

# HEALTH SERVICE BOARD

Annual Self-Evaluation  
Year 2025

---

Presented by:  
Board Secretary, Holly Lopez



# Overview

## *The Process*

In November 2025, The Health Service Board (HSB) Governance Committee met and reviewed the annual Board Self-Evaluation process, timeline, and survey. In January 2026, Holly Lopez sent each member the HSB 2025 Self-Evaluation for completion. The evaluation was administered via the Microsoft 365 Forms virtual platform. 100% of Board members completed the evaluation. The results of this Board evaluation were presented to the Governance Committee meeting on March 6, 2026, and presented to the full Board at its regular meeting on March 12, 2026.

## *The Self-Evaluation Form*

Under the Board Evaluation Policy, Board members must complete the annual Board Self-Evaluation. There are six sections in the evaluation. Sections one through four have 36 questions and identify 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. Section five focuses on Education topics the Board would like to focus on in 2026. Section six gathers Commissioner self-study hours. It is noteworthy that two new Commissioners were seated in 2025 (April and June).

# Executive Summary

Overall, the scores changed in each category. The chart below shows the total scores for the past three years to show overall increases and decreases. 11 out of 32 statements in the evaluation showed score reductions compared to last year’s ratings. 15 out of the 32 statements in the evaluation showed a score increase from last year’s ratings. This report is outlined in three sections: results for each category, comparison of 2024 to 2025, and conclusion.

Areas for Evaluation	2023 Total Score	2024 Total Score	2025 Total Score
Governance Structure & Policies	4.5	4.36	4.29
Board Member Interactions and Meeting Activities	4.6	4.11	4.2
Goal Setting and Communication	4.14	3.86	4
Board’s Interactions with Management	4.46	4	4.09

# Results of Board Performance Evaluation

## ***Evaluation of Governance Structure & Policies***

The Governance Structure and Policies scores ranged from neutral to strongly agree. The table shows the score breakdowns and the average score of 4.29, which is 0.07 points lower than the 2024 average score of 4.36. The following Commissioner comments provide insight into scores.

**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.				57.14%	42.86%	4.17
The roles that the Board has assigned to key parties match the experience of those parties.				100%		4.33
The Board’s continuing education program equips its members with the knowledge they need to be effective.			42.86%	42.86%	14.29%	3.71
The Board developed a comprehensive Board policy framework or manual.			14.29%	42.86%	42.86%	4.29
The Board receives the information and reports that are necessary to carry out its duties.				42.86%	57.14%	4.57
Board meeting agendas adequately reflect policy matters that are consistent with the Board’s role.				28.57%	71.43%	4.71
<b>Grand Total</b>						<b>4.29</b>

- Too, too soon to develop an opinion as a new board member.
- The Board adequately delivers roles and materials to ensure that members are prepared.
- Ongoing education for the Board is vital to ensure effective governance and informed decision-making. Currently, the third-party classes available to us are often costly and held out of state, which can pose logistical and financial challenges. It would be highly beneficial if the City could offer local educational programs specifically tailored for Health Service Board members. Such initiatives would enhance accessibility, reduce costs, and contribute significantly to the professional development of our board.
- The Board prep is excellent, and the regular 'in-service' education on various topics is also helpful and relevant.
- I think site visits at SFHSS would be helpful for the board to have an idea of who is doing the work and how it is getting done.

### Board Member Interactions and Meeting Activities

The Board Member Interactions and Meeting Activities scores ranged from neutral to strongly agree. The table shows the score breakdowns and the average score of 4.2, which is 0.09 points higher than the 2024 average score of 4.11. The following Commissioner comments provide insight into scores.

**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.				85.71%	14.29%	4.14
Board members are well organized.				85.71%	14.29%	4.14
The Board focuses on policy and strategy in addition to operations.		14.29%		85.71%		3.71
Board members understand when it is appropriate to act as a fiduciary.				57.14%	42.86%	4.43
All Board members adequately contribute to discussions and deliberations.				100		4
Board members are respectful of each other’s ideas and opinions.				28.57%	71.43%	4.71
Disagreements between Board members are handled professionally.				28.57%	71.43%	4.71
The Board adheres to its own policies.				71.43%	28.57%	4.29
The Board effectively manages Board members who fail to act in accordance with policies.			57.14%	42.86%		3.43
Board members accept decisions of the Board, even if they did not vote in favor of them.			14.29%	57.14%	28.57%	4.14
The Board takes timely action to resolve problems when they arise.				100%		4
The Board carefully deliberates before taking action.				28.57%	71.43%	4.71
<b>Grand Total</b>						<b>4.2</b>

