

FY 2017-18

Health Service Board Annual Self-Evaluation

Annual Self-Evaluation

The Health Service Board conducted its annual self-evaluation during the month of January. This is a report on a summary of the self-evaluation.



Overview

The Process

In January 2019 the Health Service Board (Board) Secretary, Natalie Ekberg, sent a blank Board Performance Evaluation Survey (Board Survey) to each of the Board Commissioners for completion. This was an anonymous evaluation, and the completed Board Surveys were sent to the Department of Human Resources' Managing Deputy Director, Kate Howard. The results of this Board Survey were presented to the Board's Governance Committee meeting on January 31, 2019 and will be presented to the full Board at its regular meeting on February 14, 2019.

The Self-Evaluation Form

In accordance with the Board Evaluation Policy, Board members are required to annually complete the Board Survey. 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 each Commissioner indicates his/her level of agreement or disagreement on a 5-point Likert scale.

Executive Summary

The 2017-18 Board Survey showed evaluation improvements in some areas, decreases in others and found some issues still outstanding. Highlighted here are evaluation statements that demonstrate significant decreases or increases (0.3 points or higher) in comparison to the 2015-16 Board Self-Evaluation Survey. All six Board members completed the survey. Overall, across all four areas, the average score was nearly 4.0 (3.9 in Goal Setting and Communications).

Areas of Improvement

There were several areas of significant improvement as indicated below. Of particular note were the Board continued improvement regarding succession planning.

Governance Structure and Policies

Statement	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2017-18
The Board receives the information and reports that are necessary to carry out its duties.			3.8	4.4
Board meeting agendas adequately reflect policy matters that are consistent with the Board's role.			3.8	4.3

Board Member Interactions and Meeting Activities

Statement	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2017-18
Board members accept the decisions of the Board, even if they did not vote in favor of them.			3.5	4.2

Goal Setting and Communications

Statement	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2017-18
The Board establishes suitable goals for the investment program.	3.8	2.7	3.5	3.8

Board's Interactions with Management

Statement	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2017-18
The Board provides the Executive Director with helpful feedback to enhance future performance.	3.7	4.1	3.5	4.0
Where feasible, the Board engages in effective management succession planning.	2.5	3.0	2.8	3.7

Areas of Possible Concern or Focus

Listed below are evaluations which showed a decrease in scores from the previous year. There may be a number of reasons for the decrease, such as heightened Board expectations or new members joining the board. Therefore, these statements are highlighted as areas to be aware of during the coming year. Education and orientation for Board members continues to be a theme to focus on, as well as strengthening communication across a variety of stakeholders.

Governance Structure and Policies

Statement	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2017-18
The Board orientation program met your expectations.			3.8	3.2
The Board's continuing education program equips its members with the knowledge they need to be effective.	2.5	3.0	3.8	3.5

Board Member Interactions and Meeting Activities

Statement	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2017-18
Board members are adequately prepared for meetings.			4.2	3.7
The Board takes timely action to resolve problems when they arise.			4.2	3.8
The Board carefully deliberates before taking action.			4.2	3.8

Goal Setting and Communications

Statement	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2017-18
The Board establishes suitable goals for Member Services.			4.2	3.8
The Board communicates effectively to Plan members.	3.8	4.1	4.0	3.7
The Board communicates effectively to The City.	3.6	4.1	4.2	3.6

Board's Interactions with Management

Statement	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2017-18
The Board ensures management has the necessary financial and human resources to achieve the organization's goals.	3.5	3.9	4.3	4.0

Results of Board Performance Evaluation

Evaluation of Governance Structure & Policies

The vast majority of statements (5 out of 7) in this area received 83% to 100% of “Agree” or “Strongly Agree.” Only 40% of the Commissioners indicated agreement regarding the statement that the Board’s continuing education program equips its members with the knowledge they need to be effective. One additional comment about this particular topic stated, “Board members need more training in certain areas.”

The following table shows the breakdown of levels of agreement with an average of 4.0 out of a possible 5 points for the Evaluation of the Board’s Governance Structure & Policies. The 4.0 points is consistent with the 4.0 score from the 2015-16 Evaluation.

Table 1:

Statement	Strongly					Average Score
	Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	
1. Evaluation of Governance Structure & Policies						
Board meeting agendas adequately reflect policy matters that are consistent with the Board's role.				66.7%	33.3%	4.3
The Board has clearly defined the roles of all key parties.				66.7%	33.3%	4.3
The Board has developed a comprehensive Board policy framework or manual.			16.7%	50.0%	33.3%	4.2
The Board orientation program met your expectations.			80.0%	20.0%	0.0%	3.2
The Board receives the information and reports that are necessary to carry out its duties.				60.0%	40.0%	4.4
The Board's continuing education program equips its members with the knowledge they need to be effective.		20.0%	40.0%	20.0%	20.0%	3.5
The roles that the Board has assigned to key parties match the expertise or experience of those parties.				66.7%	33.3%	4.3
Grand Total						4.0

Board Member Interactions and Meeting Activities

All of the statements (12 out of 12) in this area received 66.7.4% to 100% of “Agree” or “Strongly Agree.” Although all statements in this area were positive, there were also a couple of additional comments which stated, “We have been handicapped by the resignation of one board member, without replacement, and transition from one member in the Board of Supervisor's position to another person. Nonetheless, I feel there is more respect for all Board Members, whether elected or appointed,” and “Not all Board members contribute to discussion and may be looking at their cell phone.” Generally the comments focused on the respectful nature of the interactions between board members.

