Multnomah County

**Multnomah County Public Health Advisory Board
Ethics Committee Minutes
February 2019**

Date: Thursday, February 28, 2019
Time: 3:30 p.m. – 5:30 p.m.
Location: Multnomah Building, 501 SE Hawthorne, Room 126
Purpose: To provide broad stakeholder input on work related to reducing health inequities and improving population health in Multnomah County.
Desired Outcomes:
1. Revisit creation and intention of the Ethics Committee
2. Review and make meaning of evaluation survey data
3. Identify potential solutions and create an action plan for Public Health Leadership consideration

Members Present: Suzanne Hansche, Audrey DeCoursey, Gerald Deloney, Alicia Junker, Becca Brownlee, Debbie McKissack, Rebecca Lavelle-Register, Cheryl Carter, Bernal Cruz
MCHD staff: Jessica Guernsey, Christina Brown, Jennifer Vines, Hilary U'Ren, Bernadette Nunley, Motoya Nakamura

Item/Action	Process	Lead
Welcome	- Introductions - Reviewed agenda - Reviewed and approved November minutes with one edit (incorporated)	Suzanne Hansche
Ethics Committee Overview	- Revisited creation & intention of the Ethics Committee - Approximately one year ago (at the beginning of 2018), MCPHAB structure split into two committees: Ethics & Public Health Approaches. - Public Health Accreditation requires an ethics committee involving community members, which is one reason we chose MCPHAB as an avenue for hosting our Ethics Committee. - Reviewed the deliberations over the past year: - Teen pregnancy prevention grant – deliberation of hypothetical scenario - Teen pregnancy prevention grant – deliberation regarding communications around county decision for grant - Strategic transition from opioid-specific approach to an all-substances approach – deliberation regarding communications - Flu epidemic resource allocation – deliberation of hypothetical scenario	Christina Brown
Making Meaning – Evaluation Overview & Data Analysis	**TOOLS** (5Ps) - What works? - Perspective - Underrepresented - Who's been left behind? Work on questions that drive ability to identify those folks and how they were left there - Gives us a tool to do homework - Diversity - Inclusion - Process – dynamic experience of the thought carousel opens us up to someone else's understanding/interpretation that may not have occurred to us. - What doesn't work? - How can we make lasting perspective a part of the conversation? - Can get muddled among the various Ps – caught up about which P each question/issue/etc. should go under. - Doesn't flow – clunky. Need more practice & mastery. Allow ourselves to say where we are with the tool along the way. - Improvements/Suggestions: - Before we put something under a certain P, may be a helpful exercise to talk through as a group – where does it belong? - Perhaps expand capacity – can things go under multiple Ps, sometimes the Ps are less applicable. Try not to let the Ps be too restrictive. - Look at and potentially adjust the 5Ps in relation to the question at hand to determine applicability. - Open up leadership phone meetings so that others can feel free to participate in advance. - Provide annual/regular equity & empowerment training for new folks (difficult	Christina Brown

for new members to just jump in). Perhaps at regular July retreat? Keep materials available year-round for anyone to utilize at any time.
- o Possibly create an intake form, something to organize people's thoughts as they go through prep materials and 5Ps.
- o Time management is a struggle – how much to devote to MCPHAB prep work, balance home, work, etc.
- o Some members interested in creating a buddy system to hold each other accountable for doing prep work/homework.
- o Seeing previous meeting minutes is extremely helpful for new members to understand how these meetings work and what the 5Ps accomplish – provide these as examples to new members for orientation.
- o Adding a sixth P was suggested – each person includes their Personal stake in the matter being deliberated. We want to balance trauma-informed practice and ensure this is a safe space – people are by no means *required* to share anything they don't want to. However, we also want to be sure people are pulling their own personal narratives into their decision-making and not trying to remain detached and unaffected by their experiences.
- o In terms of materials provided in advance of deliberations, would be very helpful to have a very clear statement of the question and the takeaway expected. The group functions better with more open-ended questions, don't get hung up on a group consensus with a hard yes or no – we want an anchored, clear question that still leaves room for options.

DELIBERATION PROCESS
- ● What prevents people from fully engaging in the deliberation process?
  - o Some people noted not feeling like they could participate because they don't have relevant experience – we want people to engage in the questions and deliberations just as people, rather than experts in a particular field.
  - o Don't want to take up space or time – concerning because we want to create a safe space where everyone feels welcomed to speak and contribute.
- ● Improvements/Suggestions:
  - o Submit questions that arise ahead of time to help Dr. Vines prepare answers.
  - o Share questions with the group – if one person has that question, others might as well, but may not feel comfortable raising it.
  - o Encourage and reinforce use of a stacked speakers list to ensure we're allowing everyone the chance to speak.
  - o For background materials: a one-pager with a big overarching (open-ended) question, background (with links to more information for people who want to and have time to dig deeper). In addition to the big broad question, will include additional, more concrete "questions to think about."
  - o Include relevant definitions in the one-pager.
  - o Use optional check-in at the beginning of the meeting for everyone's "Personal." A way to check the temperature of the room, gauge people's experience with the topic at hand, explain how you've been considering the question, etc.
  - o In addition to sharing your personal connection to the topic, also use that to think about your potential privilege in *not* having a connection or experience with it. I.e., while some may have great personal stake in a deliberation about substance use, others may say "I have had the privilege of not having this personal experience in the way others have." Acknowledge varying experiences from those different from you.

AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT
- ● Can we invite other community members to join if they want to share something they're passionate about that's relevant to the Ethics Committee?
- ● When the MCHD employees comes up with the questions for deliberation, share with the committee why these questions have come up or why they're being prioritized.
- ● Provide follow-up on deliberations: how was our input used? Helps us know how we contributed and how to better bring in our community experience.
- ● We want to be sure the topics we select are tied to avenues where we have some connection/influence – what can we do something about?

| Action Plan | ● Action Items for MCHD Staff: | Christina |

Development	o Background one-pager development for future deliberations. o Allow committee members to join leadership phone meetings if they so wish. o Include regular equity & empowerment training to the whole board (for new members). ▪ Look into whether members would be able to attend county trainings that would address this need. o Provide previous Ethics Committee meeting minutes to new members as part of onboarding orientation process. o Follow up with the Ethics Committee to provide updates about the impact of their deliberations.	Brown

Wrap-up and Meeting Evaluation	● How often do we plan on doing this kind of evaluation?
	  o Annual, biannual?
	  o Not a static process – dynamic and adaptive along the way
	● How do we incorporate real-time modifications that arise in the future?
	● At the end of every meeting, we should really use that last five minutes to discuss what worked or didn't work for us to inform future processes.
	● How did today's process work for the group?
	  o Very helpful – concrete sense of next year and how things are teed up.
	  o Loved the interactive factor of the purple sticky board.
	  o Topics we've done so far are very good.
	● Thank you to Alicia Junker – this was her last meeting, she is moving to California!
	● Two potential upcoming deliberation topic areas:
	  o Vaccine non-medical exemptions
	  o Tobacco retail licensing
		Suzanne Hansche