

HEALTH SERVICE BOARD

Annual Self-Evaluation
FY 2019-20

Presented by:
Board Secretary, Holly Lopez



Overview

The Process

In November 2020, The Health Service Board Governance Committee met and reviewed the annual Board Self-Evaluation and Employee Performance Evaluation process, timeline, and survey. Committee Chair Randy Scott informed the Board that the Department of Human Resources would no longer be available to offer active support in the administration of Board evaluations. The Committee agreed that the Board Secretary, Holly Lopez would be the administrator going forward with access to DHR for any consultative needs.

In mid-November, Holly Lopez sent an online survey link for the HSB 2020 Self-Evaluation Survey (Board Survey) to each of the Board members for completion. This was an anonymous evaluation and completed Board Surveys were submitted via Microsoft 365 Forms platform for review and analysis. All seven Board members completed the survey. The results of this Board Survey were presented to the Governance Committee meeting on January 21, 2021 and will be presented to the full Board at its regular meeting on February 11, 2021.

The Self-Evaluation Form

In accordance with the Board Evaluation Policy, Board members are required to complete the Board Survey annually. It identifies four areas for evaluation: (1) Governance Structure & Policies, (2) Board Member Interactions and Meeting Activities, (3) Goal Setting and Communications, and (4) Board's Interactions with Management. Statements identifying performance measurements under each area are listed and Board members indicate their level of agreement or disagreement on a 5-point Likert scale.

The Governance Committee unanimously approved modifications to three survey questions. Question number 3, "The Board orientation program met your expectations" added a response option "N/A"; question 12 "Board members understand when it is appropriate to act in a fiduciary or stakeholder role" removed "or stakeholder role"; and question 23, "The Board established suitable goals for the investment program" was deleted from the survey.

Executive Summary

Overall, the evaluation shows improvement in two of the four areas, stabilization in one area, and a decrease in one area, as evidenced in the Grand Total average scores. Notably, both the Goal Setting and Communications and the Board's Interaction with Management experienced an overall increase of .2 points. The overall total score in the section on Board Member Interactions and Meeting Activities stayed consistent at 4.1 compared to last year. The Governance Structure & Policies decreased by .4 points. The chart below shows the total scores for the past three years to show overall increases and decreases. 19 out of 36 statements in the evaluation showing score increases compared to last year's ratings. This

Executive Summary highlights the areas where there were more significant decreases or increases and where there was the greatest improvement made over the past year.

Areas for Evaluation	2017-18 Total Score	2018-19 Total Score	2019-20 Total Score
Governance Structure & Policies	4	4.2	3.8
Board Member Interactions and Meeting Activities	4	4.1	4.1
Goal Setting and Communication	3.9	3.9	4.1
Board's Interactions with Management	4	4.1	4.3

The following sections highlight evaluation statements that demonstrate more significant decreases or increases (0.3 points or higher) in comparison to the 2018-19 Board Self-Evaluation.

Improvements in Areas of Possible Concern or Focus Highlighted in the 2019-2020 Evaluation

This evaluation surfaced a concentrated section of improvement in the Governance Structure and Policies with (6 out of 6) questions showing a noticeable drop between 0.3 and 0.5. The evaluation also found one area of improvement for the Board Member Interactions and Meeting Activities.

Governance Structure & Policies

Statement	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
The Board has clearly defined the roles of all key parties.	4.3	4.4	4.0
The roles that the Board has assigned to key parties match the experience of those parties.	4.3	4.4	3.9
The Board’s continuing education program equips its members with the knowledge they need to be effective.	3.5	3.7	3.2
The Board developed a comprehensive Board policy framework or manual.	4.2	4.4	3.9
The Board receives the information and reports that are necessary to carry out its duties.	4.4	4.4	4
Board meeting agendas adequately reflect policy matters that are consistent with the Board’s role.	4.3	4.4	4.1

Board Member Interactions and Meeting Activities

Statement	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Board members understand when it is appropriate to act in a fiduciary role.	4.0	4.1	3.7

Goal Setting and Communication

There were no statements within the Goal Setting and Communications area of the evaluation in which the average score decreased by 0.3 points or higher.

Board's Interactions with Management

There were no statements within the Goal Setting and Communications area of the evaluation in which the average score decreased by 0.3 points or higher.

