

Ethics Committee deliberations:

Should Public Health receive lunches or other gifts from pharmaceutical companies? *(Deliberated June 22, 2012)*

As sponsors of the Clark County Immunization Coalition, pharmaceutical companies provided food and educational materials. Because of the potential that the public would question the objectivity of education materials from these companies, Public Health created a policy that would restrict gifts in these situations. The pharmaceutical companies felt the policy unfairly stigmatized them. During the Ethics Committee deliberation, various stakeholder groups provided input into the policy. As a result, Public Health revised the policy in a way that was more broadly worded and did not single out any one industry. The revised policy was well received by all stakeholders, including pharmaceutical companies.

Should Public Health participate in a federal Nurse Family Partnership (NFP) study that randomizes NFP participants? *(Deliberated October 31, 2013)*

Participating in the study could potentially result in improved funding for the national NFP program and ultimately benefit at-risk women. However, Public Health's NFP nurses were concerned that 50% of women referred to NFP would be put into a control group. These women would be referred to other community agencies that provide a lower level of support and services than our NFP program. The randomized study would eliminate the ability of nurses to triage clients, with the result that women most in need of NFP services might receive a much-reduced level of care as part of the control group. The Ethics Committee recommended that Public Health participate in the study but remove nurses from the process of screening clients to avoid conflicts with their own professional ethics. However, given the continued concern that NFP nurses had about high risk clients, and, after considering all the perspectives raised, Public Health leadership decided to opt out of the study.