

Ohio Partners for Cancer Control

2017 Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory & Membership Survey



Survey responses indicate that the OPCC collaboration is strong: average scores for 12 out of 20 factors were 4.0 or higher. Sufficient resources lagged behind with a 2.8 average, but overall, scores remained mostly consistent with those from 2016 and 2015 surveys.



In general, respondents with higher levels of engagement also reported longer histories of OPCC membership.

This survey was administered in-person & online in March 2017. For all charts, N = 38 respondents.

Prepared by Professional Data Analysts, April 2017.

Organizational representation



Roles at member organizations



27% of respondents strongly disagreed or disagreed that each OPCC decision-maker can speak for the entire organization they represent, not just a part. An equal number of respondents had no opinion, the majority of whom have been involved with OPCC for 5+ years. **40%** of respondents strongly disagreed or disagreed that all the organizations the OPCC needs to be members are represented in the group.

This viewpoint was held consistently by respondents from all engagement levels and years of membership.

Recommendations

- Clearly communicate OPCC funding structures and parameters to membership.
- Intentionally recruit new OPCC members from Ohio regions outside the immediate Columbus area to encourage balanced geographic representation.
- Share the 2015-2020 Cancer Plan more proactively and strategically with relevant stakeholders across the state.
- Create structured data collection processes to track ongoing committee progress toward Cancer Plan objectives.
- Offer ways for members to get involved beyond priority area work, including a reinstated data committee, events and conferences, and related advocacy opportunities.

36% of respondents strongly disagreed or disagreed that OPCC has adequate funds to do what it wants to accomplish.

Prepared by Professional Data Analysts, April 2017.