The following table shows the breakdown of levels of agreement with an average of 4.0 out of a possible 5 points for the Evaluation of the Board Member Interactions and Meeting Activities. The 4.0 points is lower than the 4.3 average points in the 2015-16 Board Survey in this category.

Table 2:

Statement	Strongly					Average Score
	Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	
2. Evaluation of Board Member Interactions & Meeting Activities						
Disagreements between Board members tend to be handled professionally.			16.7%	50.0%	33.3%	4.2
All board members adequately contribute to discussions and deliberations.			33.3%	50.0%	16.7%	3.8
Board meetings are frequently well-organized.				66.7%	33.3%	4.3
Board members accept the decisions of the Board, even if they did not vote in favor of them.			16.7%	50.0%	33.3%	4.2
Board members are adequately prepared for meetings.			33.3%	66.7%	0.0%	3.7
Board members are respectful of each other's ideas and opinions.				66.7%	33.3%	4.3
Board members understand when it is appropriate to act in a fiduciary or stakeholder role.		16.7%	16.7%	16.7%	50.0%	4.0
The Board carefully deliberates before taking action.			33.3%	50.0%	16.7%	3.8
The Board effectively manages Board members who fail to act in accordance with policies.			16.7%	66.7%	16.7%	4.0
The Board focuses on policy and strategy rather than operations.			20.0%	60.0%	20.0%	4.0
The Board routinely adheres to its own policies.			16.7%	50.0%	33.3%	4.2
The Board takes timely action to resolve problems when they arise.			16.7%	83.3%	0.0%	3.8
Grand Total						4.0

Evaluation of Goal-Setting and Communications

The vast majority of the statements (7 out of 9) in this area received 66.7% to 83.3% of “Agree” or “Strongly Agree.”

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 Goal-Setting and Communications. The 4.1 points is the same number of average points in the 2014 Board Survey in this category.

Table 3:

Statement	Strongly					Average Score
	Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	
3. Evaluation of Goal Setting and Communications						
The Board communicates effectively to Plan members.			33.3%	66.7%	0.0%	3.7
The Board communicates effectively to service providers.			16.7%	50.0%	33.3%	4.2
The Board communicates effectively to staff.			33.3%	50.0%	16.7%	3.8
The Board communicates effectively to The City.			40.0%	60.0%	0.0%	3.6
The Board communicates with one voice to all parties.			16.7%	83.3%	0.0%	3.8
The Board establishes suitable goals for Member Services.			33.3%	50.0%	16.7%	3.8
The Board establishes suitable goals for the investment program.			33.3%	50.0%	16.7%	3.8
The Board establishes suitable goals for the organization as a whole.			16.7%	50.0%	33.3%	4.2
The Board instills trust among stakeholders.			33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	4.0
Grand Total						3.9

Evaluation of Board’s Interactions with Management

The majority of statements (7 out of 9) in this area received 66.7% to 100% of “Agree” or “Strongly Agree.” The statement that the Board creates an atmosphere where management’s ideas are welcome and that Board members are respectful of the opinions expressed by staff both received 100% “Agree” or “Strongly Agree.” However, the statement that the Board ensures management has the necessary financial and human resources to achieve the organization's goals received a 60% “Agree” or “Strongly Agree.” Comments in this area highlighted the strategic planning process, “In addition, the strategic planning process, under the direction of the new Director, was well attended by all HSB members, who all contributed, and the desire of the Board to hear from management, “I feel the HSB does ask for

additional information re: the issue of how the HSS staff views the activities and input from the HSB.” One comment noted a concern stating, “The Board does not have a Management succession plan.”

The following table shows the breakdown of levels of agreement with an average of 4.0 out of a possible 5 points for the Evaluation of the Board’s Interactions with Management. The 4.0 points is slightly lower than the 4.2 average points indicated in the 2015-16 Board Survey in this category.

Table 4:

Statement	Strongly					Average Score
	Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	
4. Evaluation of Board's Interactions with Management						
The Board challenges management in a constructive manner.			20.0%	60.0%	20.0%	4.0
The Board creates an atmosphere in which management's ideas are genuinely welcome.				66.7%	33.3%	4.3
The Board effectively evaluates the Executive Director's performance.			16.7%	83.3%	0.0%	3.8
The Board ensures management has the necessary financial and human resources to achieve the organization's goals.			40.0%	20.0%	40.0%	4.0
The Board members are respectful of the opinions expressed by staff and management.				83.3%	16.7%	4.2
The Board provides sound advice to management.			16.7%	83.3%	0.0%	3.8
The Board provides the Executive Director with helpful feedback to enhance future performance.			16.7%	66.7%	16.7%	4.0
The Board provides valuable alternative points of view to management.			16.7%	83.3%	0.0%	3.8
Where feasible, the Board engages in effective management succession planning.			33.3%	66.7%	0.0%	3.7
Grand Total						4.0

Additional General Comments

Commissioners had the opportunity to submit additional comments, some of which were highlighted in the previous sections. The comments demonstrate the progress the Board has made and, at the same time outlines some of the issues to be addressed. The following are some of the comments:

“During this period of transition with the retirement of one Executive Director and the search, selection, and on boarding of a New Executive Director, the HSS Board fulfilled its functional and fiduciary duties in an exceptional manner.”

“The selection process for a new ED was a model for public boards in SF and was ably supported by DHR and an outstanding Executive Recruiter. Board Members were active and fully engaged in all phases of this work. The outstanding support of COO and Interim ED Mitchell Griggs and the rest of HSS management and staff team must also be commended during this transition period and their steadfast service to our Members.”

“The HSB had a challenging process to choose a new Executive Director. All members of the Board were respectful of the discussions and process.”