Improvements in Areas of Possible Concern or Focus Highlighted in the 2018-19 Evaluation

Listed below are areas noted in last year’s evaluation as areas of possible concern or focus. The 2019 evaluation surfaced very few notable areas for improvement. In 2019 the Board sought to improve the Board orientation to meet the needs of newer board members along with long-standing Board members. The 2020 evaluation shows there was an improvement in one area as evidenced by score increases in all statements below. In July of 2020, the full Board was offered a “refresher” orientation. According to one Board Member: “After 5 years I attended a New Member orientation online. It was excellent, well laid out, and comprehensive. A good refresher for me.” These score increases indicate that the Board’s efforts this past year to improve in these areas had a positive impact.

Governance Structure and Policies

Statement	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
The Board orientation program met your expectations.	3.2	3.8	4.6

Board Member Interactions and Meeting Activities

Statement	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
The Board effectively manages Board members who fail to act in accordance with policies.	4.0	3.5	3.7

Summary of Areas that Showed the Most Significant Score Increases

The evaluation showed significant score increases (0.3 point increases or higher) for 10 statements across all areas of the evaluation. The statements that showed the greatest score increases are listed below:

Governance Structure and Policies

Statement	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
The Board orientation program met your expectations.	3.2	3.8	4.6

Board Member Interactions and Meeting Activities

Statement	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Board members are adequately prepared for meetings.	3.7	3.9	4.2
All Board members adequately contribute to discussions and deliberations.	3.8	3.9	4.4
Board members accept decisions of the Board, even if they did not vote in favor of them.	4.2	4.1	4.4

Goal Setting and Communication

Statement	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
The Board Communicates effectively to staff.	3.8	3.9	4.2
The Board communicates effectively to service providers.	4.2	4.0	4.4
The Board communicates effectively to The City.	3.6	3.7	4.2
The Board instills trust among stakeholders.	4.0	3.9	4.2

Board's Interactions with Management

Statement	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
The Board provides valuable alternative points of view to management.	3.8	4.1	4.4
The Board effectively evaluates the Director's performance.	3.8	4.1	4.4

Results of Board Performance Evaluation

Evaluation of Governance Structure & Policies

The majority of statements in this area received 85% to %100 of “Agree” or Strongly Agree”. Comments were positive about Board Governance Structure and Policies: “I attended a New Member orientation online. It was excellent, well laid out, and comprehensive. A good fresher for me.”; “The Board clearly articulates expectations and roles of key parties...and also provides ongoing support in the form of policy/procedure manuals and access to online materials to support Board members in carrying out their duties.”; and “the Board has been able complete all its functions in a very effective manner. New members have added to the scope and depth of Committee and Board meetings.” Notably, the Board Orientation question accurately reflects the Board member's participation with the new response option of N/A.

It should be noted that the average score shift is driven by a significant number of “strongly disagree” responses by one respondent. However, that respondent provided positive comments to the Board's work in the comments section. Therefore, the strongly disagree responses could have been an error in the respondent’s markings to the questions.

42.9% of Board members either strongly disagreed, disagreed, or remained neutral to “The Board’s continuing education program equips its members with the knowledge they need to be effective.” Two comments referenced continuing education and expressed the need for subject matter experts for training and another comment suggested more opportunities to take external training. Based on this feedback, the Board may want to consider diversifying the educational experiences resources.

Two additional comments worth noting: “The Board serves all of its members and by focusing on the entire membership in our deliberation. The Board would better serve HSS members by focusing on the whole, rather than a singular group or concern.” and “The virtual formatting, necessary during pandemic times, has created some challenges that are being addressed and improved upon as time passes.”

The following table shows the breakdown of levels of agreement with an average of 3.8 out of a possible 5 points for the Evaluation of the Board’s interactions with Management. The 3.8 is recognizably lower than the 4.2 average total score indicated in the 2019 Board Survey in this category

Table 1: Evaluation of Governance Structure and Policies

Statement	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	N/A	Average Score
The Board has clearly defined the roles of all key parties.	14.3%			42.9%	42.9%		4
The roles that the Board has assigned to key parties match the experience of those parties.	14.3%			57.1%	28.6%		3.9
The Board orientation program met your expectations.				28.6%	42.9%	28.6%	
The Board’s continuing education program equips its members with the knowledge they need to be effective.	14.3%	14.3%	14.3%	42.9%	14.3%		3.2
The Board developed a comprehensive Board policy framework or manual.	14.3%			57.1%	28.6%		3.9
The Board receives the information and reports that are necessary to carry out its duties.	14.3%			42.9%	42.9%		4
Board meeting agendas adequately reflect policy matters that are consistent with the Board’s role.	14.3%			28.6%	57.1%		4.1
Grand Total							3.8

Board Member Interactions and Meeting Activities

The majority of the statements (10 of 12) in this area received 85% to 100% of “Agree” or “Strongly Agree.” Scores increased from last year in 6 of the 12 areas, with notable growth of 0.5 points in “All Board members adequately contribute to discussions and deliberations and 0.3 points in “Board members are adequately prepared for meetings” and “Board members accept decisions of the Board, even if they did not vote in favor of them.” Comments were positive about the Board’s interactions: “Board members are thoughtful, articulate and well-prepared, engaged, and respect of colleagues” and “The Board is a very effective deliberative body in all aspects of its performance including meeting participation and decision making.”

