

HEALTH SERVICE BOARD

Annual Self-Evaluation
Year 2023

Presented by:
Board Secretary, Holly Lopez



Overview

The Process

In December 2023, The Health Service Board Governance Committee met and reviewed the annual Board Self-Evaluation and Employee Performance Evaluation process, timeline, and survey. In December, Holly Lopez sent each member the HSB 2023 Self-Evaluation Evaluation for completion. The evaluation was anonymous and administered via the Microsoft 365 Forms virtual platform. 100% of the seven current Board members completed the evaluation. The results of this Board evaluation were presented to the Governance Committee meeting on March 5, 2024, and presented to the full Board at its regular meeting on March 14, 2024.

The Self-Evaluation Form

Under the Board Evaluation Policy, Board members must complete the annual Board Self-Evaluation. 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. At the end of each section, Commissioners could suggest improvements and give statements on their neutral, disagree, or strongly disagree selections. There were 32 questions in total.

The Governance Committee adjusted two questions this year and deleted three from the previous evaluation tool. It is also important to note that six commissioners completed the survey in 2022 versus seven who completed the evaluation in 2023, which means the weighted scores are not a direct comparison.

Executive Summary

Overall, the scores changed in each category. Notably, the Governance Structure and Policies score decreased by 0.25. The Board’s Interactions and Meeting Activities experienced an overall increase of 0.1 points. The Board’s Interactions with Management decreased by 0.36 points. The Goal Setting and Communication section dropped by a score of .01 points. The chart below shows the total scores for the past three years to show overall increases and decreases. 20 out of 32 statements in the evaluation showed score reductions compared to last year’s ratings. This Executive Summary highlights the areas with more significant decreases or increases and the greatest improvement areas.

Areas for Evaluation	2021 Total Score	2022 Total Score	2023 Total Score
Governance Structure & Policies	4.3	4.75	4.5
Board Member Interactions and Meeting Activities	4.3	4.5	4.6
Goal Setting and Communication	4.3	4.5	4.14
Board’s Interactions with Management	4.2	4.5	4.46

Health Service Board Annual Self-Evaluation

The following sections highlight evaluation scores demonstrating more significant decreases or increases (0.3 points or higher) than the 2022 Board Self-Evaluation.

Areas of Possible Concern or Focus Highlighted in the 2023 Evaluation

Governance Structure and Policies

Statement	2021	2022	2023
The Board receives the information and reports that are necessary to carry out its duties.	4.70	4.83	4.43

Board Member Interactions and Meeting Activities

Statement	2021	2022	2023
Board members understand when it is appropriate to act in a fiduciary role.	4.10	4.67	4.29

Goal Setting and Communication

Statement	2021	2022	2023
The Board establishes goals for the organization as a whole.	4.40	4.50	4.14
The Board establishes suitable goals for Member Services.	4.50	4.50	3.86
The Board communicates effectively to staff.	4.50	4.50	4.14
The Board communicates effectively to service providers.	4.40	4.83	4.14
The Board instills trust among stakeholders.	4.50	4.50	4.14

Board's Interactions with Management

Statement	2021	2022	2023
The Board provides sound advice to management.	4.40	4.67	4.29
The Board provides valuable alternative points of view to management.	4.20	4.50	4.14

Summary of Areas that Showed the Most Significant Score Increases

Board Member Interactions and Meeting Activities

Statement	2021	2022	2023
All Board members adequately contribute to discussions and deliberations	4.10	4.5	4.86

Improvements in Areas of Possible Concern or Focus Highlighted in the 2022 Evaluation

There were no statements within any of the four areas where the average score decreased by 0.3 points or higher; therefore, there were no areas of possible concern or focus.

Results of Board Performance Evaluation

Evaluation of Governance Structure & Policies

The Governance Structure and Policies scores ranged from neutral to strongly agree. Half of the questions received a 4.57 score, and the remaining half received a score of 4.43. In five of the six questions, Board members selected a neutral rating. The question “The Board orientation program met your expectations” was removed from the evaluation tool.

71.4% strongly agreed that the Board developed a comprehensive Board Policy framework or manual; two comments referenced this strength: “Board policies are readily accessible and updated per protocol,” and “Governance rules are well defined.” Scores for the Board’s role ranged from neutral to strongly agreed, and two comments shared insights: “The roles are well defined,” and “The Board’s role is clearly defined and followed in practice per the recently updated Health Service Board Governance Terms of Reference.”

The Board’s continuing education program equipping its members with the knowledge they need to be effective received a 4.57 score, and one comment offered examples of continuing education materials: “Periodicals, conference, online workshops, etc are provided and recommended.”

One comment noted an overall statement, “The current configuration related to this section seems optimal.” One comment suggested, “It would be helpful if the titles of the attachments match the agenda titles.” Based on this feedback, the Board may want to request an adjustment to document naming conventions.

