

FY 2018-19

# Health Service Board Annual Self-Evaluation

## Annual Self-Evaluation

The Health Service Board conducted its annual self-evaluation during the months of November and December 2019. This report is a summary of the self-evaluation.



# Overview

---

## *The Process*

In November 2019, Department of Human Resources' (DHR) Workforce Development Director, Julia Ma, sent an online survey link for the HSB 2019 Self-Evaluation Survey (Board Survey) to each of the Board members for completion. This was an anonymous evaluation, and the completed Board Surveys were submitted via the Survey Monkey platform for DHR review and analysis. All seven Board members completed the survey. The results of this Board Survey were presented to the Board's Governance Committee meeting on January 16, 2020 and will be presented to the full Board at its regular meeting on February 13, 2020.

## *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.

# Executive Summary

---

The 2018-19 Board Survey showed a significant number of improvements across all four areas of the evaluation, with a total of 26 out of 40 statements in the evaluation showing score increases compared to last year's ratings. No outstanding issues surfaced from this evaluation. This Executive Summary highlights the areas where there were more significant decreases or increases in scores, and where there was greatest improvement made over the past year.

Overall, this evaluation shows improvement in three of the four areas of the Board Survey, as evidenced by the following increase in Grand Total average scores. Notably, the Governance Structure & Policies section experienced an overall increase of .2 points. The overall total score in the section on Goal-Setting and Communications stayed consistent at 3.9 compared to last year, which is lower than the overall total score in the other three areas. Although the Board did improve on several individual statements described below in the Goal-Setting and Communications area; the Board may want to continue focusing on this area overall for continued improvement in the new year.

Area for Evaluation	2017-18 Total Score	2018-19 Total Score
Governance Structure & Policies	4.0	4.2
Board Member Interactions and Meeting Activities	4.0	4.1
Goal-Setting and Communications	3.9	3.9
Board's Interactions with Management	4.0	4.1

Highlighted below are evaluation statements that demonstrate more significant decreases or increases (0.3 points or higher) in comparison to the 2017-18 Board Self- Evaluation Survey.

### *Areas for Improvement*

This evaluation surfaced very few notable areas for improvement. Overall in the evaluation, only 8 out of 40 statements saw a score decrease compared to last year’s ratings. Almost all decreases were very modest, with a point decrease of .2 points or lower. There could be several reasons for these decreases, such as heightened Board expectations, new members joining the Board, or the selection of the “Neutral” rating for statements regarding behaviors not observed. For the one statement in the Board Member Interactions and Meeting Activities area below that saw a significant point decrease of .5, selection of the “Neutral” rating appears to be the primary reason for the significant decrease. Comments provided by several Board members indicated that they marked “Neutral” because they had not observed such behavior and therefore could not assess the statement. The Board can further assess whether this is truly an area for improvement.

#### Governance Structure and Policies

There were no statements within the Governance Structure and Policies area of the evaluation in which the average score decreased by .3 points or higher.

#### Board Member Interactions and Meeting Activities

Statement	2014-15	2015-16	2017-18	2018-19
The Board effectively manages Board members who fail to act in accordance with policies.			4.0	3.5

#### Goal Setting and Communications

There were no statements within the Goal Setting and Communications area of the evaluation in which the average score decreased by .3 points or higher.

#### Board’s Interactions with Management

There were no statements within the Board’s Interactions with Management area of the evaluation in which the average score decreased by .3 points or higher.

### *Improvements in Areas of Possible Concern or Focus Highlighted in the 2017-18 Evaluation*

Listed below are areas noted in last year’s evaluation as areas of possible concern or focus. The 2019 evaluation shows there was improvement in almost all of these areas as evidenced by score increases in all statements below, except the statement under the Board’s Interactions with Management. These score increases indicate that the Board’s efforts this past year to improve in these areas have had a positive impact. To further improve, the Board can focus on its role in ensuring that Management has the necessary financial and human resources to achieve the organization’s goals.

