excellent job keeping things moving and adapting as needed. The long breaks were especially appreciated. Suggest fewer concurrent sessions; it is difficult to choose and this lends to little discussion. Case discussions were all excellent!

-The blending of art into the program and the setting was outstanding.

-Great conference! Way to go Dr Tuohey!

-This evaluation form isn't easy/user friendly and takes too long to complete. It is also hard to judge a "session" when only one of three talks was "good", for instance. Finally, Portland was and EXCELLENT choice, I love it!

-On the actual abstract-place abstract numbers? Do we have access to powerpoints after conference?

-Great conference-thank you for all the thoughtful gestures, gift of wine, great food, lovely music, art, beautiful venue. Given the intensity of the work we do and the intensity of the subject matter, how wonderful to provide the environment and the balance. Excellent presentations. Please consider listing institution on attendance roster and credentials on speakers. Would also be great to have email addresses on everyone or at least for speakers. Thank you!

-In terms of venue, city, organization, this conference was excellent. In terms of content of papers and speakers, this is the worst conference I have ever attended. Speakers were often factually inaccurate, hardly any methodological or theoretical grounding to talks. My recommendation would be to shorten conference and focus on higher quality papers.

-Conference volunteers and organizers were ALWAYS available and extremely responsive to any questions or concerns.

- I am glad I decided to attend. Looking forward to attending future meetings.
- I would like to see more workshop sessions and/or more interactive analyses of cases and concepts. It is difficult to listen to multiple paper presentations all day. Good spacing and length for breaks.
- As a clinician I came to learn more about formal biomedical ethics and was a bit overwhelmed by the smorgasbord of offerings from academic to practical, but I learned tons! Thank you. I only wish I had fewer family/work distractions. It might be nice to distinguish the highly academic and theoretical from the clinical/practical though I am not certain if it is possible. It would also help if sessions were organized around a theme, instead of randomly grouped.
- The conference, although much bigger than Taiwan or Basel meetings, kept "feel" of intimacy of those. Highly endorse diversity of presenters (nationality) in each session. Would like to see more sessions like #74 in which real critical discussion of what we do as ethics consultants.
- Hats off to Dr Tuohey. His ability shows through in the organization and execution of this conference.
- Plenary session on "Dr. House was excellent! It was very relatable and yet interesting. It provoked much discussion/awareness in the group I was with.
- The Tuohey Team has done a masterful job. Thank you for the rich stimulation and awakening to the facts of informative ethical care. Conference is extraordinary: Rich, well planned and the setting was inspiring.
- I was never bored at this conference. I didn't want to miss anything. Everything was wonderful. It was easily the best large conference I have ever attended.
- For presenters with limited language skill, there needs to be translator available to assist, especially with Q&A sessions. ALL speakers need to improve their presentation skills. Do NOT read power point slides to the audience!!! But overall a very well done and beneficial conference.
- Thank you for an excellent and extremely stimulating conference. The international perspective was a true gift to the Portland community.
- Session K: Plenary- great examples via "house": brought up some very good points.
- I'm torn about the corporate sponsorship. It keeps the registration cost down, but I'm also nervous about all the gifts. Kudos to the hosts and all the volunteers. I'm sure you're all exhausted, even as you manage to look fresh at all times! Great work!
- I see need for a lot of public education on various processes. Also to encourage this is a must for those interested (should have character questionnaires etc). Also a review course recommended every year for RN's in most settings so referrals could be implemented earlier.
- Providence has been outstanding hosts-You've set the bar very high. Bravo! P.S. Poster sessions would also be wonderful to have posted on-line. Thank you, thank you, thank you!!
- Many perspectives were not terribly compelling. Plenary sessions could have been a bit more engaging. Controversial topic or something of interest to everyone. Would recommend more compelling engaging plenary sessions. People reading their slides is just too problematic. I hope these folks are not like this in the classroom!
- The only negative comment I have is that it was difficult to hear at times. Amplification would have been helpful in almost every presentation I attended.
- Overall a very though-provoking conference, organized very ably by friendly people in a beautiful venue. Thank you.
- General comments: 5-star conference! One of the best organized I've attended in 40 years! From AV equipment, quality speakers, environments-everything top quality, proued to be a Portlander and Providence employee! Thanks!
- I would have liked to have a bookstore available at the conference. I would like to have access to the recordings as well. The plenaries were not really plenaries. I would like to have keynote from field experts in these slots. Add structured opportunity for table-top case discussions facilitated by seasonal consultants where people can bring forward touch cases.
- Dr. Schmidt's presentation about Dr. House was outstanding, one of the very best this week.

-Would have been very helpful to have a page listing all presenters, titles, and contact information. This would encourage future connections with other professionals. It's helpful to have presentations available to either download, hard copies, etc. Thank you! Excellent program.

-The welcome bag was so generous and thoughtful. Thanks!

-Very good, John. You deserve a big thanks, (which you will get in abundance) and probably some time off to recuperate (which you will probably not get).

-It might be helpful to have ethics books for sale. Our international colleagues may not have easy access to the literature. This was an extremely enjoyable experience.

-Dr. Schmidt's presentation on Dr. House was excellent.

-I would like to hear more about the ethics of standards of practice. In patients or families who request full code; or life supports in a condition that is progressive to terminal. I would like a way other than facebook, to present cases and allow for open ethics consultation for those already familiar with similar dilemmas or questions.