

Assisted Dying Public Engagement Project

Meeting 4 – Advisory Board Meeting minutes

22nd March 2024, 3 - 4pm, online via Microsoft Teams

Attendance – Advisory Board members:

Anne Kerr (Chair), Professor of Science and Technology Studies and Head of School of Social and Political Sciences, University of Glasgow; NCOB Council member

Clare Chambers, Professor of Political Philosophy, University of Cambridge; NCOB Council member

Sarah Cunningham-Burley, Professor of Medical and Family Sociology / Dean of Molecular, Genetic and Population Health Sciences, The University of Edinburgh; NCOB Chair-elect (January 2024)

Suzanne Hall, Director of Engagement, The Policy Institute, King's College London

Malcolm Oswald, Director, Citizen' Juries c.i.c; Honorary Research Fellow in Law, University of Manchester

Selena Stellman, General Practitioner; NCOB Council member

Nuffield Council on Bioethics

Molly Gray, Project Manager

Rebecca Mussell, Associate Director, Research and Policy

Cris Cloyd, External Affairs Manager

Hopkins Van Mil

Henrietta Hopkins, Director

Kate Furber, Researcher

Independent evaluation

Leah Holmes, Independent Evaluator

Apologies

Rachel Lopata, Freelance Researcher

Michael Reiss, Professor of Science Education, Institute of Education, University College London; NCOB Council member

Holly Rogers, Head of Engagement, Academy of Medical Sciences

Hally Ingram, Senior Associate, HVM

1. Welcome and introductions

- It was noted that Advisory Board members, including those unable to attend the meeting, have circulated feedback by email on the speaker list.

2. Citizens' Jury design – speaker list

- The Advisory Board reviewed the speaker list.
- Discussed the inclusion of members of the Nuffield Council on Bioethics, the Advisory Board, and the Content Group as expert witnesses at the Jury. It was recommended not to involve members of the project team or oversight groups as expert witnesses to maintain the Jury's independence and not confuse roles within the process.
- More clarity is needed around the 'ethical briefings' role.
 - i. It was suggested that all ethical briefings be delivered by the same individual(s).
- Discussed the number of speakers for each workshop, and it was advised to trim down the number of expert witnesses for the Jury to help Juror members with the digestion of information and to leave sufficient time for deliberation.
- The balance of advocates vs informant speakers was discussed. It was advised to increase the number of 'informant' speakers compared to 'advocate' speakers throughout the Jury.
- It was agreed, where possible, to avoid having sessions where all expert witnesses are one gender.
- Discussed the appropriateness of having an MP as a speaker to give a parliamentary perspective.
- HVM shared that discussions with the Content Group are ongoing about which countries to include as detailed case studies.
- For workshop 3: trimming the number of speakers' presentations on faith and religious perspectives to one/two witnesses to deliver an overview of faith and religious perspectives on assisted dying was suggested to allow more time for deliberation and reflection.
- For workshop 4: discussed the right balance of advocates vs informant speakers for disability perspectives on assisted dying. Considered having one speaker give an 'informant' presentation on an overview of disability perspectives rather than two 'advocates' with differing perspectives.
- Discussed inviting those with lived experience of providing care to attend workshop 4 if palliative care professionals are invited as speakers.
- For workshop 5, it was agreed that the lead facilitator should deliver the final round-up presentation to the Jury.
- HVM and NCOB re-clarified the difference in the roles of the Content Group and Advisory Board with regard to the speaker list and selection.
- Final programme and speaker list to be circulated via email to Advisory Board members.