Two comments also worth noting on Member Interaction and Meeting activities include: “During discussions/deliberations, there have been occasions when Board members, slip in matters that are ancillary to the matter at hand.”; One comment requested training on meeting processes and procedures.

Notably, 71% of Board members agreed or strongly agreed that Board members understand when it is appropriate to act in a fiduciary or stakeholder role, while 29% felt neutral or disagreed with this statement, representing a noticeable drop from 4.1 points last year to 3.7 points. Two comments expressed the need to remind the Board of its fiduciary responsibilities: “ We need to do better at our fiduciary responsibilities to consider the cost to both members and employer” and “We are fiduciaries, first and foremost, and I hope reminders are continued.” The Board may want to consider an annual fiduciary training offered to all Board members.

Additionally, 28% of Board members (0.2 points higher than last year) felt neutral on how the Board effectively manages Board members who fail to act in accordance with policies. Comments also expressed either never having experienced members failing to act in accordance with policies or agreement that the Board would be able to manage any situation that could arise.

14.3% of Board members expressed strong disagreement with “The Board focuses on policy and strategy in addition to operations.” In reviewing comments provided, two items indicated an area for improvement, “The Request for Proposal (RFP) process required hindsight review to understand how the HSB had impacted and influenced the RFP. The role of the HSB in the RFP process could have been better outlined as the RFP rolled out. The HSB also continues to struggle with how the Five Areas of the Strategic Plan are being addressed by each item for action and how the actions further the implementation of this Strategic Plan.” To further improve, the Board can consider when Strategic Plan updates are delivered to the Board and share a timeline of Health Service Board involvement in future Request for Proposal process.

The following table shows the breakdown of levels of agreement with an average of 4.1 out of a possible 5 points for the Evaluation of the Board’s interactions with Management. The 4.1 overall is consistent with the 2019 Board Survey in this category.

Table 2: Evaluation of Board Meeting Interactions & Meeting Activities

Statement	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Average Score
Board members are adequately prepared for meetings.				71.4%	28.6%	4.2
Board members are well organized.		14.3%		57.1%	28.6%	4
The Board focuses on policy and strategy in addition to operations.	14.3%			28.6%	57.1%	4.1
Board members understand when it is appropriate to act in a fiduciary role.		14.3%	14.3%	57.1%	14.3%	3.7
All Board members adequately contribute to discussions and deliberations.				57.1%	42.9%	4.4
Board members are respectful of each other’s ideas and opinions.				57.1%	42.9%	4.4
Disagreements between Board members are handled professionally.			14.3%	57.1%	28.6%	4.1
The Board routinely adheres to its own policies.				71.4%	28.6%	4.2
The Board effectively manages Board members who fail to act in accordance with policies.			28.6%	71.4%		3.7
Board members accept decisions of the Board, even if they did not vote in favor of them.				57.1%	42.9%	4.4
The Board takes timely action to resolve problems when they arise.				71.4%	28.6%	4.2
The Board carefully deliberates before taking action.				42.9%	57.1%	4.5
Grand Total						4.1

Board Evaluation of Goal Setting and Communications

The Board felt overwhelmingly positive about its interactions with Goal Setting and Communications. All 9 statements in the Goal Setting and Communications areas received 85% of scores in the “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” ratings. Compared to last year’s ratings, the scores increased in 7 of the 8 areas of this section, with the greatest increase of .5 points from 3.7 to 4.2 points for the statement, “The Board communicates effectively with The City.” One Commissioner shared, “...how nimble the Board is to adapt to unexpected challenges in a COVID world, particularly with remote meetings. Ongoing flexibility will allow the Board to continue to succeed and improve performance.” Another comment noted, “the Board has effectively communicated and responded to questions and issues from its multiple constituents in a timely manner.”

14.3% of Board members expressed neutrality with two statements: “The Board communicates effectively to Plan Members.”; “The Board communicated effectively with one voice to all parties.” Comments from provided insight on these ratings: “A difficult question to know since the format for HSB to interact with stakeholders is through monthly HSB meetings”; “Whether we communicate to all parties is difficult to answer.”; and “Not sure that we really know if there is specific or correct communication. Most of our communication would involve benefits and policies which must be communicated back to staff and to membership.” One comment offered a suggestion: “The communications seem strong. One thing to improve would be some broader communication about what the HSB does, since I don’t think most people know.”