- Situation hasn’t occurred, so it is difficult to provide a rating.
- This group on the Board is still relatively new and has not been working together for an extended period. However, through ongoing collaboration and shared efforts, we are continuously growing stronger and more cohesive. Together, we are enhancing the effectiveness and efficiency of the Health Service, laying a solid foundation for sustained success.
- I answered neutral on #17 as I can't think of an issue that we voted disparately in 2025.
- I feel that the board is effective and collaborative.
- #16 - We have not yet encountered a Board member who has failed in accordance with policy.

### **Board Evaluation of Goal Setting and Communications**

The Goal Setting and Communications scores ranged from disagree to agree strongly. The following table shows the score breakdown. The average score is 4 out of 5 points. The average score is 0.14 points higher than the average 2024 score of 3.86. The following Commissioner comments provide insight into scores.

**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 provides feedback on suitable goals for the organization as a whole.				100%		4
The Board provides feedback on suitable goals for Member Services.		14.29%		71.43%	14.29%	3.86
The Board communicates effectively to staff.				85.71%	14.29%	4.14
The Board communicates effectively to service providers.			14.29%	85.71%		3.86
The Board communicated effectively as one voice to all parties.				100%		4
The Board instills trust among stakeholders.				85.71%	14.29%	4.14
<b>Grand Total</b>						<b>4</b>

- The Board and staff have a good working relationship.
- The Health Service Board communicates very well with the Board members. However, there could be more communication with Blue Shield of California.
- The Board remains committed to advancing our goals and enhancing communication, fostering a more unified and effective team.
- A trustworthy body. I am still always challenged in public comment to only listen and not answer, or give clarity or guidance. It makes issues dangle after the meeting, without clear steps on resolving. I understand it is the process, but it is not ideal.
- #22 - While the Board has commented on member services' metrics, we have not set goals for them to achieve.

### ***Evaluation of Board’s Interactions with Management***

The evaluation of the Board’s interactions with management scores ranges from disagree to agree strongly. The following table shows this section's score breakdown and the average score of 4.09 out of 5 points. The score is 0.09 points higher than the 2024 average score of 4.

**Table 4: Evaluation of the 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.				85.71%	14.29%	4.14
The Board challenges management in a constructive manner.			14.29%	71.43%	14.29%	4
The Board provides valuable alternative points of view to management.			28.57%	42.86%	28.57%	4
The Board creates an atmosphere in which management's ideas are genuinely welcome.				71.43%	28.57%	4.29
The Board effectively evaluates the Director's performance.			14.29%	71.43%	14.29%	4
The Board provides the Executive Director with helpful feedback to enhance future performance.			14.29%	85.71%		3.86
Where feasible, the Board may make recommendations regarding effective management succession planning.		16.67%		83.33%		3.86
The Board members are respectful of the opinions expressed by staff and management.				42.86%	57.14%	4.57
<b>Grand Total</b>						<b>4.09</b>

- Situation hasn’t occurred, therefore making it difficult to provide a rating
- The Board's interaction with management is healthy and solid.
- Q32 and 33 are difficult to actually answer as I cannot say if the feedback is effective, unless it is given time to improve or resolve. I also do not know if other board members offer feedback and of what nature.

# Yearly Comparison

Evaluation of Governance Structure and Policies	2024	2025
The Board has clearly defined the roles of all key parties.	4.17	4.17
The roles that the Board has assigned to key parties match the experience of those parties.	4.33	4.33
The Board's continuing education program equips its members with the knowledge they need to be effective.	4.17	3.71
The Board developed a comprehensive Board policy framework or manual.	4.33	4.29
The Board receives the information and reports that are necessary to carry out its duties.	4.67	4.57
Board meeting agendas adequately reflect policy matters that are consistent with the Board's role.	4.50	4.71
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>4.36</b>	<b>4.29</b>