The following table shows the Evaluation of the Board’s Interactions with Management score breakdowns and the average score of 4.50, which is 0.25 points lower than the 2022 average score of 4.75.

Table 1: Evaluation of Governance Structure and Policies

Statement	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Average Score
The Board has clearly defined the roles of all key parties.			14.3%	28.6%	57.1%	4.43
The roles that the Board has assigned to key parties match the experience of those parties.			14.3%	14.3%	71.4%	4.57
The Board’s continuing education program equips its members with the knowledge they need to be effective.			14.3%	28.6%	57.1%	4.43
The Board developed a comprehensive Board policy framework or manual.			14.3%	14.3%	71.4%	4.57
The Board receives the information and reports that are necessary to carry out its duties.			14.3%	28.6%	57.1%	4.43
Board meeting agendas adequately reflect policy matters that are consistent with the Board’s role.				42.9%	57.1%	4.57
Grand Total						4.50

Health Service Board Annual Self-Evaluation

Board Member Interactions and Meeting Activities

The Board rated this area the highest score, 4.6 out of 5 points. The Board felt overwhelmingly positive about the Member Interactions and Activities. Scores increased from last year in 8 of the 12 questions. 75% of questions scored 4.57 or higher. The word “routinely” was removed from question fifteen: “The Board routinely adheres to its own policies.”

The first question in this section relates to meeting preparedness, and one response gave specific examples of meeting preparations, “We are provided with updates in the industry, informed of local issues that might impact services, plus kept up to date about the state of the City (budget deficit). We are encouraged to attend relevant conferences. The staff keeps us current between meetings, too.”

14.3% of Board members rated disagree with “All Board members adequately contribute to discussions and deliberations,” with one response noting, “Not all Board members engage in active discussions due to their career not being focused in Health Service or a related field.” Another related comment shared, “A couple of Board members do not attend all or an adequate number of meetings.”

The “Board members understand when it is appropriate to act in a fiduciary role” question rating decreased by 0.38 points. Although one comment noted, “We receive regular information sessions on our fiduciary responsibility,” another comment stated, “Board members need to consider both sides of the fiduciary responsibility coin: the effects on the members and the trust.”

“The Board adheres to its own policies” received a 4.71 rating. One comment mentioned, “I have never observed nor am I aware of any Board member who has failed to act in accordance with policies. Notably, the 2022 evaluation receive a similar comment. The Board may want to review this question for next year.

The following table shows the Evaluation of the Board’s interactions with Management score breakdown and an average of 4.6 out of a possible 5, a 0.1 increase from the 2022 Board evaluation in this category.

Table 2: Evaluation of Board Member 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.				28.6%	71.4%	4.71
Board members are well organized.				28.6%	71.4%	4.71
The Board focuses on policy and strategy in addition to operations.				42.9%	57.1%	4.57
Board members understand when it is appropriate to act as a fiduciary.			28.6%	14.3%	57.1%	4.29
All Board members adequately contribute to discussions and deliberations.		14.3%		42.9%	57.1%	4.86
Board members are respectful of each other’s ideas and opinions.				28.6%	71.4%	4.71
Disagreements between Board members are handled professionally.			14.3%	28.6%	57.1%	4.43
The Board adheres to its own policies.				28.6%	71.4%	4.71
The Board effectively manages Board members who fail to act in accordance with policies.			28.6%	42.9%	28.6%	4
Board members accept decisions of the Board, even if they did not vote in favor of them.				42.9%	57.1%	4.57
The Board takes timely action to resolve problems when they arise.			14.3%	28.6%	57.1%	4.43
The Board carefully deliberates before taking action.				28.6%	71.4%	4.71
Grand Total						4.6

Board Evaluation of Goal Setting and Communications

The Goal Setting and Communications scores ranged from disagree to agree strongly. Every question received at least one neutral rating, and one question received a disagree rating. Four of the six questions received a score of 4.14. Two questions were removed from last year: “The Board communicates effectively to Plan Members” and “ The Board communicates effectively with The City.”

14.3% of respondents disagreed that the “Board establishes suitable goals for Member Services.” Two respondents shared their viewpoints: “Goals for member Services have not been presented to the Board, nor has the Board opined on any such goals,” and “Not sure that complaints via member services are handled in a timely manner per the Board recommendations. The Board never hears outcomes of decisions made by the HSB in closed session when member complaints have been presented for adjudication.” The Board may want to request staff share the process for which SFHSS communicates with members after the Board adjudicates on a member appeal. In addition, the Board may consider adding a regular Member Services goals report and presentation.

This section asks about communications with service providers, and one respondent noted, “The Board is governed by laws that often prevent us from communicating with providers/contractors during certain times. All Board members adhere to the laws that govern our positions and responsibilities.”

