

HPHA Board of Directors - Meeting Evaluation - June 2025

The broad focus of the meeting was:

	Operational		2		3		4		Strategic		Total	Weighted Average
1	11.11%	1	0.00%	0	33.33%	3	55.56%	5	0.00%	0	9	3.33

The meeting structure allowed for:

	Limited Participation		2	3	4	Full Participation		Total	Weighted Average			
1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	11.11%	1	33.33%	3	55.56%	5	9	4.44

The materials provided were:

	Too late for review		2	3	4	In time for review		Total	Weighted Average			
1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	11.11%	1	22.22%	2	66.67%	6	9	4.56

The materials provided for the meeting were:

	Confusing	2	3	4	Informative	Total	Weighted Average			
1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	11.11%	1	88.89%	8	9	4.89

The issues covered were:

	Not very important		2	3	4	Very Important		Total	Weighted Average
1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	100.00%	9	5

The time given to all agenda items was:

	Inadequate		2		3		4		Adequate		Total	Weighted Average
1	0.00%	0	11.11%	1	0.00%	0	22.22%	2	66.67%	6	9	4.44

Opportunities for improvement were:

	Identified	2	3	4		Not identified	Total	Weighted Average				
1	55.56%	5	33.33%	3	11.11%	1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	9	1.56

Action plans from the previous meeting were:

	Reviewed	2	3	4		Not reviewed	Total	Weighted Average				
1	55.56%	5	33.33%	3	11.11%	1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	9	1.56

Board members came to the meeting prepared to meaningfully contribute to discussions about the agenda items within their area(s) of expertise.

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		Total	Weighted Average
1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	55.56%	5	44.44%	4	9	4.44

Individual board members asked questions and provided meaningful input on agenda items within their area(s) of expertise.

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		Total	Weighted Average
1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	44.44%	4	55.56%	5	9	4.56

I came to the meeting prepared, and contributed in a meaningful way to the discussion on agenda items within my area(s) of expertise.

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		Total	Weighted Average
1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	55.56%	5	44.44%	4	9	4.44

The Board Chair led an effective and efficient board meeting.

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		Total	Weighted Average
1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	11.11%	1	55.56%	5	33.33%	3	9	4.22

The Board's treatment of all persons was courteous, dignified and fair.

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		Total	Weighted Average
1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	33.33%	3	66.67%	6	9	4.67

What was most helpful for you at this board meeting (or board development session)?

- Financial review Discussion on ER future
- The emergency dept discussion
- Updates on responses from MPPs, discussion of cyber security
- The discussion concerning CPH. It showed that the Board wants to focus on discussing items of strategic importance.
- The robust discussion surrounding ERs was very timely and thorough. Also, the tour of the lab facility in advance of the meeting was fantastic and brings the mission to reality of 'what we do' for the community.
- Clinton ED options; Budget challenges
- discussion on the future of Clinton ED

What was least helpful for you at this board meeting (or board development session)?

- Commitments to our community

All was helpful

All agenda items were helpful and important

As Chair, not being physically at the meeting made it hard to encourage participation from all Board members.

What expectations do you have for future meetings?

Continued review of financial

Continued discussions to strategically move us forward

Discuss the ways in which board members can best provide meaningful governance in the areas of cybersecurity, partnerships, and quality; and refresh of Commitments to Our Communities.

That the agenda is not overpacked, which ends up giving short shrift to items placed at the end of the agenda.

General comments:

Obviously, more time should have been allocated in the agenda for the CPH discussion. The Commitments to our Communities update should be near the top of the agenda, not the very bottom.

Leading a hybrid board meeting with the chair on zoom is not ideal. While the chair did an admirable job with this task, I would suggest that we consider it be a 'best practise' for someone in the physical room to chair the meeting should that situation occur again in the future.

Patient Experience & Engagement Report - The report that Jim Battle provides is SO very important. I look forward to the patient stories (and their learning opportunities) provided at both the Board and Committee level. Personally, Jim's report (and the stories) help ground my decision making.

I appreciate the depth of discussion as we contemplate options to ensure that the Board's role in the commitment to people-centred care isn't relegated to "stories". I'm confident that this organization, with input from our patient partners, will find a new and innovative way to have meaningful Board involvement.