The following table shows the breakdown of levels of agreement with an average of 4.1 out of a possible 5 points for the Evaluation of the Board’s interactions with Management. The 4.1 is slightly higher than the 3.9 average total score indicated in the 2019 Board Survey in this category.

Table 3: Evaluation of Goal Setting and Communications

Statement	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Average Score
The Board establishes goals for the organization as a whole.				71.4%	28.6%	4.2
The Board establishes suitable goals for Member Services.				71.4%	28.6%	4.2
The Board communicates effectively to Plan members.			14.3%	71.4%	14.3%	4
The Board Communicates effectively to staff.				71.4%	28.6%	4.2
The Board communicates effectively to service providers.				71.4%	28.6%	4.4
The Board communicates effectively to The City.				71.4%	28.6%	4.2
The Board communicated effectively with one voice to all parties.			14.3%	57.1%	28.6%	4.1
The Board instills trust among stakeholders.				71.4%	28.6%	4.2
Grand Total						4.1

Evaluation of Board’s Interactions with Management

The Board overwhelmingly felt positive about interactions with Management. All 8 statements in the Evaluation of Board’s Interactions with Management are received 85% of scores in “Agree” or “Strongly Agree,” ratings. Scores increased from last year for 6 out of 7 statements, with the total score increasing from 4.1 to 4.3 points this year. Markedly, two questions “The Board challenges management in a constructive manner” and “The Board provides valuable alternative points of view to management” shifted more responses from the “Agree” to the “Strongly Agree” than last year. Comments were positive about the Board’s Interactions with Management: “The Board’s interaction with Management has been extremely positive and collegial...This trusted relationship allows the Board and Management to identify any areas of improvement.”; “When there have been concerns, referral to the appropriate standing committee, often Governance, has been swift and timely. This is excellent.”; and “The Board has built good working relationships with the management team.”

14.3% of members expressed neutrality with two statements: “The Board ensures management has the necessary financial and human resources to achieve the organization's goals” and “The Board provides the Executive Director with helpful feedback to enhance future performance.” One comment shared that the Board has no control of the financial and human resources.

The question “Where feasible, the Board engages ineffective management succession planning. had a spelling typo (“ineffective” should have read “in effective”) which changed the meaning of the question and Board members noted confusion and thus the question was not able to accurately respond. Therefore, the question was omitted from the yearly comparison and total average scoring.

The following table shows the breakdown of levels of agreement with an average of 4.3 out of a possible 5 points for the Evaluation of the Board’s interactions with Management. The 4.3 is slightly higher than the 4.1 average total score indicated in the 2019 Board Survey in this category.

Table 4: Evaluation of Board’s Interactions with Management

Statement	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Average Score
The Board provides sound advice to management.				85.7%	14.3%	4.1
The Board challenges management in a constructive manner.				71.4%	28.6%	4.2
The Board provides valuable alternative points of view to management.				57.1%	42.9%	4.4
The Board ensures management has the necessary financial and human resources to achieve the organization's goals.			14.3%	57.1%	28.6%	4.1
The Board creates an atmosphere in which management's ideas are genuinely welcome.				57.1%	42.9%	4.4
The Board effectively evaluates the Director's performance.				57.1%	42.9%	4.4
The Board provides the Executive Director with helpful feedback to enhance future performance.			14.3%	57.1%	28.6%	4.1
Where feasible, the Board engages in effective management succession planning.						
The Board members are respectful of the opinions expressed by staff and management.				57.1%	42.9%	4.4
Grand Total						4.3

Conclusion

In conclusion, although no outstanding issues surfaced from this evaluation, the Board can continue to improve by focusing on areas including:

- Diversifying Board education resources
- Offering an annual fiduciary responsibility review by Counsel
- Creating a timeline of how the HSB will be involved in the future Request for Proposal Process
- Providing Regular Strategic Plan updates at Board meetings
- Providing Strategic Plan notation on Board agendas
- Offering an annual fiduciary responsibility review by Counsel
- Reviewing Communications Plan
- Creating key messages on the Board webpages

The Evaluation process can also consider the following procedural areas to improve:

- Ensure the survey tool allow respondents to review answers before submitting
- Enable survey tool to send an email to confirm completion

The Board's progress in several areas highlighted in the 2019-20 evaluation for improvement should be commended.