Evaluation of Board Member Interactions & Meeting Activities	2024	2025
Board members are adequately prepared for meetings.	4.17	4.14
Board members are well organized.	4.17	4.14
The Board focuses on policy and strategy in addition to operations.	4.33	3.71
Board members understand when it is appropriate to act as a fiduciary.	4.17	4.43
All Board members adequately contribute to discussions and deliberations.	4.00	4.00
Board members are respectful of each other's ideas and opinions.	4.33	4.71
Disagreements between Board members are handled professionally.	4.00	4.71
The Board adheres to its own policies.	4.33	4.29
The Board effectively manages Board members who fail to act in accordance with policies.	3.67	3.43
Board members accept decisions of the Board, even if they did not vote in favor of them.	4.00	4.14
The Board takes timely action to resolve problems when they arise.	4.00	4.00
The Board carefully deliberates before taking action.	4.17	4.71
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>4.11</b>	<b>4.20</b>

Evaluation of Goal Setting and Communications	2024	2025
The Board provides feedback on suitable goals for the organization as a whole.	3.67	4.00
The Board provides feedback on suitable goals for Member Services.	3.66	3.86
The Board communicates effectively to staff.	4.00	4.14
The Board communicates effectively to service providers.	4.00	3.86
The Board communicated effectively as one voice to all parties.	3.67	4.00
The Board instills trust among stakeholders.	4.17	4.14
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>3.86</b>	<b>4</b>

Evaluation of the Board's Interactions with Management	2024	2025
The Board provides sound advice to management.	3.83	4.14
The Board challenges management in a constructive manner.	3.83	4.00
The Board provides valuable alternative points of view to management.	4.00	4.00
The Board creates an atmosphere in which management's ideas are genuinely welcome.	4.33	4.29
The Board effectively evaluates the Director's performance.	4.00	4.00
The Board provides the Executive Director with helpful feedback to enhance future performance.	3.83	3.86
Where feasible, the Board may make recommendations regarding effective management succession planning.	3.67	3.86
The Board members are respectful of the opinions expressed by staff and management.	4.50	4.57
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4.09</b>

# Conclusion

*In 2025, the Board took the following steps to improve.*

Areas for improvement from the 2025 Evaluation	
1. Onboarding Education Schedule: Review the educational programs needed within the first year and consider spacing additional educational programs into the 2 <sup>nd</sup> year serving the term.	→ Executive Director Guillen and Holly Lopez, Board Secretary will revise the schedule for the next onboarding cycle.
2. A projected calendar, possibly organized quarterly, outlining key decisions would help me and other board members stay informed about upcoming issues.	→ The Board Secretary designed and created a new milestones timeline calendar for the HSB.
3. Governance Committee review the following evaluation questions for need and clarity #21 and #22 are inaccurate. #21-The Board establishes suitable goals for the organization as a whole #22-The Board establishes suitable goals for Member Services. Clarify how the Board... #23 The Board communicates effectively to staff. #24-The Board communicates effectively to service providers. #25-The Board communicates effectively with one voice to all parties.	→ The HSB edited questions #21 and #22. The HSB Governance Committee agreed that the evaluation is at least 10 years old and the Committee will conduct a full review of all questions in Spring 2026. Questions #23, #24 and #25 will be reviewed in that process.

## Areas to Focus on in 2026:

- Local Ongoing Education: It is vital for the Board to ensure effective governance and informed decision-making. It would be highly beneficial if the City could offer local educational programs specifically tailored for Health Service Board members. Such initiatives would enhance accessibility, reduce costs, and contribute significantly to the professional development of our board.
- SFHSS site-visit: I think site visits at SFHSS would be helpful for the board to have an idea of who is doing the work and how it is getting done.
- Communication Plan: The Health Service Board communicates very well with the Board members. However, there could be more communication with Blue Shield of California.
- Clarity on Role and Response to Public Comment: I am still always challenged in public comment to only listen and not answer or give clarity or guidance. It makes issues dangle after the meeting, without clear steps on resolving. I understand it is the process, but it is not ideal.
- Review questions 32 and 32: Q32 and 33 are difficult to actually answer as I cannot say if the feedback is effective to the Executive Director, unless it is given time to improve or resolve.
- Update Evaluation Tools: The Governance Committee meets in April 2026 to draft changes to the HSB Self-Evaluation and the Employee Performance Evaluation.

## Today's Recommendation:

Approve the 2025 Health Service Board Annual Self-Evaluation Report.