**Date:** 9/05/18

**Location:** RAOM – Founders Room

**Time:**  6 PM

**Attendees:** Beth, Rich, Jack, Ken, Margie, Erin, Jill, Margaret, Chris, Sid, Marc

**Agenda**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Time | Topic | Facilitator |
| 6:00 PM:  | Welcome/Introductions | Margie |
| 6:10 PM:  | Review of Prior Meeting/Action Items | Margie |
| 6:20 PM: | Open Discussion/Reflection on Previous Meeting | Margie/All |
| 6:35 PM: | Ethics Consortium Problem/Mission Statement/Action Items  | All |
| 7:35 PM: | Develop a List of Additional Action Items | All |
| 7:50 PM: | Next Meeting Date/Agenda Items | All |
| 8:00 PM | Close | Margie |

**Item: Welcome/Introductions**

Group led off with a round of introductions and Margie reemphasized a few main points about the consortium; partnership in service, reducing any barrier, building a sense of community, navigating any funding challenges and a great opportunity to work together discussing Ethics.

**Item: Review of Prior Meeting**

Margie shared the background form the previous meeting and then moved into having the group review and comment on the problem statement…

**Background & 1st Meeting (6/20/18)**

A generous donation allowed for the creation of the Rochester Academy of Medicine Ethics Education Consortium. The Academy hopes to utilize this donation to create ongoing educational support for ethics consultants and ethics committee members in the Rochester area. The first meeting led to educational collaboration across systems (experts provided ethics rounds) and collaboration around the planning of a first annual ethics conference hosted by the Division of Medical Humanities & Bioethics at the URSMD. The first meeting also led to the formation of the following draft problem and mission statements.

**Problem Statement:**

Draft for comments: Ethics consultants and committee members face numerous challenges in providing the highest level of service. Chief among the challenges are; underfunding for ethics consultation services and ethics committee work, increasing variety of backgrounds and educational experience of consultants and committee members and limited time and local opportunities to appropriately engage in targeted continuing education programs.

**Comments on the problem statement:**

* Is underfunding really an issue? Discussion on that statement led the group to discuss that perhaps this was a matter of wording in that perhaps people do not value the work of those who are performing ethics related duties are valued at the level that they should be. Evidence may be the fact that many do this work in almost a ‘volunteer’ role and that there isn’t a lot of resources being extended in that regard – not to mention not having training dollars. Some in the group felt the underfunding was an apt comment for the reasons just mentioned.

**Suggested rewording:**

Ethics consultants and committee members face numerous challenges in providing the highest level of service. Chief among the challenges are; not being valued\* at a high enough level for ethics consultation services and ethics committee work, increasing variety of backgrounds and educational experience of consultants and committee members and limited time and local opportunities to appropriately engage in targeted continuing education programs. (\*Valued may mean a variety of things; recognition or resources).

That discussion led to a broader one on the fact that people may not value ethics services at the appropriate level because they may not know what ethics work really entails. That led to a discussion about how people do their ethics work and what was clear is that it is different across each institution. Suggestion was made that since each institution uses a different model as it relates to performing ethics duties and consultation services that the group should make that visible for discussion and perhaps drive toward a best practice model that can be used for all. Having a best practice model made known might help not improve the services provided but educate others on the value of the work of those in ethics.

**Action items:** Margie and Marc develop a template for the group to fill out as to how they do their ethics work. Margie and Marc to send the template out to get feedback, refine the tool and send it back out for each institution to complete. Marc to consolidate for next meeting.

**Item: Web-site Review**

Marc shared the draft web-site that has been put in place to support information exchanges amongst the members of this group. <http://raom.org/ethics-consortium>

Work in progress to set up sections of the web-site; calendar, resources, committee member bios etc.

**Action items:** As Marc continues to work on the page, send items for posting to him and then Marc will alert the group once a month on what new items are on the site.

**Item: What else do we want to do?**

Discussion on capturing other initiatives to be undertaken by the consortium.

One topic came up was the notion of getting an ethics certification sponsored by ASBH. Margie shared that she is sitting for the ethics certification exam in November of this year ($450). (Margie, David and Mary are the only ones from URMC slated to sit for this exam). Discussion remains about what this will or won’t do in elevating the profile of ethics – is it a field or is it a discipline, will it help people see more value in those performing these services? Updates to follow.

Meeting time became an issue, so this was tabled for more discussion at next meeting. Need to also talk about sustainability as well as funding for next meeting.

**Item: Next meeting?**

Group felt that the next meeting should be in January of 2019 to continue this work.

**Action item:** Chris to send out a doodle poll.

End

Ambrosi