**Governance Structure and Policies**

Statement	2014-15	2015-16	2017-18	2018-19
The Board orientation program met your expectations.		3.8	3.2	3.7
The Board's continuing education program equips its members with the knowledge they need to be effective.	3.0	3.8	3.5	3.6

**Board Member Interactions and Meeting Activities**

Statement	2014-15	2015-16	2017-18	2018-19
Board members are adequately prepared for meetings.		4.2	3.7	3.9
The Board takes timely action to resolve problems when they arise.		4.2	3.8	4.3
The Board carefully deliberates before taking action.		4.2	3.8	4.3

**Goal Setting and Communications**

Statement	2014-15	2015-16	2017-18	2018-19
The Board establishes suitable goals for Member Services.		4.2	3.8	4.0
The Board communicates effectively to Plan members.	4.1	4.0	3.7	3.9
The Board communicates effectively to The City.	4.1	4.2	3.6	3.7

**Board's Interactions with Management**

Statement	2014-15	2015-16	2017-18	2018-19
The Board ensures management has the necessary financial and human resources to achieve the organization's goals.	3.9	4.3	4.0	3.9

*Summary of Areas that Showed the Most Significant Score Increases*

The evaluation showed significant score increases (.3 point increase or higher) for 7 statements throughout the evaluation. The statements that showed the greatest score increases are listed below:

**Governance Structure and Policies**

Statement	2014-15	2015-16	2017-18	2018-19
The Board orientation program met your expectations.			3.2	3.7

**Board Member Interactions and Meeting Activities**

Statement	2014-15	2015-16	2017-18	2018-19
The Board takes timely action to resolve problems when they arise.			3.8	4.3
The Board carefully deliberates before taking action.			3.8	4.3

**Goal Setting and Communications**

Statement	2014-15	2015-16	2017-18	2018-19
The Board communicates with one voice to all parties.			3.8	4.14

Board’s Interactions with Management

Statement	2014-15	2015-16	2017-18	2018-19
The Board provides sound advice to management.			3.8	4.14
The Board provides valuable alternative points of view to management.			3.8	4.14
The Board effectively evaluates the Executive Director’s performance.			3.8	4.14

## Results of Board Performance Evaluation

### *Evaluation of Governance Structure & Policies*

The majority of statements (5 out of 7) in this area received 85% to 100% of “Agree” or “Strongly Agree.” 50% of Commissioners agreed or strongly agreed that the Board’s orientation program met their expectations, which represents a significant increase from only 20% who agreed with this statement last year. Based on comments provided, ratings for this statement about Board orientation varied depending on whether a Board member was new to the Board, or whether a Board Member has been on the Board for a few years. According to one Board member: “As a new Board member, I found the onboarding/orientation program combined with the manual particularly comprehensive, adequate, and thorough.” On the other hand, some of the longer standing Board members commented, “I am a long time member of the Board and not sure if the present orientation program is adequate.” Another Board member indicated, “I have not seen or been a part of the Board Orientation process since I joined the Board some years ago.” The Board may want to consider offering a Board Orientation “refresher” for longstanding members of the Board who may not benefit from the current Board Orientation offered to new Board members.

Notably, 71.4% of Board members indicated agreement regarding the statement that the Board’s continuing education program equips its members with the knowledge they need to be effective, which is a significant increase from 40% of Board members who indicated agreement with this statement last year. One Board member commended efforts by the Executive Director’s Office to share continuing education opportunities with the Board: “...I have been impressed with outreach from the Executive Director’s office identifying relevant conferences and other learning opportunities to increase knowledge of matters related to the scope of the Board’s responsibilities.” Although the majority of Board members agreed with this statement, 14.3% or one Board member disagreed with this statement.

The following table shows the breakdown of levels of agreement with an average of 4.2 out of a possible 5 points for the Evaluation of the Board’s Governance Structure & Policies. The 4.2 points represents an increase from 4.0 points in the 2017-18 Evaluation.