Although the question about communicating with Plan Members was removed from the evaluation, one respondent shared their experience: “Members regularly contact Board members when they have a problem. Board members call staff when necessary because they follow City Charter guidelines.” Board members may want to receive the City Charter guidelines and Governance Policies for communicating with plan members.

The following table shows the breakdown of the Evaluation of the Board’s Goal Setting and Communications levels. The average score is 4.14 out of a possible 5 points. The 4.14 is 0.36 points lower than the 2022 score.

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.			14.3%	57.1%	28.6%	4.14
The Board establishes suitable goals for Member Services.		14.3%	14.3%	42.9%	28.6%	3.86
The Board Communicates effectively to staff.			14.3%	57.1%	28.6%	4.14
The Board communicates effectively to service providers.			14.3%	57.1%	28.6%	4.14
The Board communicated effectively as one voice to all parties.			14.3%	28.6%	57.1%	4.43
The Board instills trust among stakeholders.			14.3%	57.1%	28.6%	4.14
Grand Total						4.14

Evaluation of Board’s Interactions with Management

The score remained high this year, with a 4.46 out of 5. Half of the questions received an agree or strongly agree rating. Markedly, one comment said the Board’s performance in this section is “optimal.” The question, “Board ensures management has the necessary financial and human resources to achieve the organization’s goals,” was removed this year.

One respondent commented on the overall interaction with management, “During this performance period, the Board has very effectively interacted with the Management Team.” The question “The Board effectively evaluates the Executive Director’s performance received a 4.71 rating, and one respondent commented: “The evaluation process is thorough and will help future performances.”

85.7% of the Board agreed or strongly agreed that the Board creates an atmosphere in which management’s ideas are genuinely welcome. One respondent shared, “We have a good relationship with our staff. We want to hear from staff. We speak our minds, including staff,” and said, “The Board does not micromanage the department, so few staffing recommendations are ever made.”

Two questions decreased by more than 0.3 points, “The Board provides sound advice to management” and “The Board provides valuable alternative points of view to management,” respondents did not share any further insights.

The following table shows the evaluation of the Board’s interactions with management score breakdown and the average score of 4.46 out of 5 possible points. The 4.5 is 0.04 points lower than the 2022 Board score.

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.			14.30%	4.29%	4.29%	4.29
The Board challenges management in a constructive manner.			14.30%	28.6%	57.1%	4.43
The Board provides valuable alternative points of view to management.			14.30%	57.1%	28.6%	4.14
The Board creates an atmosphere in which management's ideas are genuinely welcome.			14.30%	14.30%	71.4%	4.57
The Board effectively evaluates the Director's performance.				28.6%	71.4%	4.71
The Board provides the Executive Director with helpful feedback to enhance future performance.				42.9%	57.1%	4.57
Where feasible, the Board may make recommendations regarding effective management succession planning.				71.4%	28.6%	4.29
The Board members are respectful of the opinions expressed by staff and management.				28.6%	71.4%	4.71
Grand Total						4.46

Conclusion

In 2023, the Board took the following steps to improve from the 2022 requests.

Areas for improvement from the 2022 Evaluation	
1. Broaden the educational platforms to include conferences and invite more speakers.	→ SFHSS and Aon staff presented nine Board Education topics during public meetings in 2023.
2. Remind Commissioners to stay on topic during discussions.	→ The President addressed Commissioners to remain on topic when discussions strayed from the agenda topic.
3. Refine Evaluation Questions: #3, #24, #27, #34 #38	<p>→ The HSB Governance Committee reviewed and edited the following evaluation questions for the 2023 Evaluation:</p> <p>Removed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #3 The Board orientation program met your expectations. • #24 The Board communicates effectively to Plan Members. • #27 The Board communicates effectively to the City. • #34 The Board ensures management has the necessary financial and human resources to achieve the organization’s goal. <p>Edited:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #16 - The Board routinely adheres to it’s own policies. REMOVED the word “routinely.” • #38 Where feasible, the Board engages in effective management succession planning. EDIT- Where feasible, the Board may make recommendations regarding management succession planning.
4. Next year, the Annual Board Self-Evaluation will include three sections: standard questions, board education topics, and board self-study hours.	→ 2023 Annual Board Self-Evaluation includes three sections: standard questions, Board education topics, and Board self-study hours.

The report called for improvement in these areas to focus on in 2024:

1. Explore new document naming conventions for materials to match agenda item titles.
2. Review question: “The Board adheres to its own policies.” Board members may not know when others violate policies, so it is hard to rate this question.
3. Staff share how SFHSS communicates with members after the Board adjudicates on a member appeal.
4. Set a regular Member Services goals report and presentation.
5. Review and share City Charter guidelines and Governance Policies for communicating with plan members.
6. The board evaluation received self-study hours, but the evaluation is anonymous, so the board secretary still needs to request individual study hours. Consider collecting this information separately from the evaluation.