### 9:00 - 9:15
**Opening**

### 9:15 - 10:30
**Implementation of Clinical Ethics Consultation and Application of Standards and Recommendations to Clinical Ethics Consultation in Practice: An Evaluation at German Hospitals**

*Speaker: Prof. Dr. Florian Steger*, Director of the Institute of the History, Philosophy and Ethics of Medicine, Ulm University, Germany.

*Moderator: Prof. Dr Silviya Aleksandrova-Yankulovska*

### 10:30 - 10:45
**Coffee break**

### 10:45 - 12:00
**A burden from birth? Non-invasive prenatal testing (NIPT) and the stigmatization of people with disabilities**

*Speaker: Prof. Dr. Florian Steger*, Director of the Institute of the History, Philosophy and Ethics of Medicine, Ulm University, Germany.

*Moderator: Prof. Dr Silviya Aleksandrova-Yankulovska*

### 12:00 - 13:30
**Lunch break**

### 13:30 - 15:30
**Workshop: Genetics and reproductive ethics Moral case deliberation session**

*Moderator: Prof. Dr Silviya Aleksandrova-Yankulovska*

*Participants: Prof. Dr. Florian Steger, Dr. Orzechowski, Oana Iftime, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Atanasova, Dr. Gergana Foreva, As. Atanas Anov, medical students 2nd year*

### 15:30 - 16:30
**Coffee break and poster session**

Lobby, Telecommunication Centre, MU-Pleven

### 16:30
**Closing**

---

**Organizing committee:**

**Prof. Dr. Silviya Aleksandrova-Yankulovska, MD, PhD, DSc, MAS**
Dean of Faculty of Public Health, Head of Department of Public Health Sciences, Medical University of Pleven
Phone: 0035964884196 / e-mail: dean-ph@mu-pleven.bg

**As. Atanas Anov, PhD**
Department of Public Health Sciences, Section of Medical Ethics
e-mail: atanas.anov@gmail.com

**Ralitsa Koleva, Desislava Milanova, Emilia Leskova**
Experts, Students’ Office Faculty of Public Health
Guests-participants:

**Prof. Dr. Florian Steger** is a German medical historian and medical ethicist. He habilitated in 2008 in History and Ethics of Medicine at the Medical Faculty of the Friedrich-Alexander University of Erlangen-Nuremberg. Since July 2016, Florian Steger is Full Professor and Director of the Institute of the History, Philosophy and Ethics of Medicine at the University of Ulm. Since 2016, he is also Chairman of the Research Ethics Committee at the University of Ulm. 2018 medal "Universitatis Lodziensis Amico" from the University of Łódź (Poland) and Honorary Professorship of the Semmelweis University in Budapest (Hungary). 2019 Professor at I.M. Sechenov First Moscow State Medical University (Russia). His main research fields include the questions of history, philosophy and ethics of medicine: ancient medicine and its reception, medicine and arts, problems of injustice in a politicized medicine, current ethical questions in medicine.

**Dr. Orzechowski** was born in Poland where he studied political science, journalism and public relations. In the period 2005-2008 he studied of British and American Studies and Law at the University of Konstanz. In 2015 received Ph.D. in political science. From 2012 to 2013 Dr. Orzechowski was a lecturer and expert researcher at the University of Konstanz. From 2012 to 2017 - associated researcher in Wroclaw, Poland. Since October 2016 he is a research fellow at the Institute of the History, Philosophy and Ethics of Medicine, Ulm University. Since 2017 he is a research assistant in the project "Praxis of patient information in the induced pluripotent stem cells research". His main research fields include morality and policy change in Europe; ethical, legal and societal aspects of prenatal medicine; politicized medicine in German Democratic Republic and Polish Peoples' Republic; current ethical challenges of diversity in healthcare.

**Oana Iftime, PhD** Biologist, Lecturer in Genetics and Bioethics, University of Bucharest, Department of Genetics. Additional expertise in the fields of: Bioethics, Cultural Anthropology, Systematic Theology, Educational Theory, Teaching Methods.

**Assoc. Prof. Dr. Victoria Atanasova** Associate professor in neonatology at the University Hospital “Dr Georgi Stranski”-Pleven, Head of the Neonatology Unit. National consultant in neonatology since 2004. Master of medicine from St. Petersburg Medical Academy Pediatric Academy (1990), Specialty in Paediatrics (1998) and Neonatology (2004). Member of the Bulgarian Association of Neonatology, Bulgarian Scientific Society of Human Genetics, Bulgarian Society of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Bulgarian Association of Bioethics and Clinical Ethics.

**Dr. Gergana Foreva** Master of medicine (1992) and economy (2002). Specialist in clinical psychology, neuropsychology and psychotherapy, internal medicine and general medicine. Chair of the Bulgarian Balint Society.
**About the Moral Case Deliberation:**

Moral case deliberation (MCD) is a form of clinical ethics support in which systematic thinking, reasoning and dialogue of health care professionals is fostered through a structured conversation method, guided by a trained facilitator. **Prof. Dr. Silviya Aleksandrova-Yankulovska is the only trained facilitator of MCD in Bulgaria, certified by VU University Medical Centre, Amsterdam.**

MCD can be used individually by ethics support staff, during ethics committees, in educational settings or by health care professionals in order to deal with the case at hand (e.g. making a decision), to develop their moral competence, to improve team cooperation and decision-making processes and to adjust, develop or implement policy and guidelines. The facilitator is non-directive regarding the content, helping participants in the deliberation process to make it a moral inquiry and to keep an eye on the focus and quality of the dialogue.

The dilemma method of MCD consists of 10 steps:

1. **Introduction**
2. **Presentation of the case** by the case-submitter
3. **Formulation of the dilemma and the underlying moral question (moral theme)**
4. **Empathising through elucidative questions**
5. **Perspectives, values and norms**
   Collectively naming values and norms with respect to the dilemma question of the parties involved (= perspectives from the case and/or participants of the Moral Case Deliberation).
6. **Alternatives** - Free brainstorm focused on realistic and unrealistic options to deal with the dilemma.
7. **Individually argued consideration:**
   a. It is morally right that I do A, B or an alternative
   b. Because of my following values and norms
   c. Despite ............(which disadvantage does this decision have?)
   d. How may I limit the damage from ‘c’?
   e. What do I concretely need to accomplish the option selected in 7.a)?
8. **Dialogue about similarities and differences**
   - What do we (not) agree on?
   - What can we learn from the similarities and differences, and which new questions does this raise?
9. **Conclusions and actions**
   - Which answer to the dilemma question and which associated actions carry the most weight? On the basis of which values/norms?
   - What is the essence of the issue? What do we have to come to terms with?
   - Which practical working arrangements do we make? Who does what, when and where?
10. **Wrapping up and evaluation**
    - How did you experience the collective conversation? How was the role of the facilitator?
    - What did you value and learn? What may be done differently or improved next time?