**Table 1: Evaluation of Governance Structure and Policies**

Statement	Strongly					Average Score
	Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	
The Board has clearly defined the roles of all key parties.				57.1%	42.9%	4.4
The roles that the Board has assigned to key parties match the expertise or experience of those parties.				57.1%	42.9%	4.4
The Board orientation program met your expectations.			50.0%	33.3%	16.7%	3.8
The Board's continuing education program equips its members with the knowledge they need to be effective.		14.3%	14.3%	71.4%	0.0%	3.7
The Board has developed a comprehensive Board policy framework or manual.			14.3%	28.6%	57.1%	4.4
The Board receives the information and reports that are necessary to carry out its duties.				57.1%	42.9%	4.4
Board meeting agendas adequately reflect policy matters that are consistent with the Board's role.				57.1%	42.9%	4.4
<b>Grand Total</b>						<b>4.2</b>

*Board Member Interactions and Meeting Activities*

The majority of statements (10 out of 12) in this area received 85% to 100% of “Agree” or “Strongly Agree.” Scores increased from last year in 7 of the 12 areas, with notable growth in two areas: “The Board takes timely action to resolve problems when they arise,” and “The Board carefully deliberates before taking action.” In both these areas, the scores increased by .5 points, from 3.8 last year to 4.3 this year. Notably, only 33% of Board members agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that the Board effectively manages Board members who fail to act in accordance with policies, while almost 67% felt neutral about this statement. This represents a noticeable drop from 4 points last year to 3.5 points this year for this statement. Additionally, 71% of Board members agreed or strongly agreed that disagreements between board members are handled professionally, while almost 29% felt neutral about this statement, representing a drop from 4.2 points last year to 4 points this year.

In reviewing comments provided, several Board members indicated a neutral rating for these statements because they have not observed instances in which Board members failed to adhere to Board policies, nor instances of disagreement between Board members. They did not feel they could assess these statements and rated the statements with a neutral score, lowering the overall points for these statements. One Board member commented about positive interactions between Board members, “I have personally observed... the Board strictly adhering to its policies and Board members consistently treating one another with courtesy and respect.”

14.3% of Board members expressed disagreement with three statements: “The Board focuses on policy and strategy in addition to operations”; “Board members understand when it is appropriate to act in a fiduciary or stakeholder role”; and “All board members adequately contribute to discussions and deliberations.” Comments from one Board member provided insight on these ratings: “Board meetings are a series of decisions that must be made. There has been no opportunity to discuss strategies, nor have we been invited into discussing strategies.” Additionally, “More seasoned members speak up more.” Based on this feedback, the Board may want to consider creating more opportunities for Board members to engage in strategic planning with Management, and also actively encourage newer Board members to share their ideas and perspectives.

The following table shows the breakdown of levels of agreement with an overall average of 4.1 out of a possible 5 points for the Evaluation of the Board Member Interactions and Meeting Activities. This is a slight increase from the overall average of 4.0 points in the 2017-18 Board Survey in this category.

**Table 2: Evaluation of Board Member Interactions & Meeting Activities**

Statement	Strongly					Average Score
	Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	
Board members are adequately prepared for meetings.			14.3%	85.7%	0.0%	3.9
Board meetings are well-organized.				85.7%	14.3%	4.1
The Board focuses on policy and strategy in addition to operations.		14.3%		42.9%	42.9%	4.1
Board members understand when it is appropriate to act in a fiduciary or stakeholder role.		14.3%		42.6%	42.9%	4.1
All board members adequately contribute to discussions and deliberations.		14.3%		71.4%	14.3%	3.9
Board members are respectful of each other's ideas and opinions.				71.4%	28.6%	4.3
Disagreements between Board members are handled professionally.			28.7%	42.9%	28.6%	4.0
The Board routinely adheres to its own policies.				57.1%	42.9%	4.4
The Board effectively manages Board members who fail to act in accordance with policies.			66.7%	16.7%	16.7%	3.5
Board members accept the decisions of the Board, even if they did not vote in favor of them.			14.3%	57.1%	28.6%	4.1
The Board takes timely action to resolve problems when they arise.				71.4%	28.6%	4.3
The Board carefully deliberates before taking action.				71.4%	28.6%	4.3
<b>Grand Total</b>						<b>4.1</b>

### Evaluation of Goal-Setting and Communications

All 9 statements in the Goal-Setting and Communications area received over 85% of scores in the “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” ratings, with 100% of Board members unanimously agreeing that the Board communicates effectively to service providers. Compared to last year’s ratings, the scores increased in 6 of the 9 areas in this area, with the greatest increase of .3 points from 3.8 to 4.14 points for the statement, “The Board communicates with one voice to all parties.” Comments were positive about the Board’s communication: “The Board is consistently unified and transparent with its goals, objectives, stakeholder and member outreach, staff relationships, interaction with the City, and communication with service providers.” One Commissioner acknowledged that communication with all stakeholders is a critical board function and suggested, “We need a mechanism to find out how well we are doing from some of these Stakeholders.”

14.3% of Board members expressed disagreement with two statements: “The Board establishes suitable goals for the investment program,” and “The Board communicates effectively to the City.” Comments provide insights on these ratings, as one Board member commented: “We get recommendations from the director and generally agree with recommendations. But I have not yet observed the Board actively providing direction. There has been no discussions about investment goals.”

The following table shows the breakdown of levels of agreement with an average of 3.9 out of a possible 5 points for the Evaluation of Goal-Setting and Communications. The 3.9 overall score is the same as the 2017-18 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 suitable goals for the organization as a whole.			14.3%	71.4%	14.3%	4.0
The Board establishes suitable goals for the investment program.		14.3%		71.4%	14.3%	3.9
The Board establishes suitable goals for Member Services.			14.3%	71.4%	14.3%	4.0
The Board communicates effectively to Plan members.			14.3%	85.7%		3.9
The Board communicates effectively to staff.			14.3%	85.7%		3.9
The Board communicates effectively to service providers.				100%		4.0
The Board communicates effectively to The City.		14.3%		85.7%		3.7
The Board communicates with one voice to all parties.			14.3%	57.1%	28.6%	4.1
The Board instills trust among stakeholders.			14.3%	85.7%		3.9
<b>Grand Total</b>						<b>3.9</b>



### Evaluation of Board’s Interactions with Management

The Board overwhelmingly felt positive about its interactions with Management. The majority of statements (7 out of 9) in this area received 85% to 100% of “Agree” or “Strongly Agree,” with 5 of these statements receiving 100% agreement. 14.3% of Board members disagreed with the following statement, “The Board ensures management has the necessary financial and human resources to achieve the organization’s goals.” One comment expressed the sentiment that the Board receives reports of what is happening with recruitments and vacancies, but the Board has not taken an active role in ensuring adequate resources.

Noticeably, 50% of Board members provided a neutral rating for the statement, “Where feasible, the Board engages in effective management succession planning.” Once Board member acknowledged that the Board has not engaged in succession planning, but should: “We have not addressed Senior Management Succession planning with the Executive Director or as a Board. We need to do so.”

Scores increased from last year for 6 statements, with scores increasing from 3.18 points last year to 4.1 points this year for the following three statements: “The Board effectively evaluates the Executive Director’s performance”; “The Board provides valuable alternative points of view to management”; and “The Board provides sound advice to management.”

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 total score is slightly higher than the 4.0 average total score indicated in the 2017-18 Board Survey in this category.

**Table 4: Evaluation of Board’s Interactions with Management**

Statement	Strongly					Average Score
	Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	
The Board provides sound advice to management.				85.7%	14.3%	4.1
The Board challenges management in a constructive manner.				85.7%	14.3%	4.1
The Board provides valuable alternative points of view to management.				85.7%	14.3%	4.1
The Board ensures management has the necessary financial and human resources to achieve the organization's goals.		14.3%	14.3%	42.9%	28.6%	3.9
The Board creates an atmosphere in which management's ideas are genuinely welcome.				57.1%	42.9%	4.4
The Board effectively evaluates the Executive Director's performance.			14.3%	57.1%	28.6%	4.1
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.			50.0%	33.3%	16.7%	3.7
The Board members are respectful of the opinions expressed by staff and management.				57.1%	42.9%	4.4
<b>Grand Total</b>						<b>4.1</b>

In conclusion, although no outstanding issues surfaced from this evaluation, the Board can continue to improve by focusing on areas including: succession planning, strategic planning and goal-setting discussions, partnering with Management to ensure adequate financial and human resources to achieve the organization's goals, Board orientation for more longstanding Board members, and encouragement to newer Board members to share their perspectives aloud.

The Board's progress in a number of areas that were highlighted in the 2017-18 evaluation for improvement should be commended.