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1. Process evaluation of project activities

1.1 Evaluation of Kick-off Meeting in Luxembourg, 6th – 7th May 2013

Prepared by: Matej Košir, UTRIP

Evaluation of the kick-off meeting (Luxembourg, 6th – 7th of May 2013)

The evaluation questionnaire was developed online and members of the Steering Committee were asked by email after the meeting to fulfil the questionnaire. It contained nine items for rating and four open answers. The participants of the Steering Committee had possibility to fulfil the questionnaire online (no paper work and postal costs).

Sample

7 members of the Steering Committee among 9 answered the questionnaire. The number of feedbacks is N=7 (77,8%).

Ranking of satisfaction with and outcome of the meeting

The participants' satisfaction with the kick-off meeting in general (M=4,29; range from 1: “Don't agree” to 5: “Totally agree”) and especially with the organisational matters (M=3,86) was very high as well as satisfaction with the results of the meeting (M=4,43).

The information in the forefront of the meeting was rated as sufficient (M=3,57). The participants gained orientation about all work packages (M= 4,86) and about the next steps of the work process (M=4,57). The members felt involved in the group and the work process (M=4,71). Organisational proceeding of the project was pretty clear to all (M=4,29) and the financial proceeding of the project was clear to most of participants (M=3,86).

Detailed results of each item are listed in the appendix.
Open answers

Beside the questions with the given categories, the participants could do further annotations. There have been four questions:

- comments concerning coordination
- what was good at the meeting
- what should be enhanced at further meetings
- further comments

The participants made use of this opportunity. In the following we will give an overview of the participants’ statements. You find the annotations in details in the appendix.

Comments concerning coordination
Just two participants have commented here. One said that the location was not ideal. This person also mentioned that for the next meeting participants would like to know the date and place of meeting earlier. The financial discussion and questions about the finances for the EC should NOT take place during the kick-off meeting. The other comment was that project is very complex, so it should be great to have figure from kick-off meeting in e-version.

**Say it in your own words: what was good at the meeting?**

Four participants have answered this question. All of them exposed that it is good to see other work package coordinators and begin the project with people that are great team, and that they could hear about others ideas.

**What didn’t suit you? What should be enhanced at further meetings?**

Four participants have answered this question. Two of them suggested better agenda and time management, and better coordination about assignments of the participants for the meeting. One of them has suggested that the coordinators of the work packages should stay present at the meetings all the time. One suggested different place for the meeting.

**Further comments**

There were two comments; one of respondents is looking forward to see others on the next meeting, the second commented that this project has very ambitious goals.

**Conclusion**

All in all, the kick-off meeting in Luxembourg was assessed as successful. The participants got benefit from getting in contact and exchanging about work packages. It seems to be useful to be more precise about the agenda and time management of the further meetings, and to be more precise in picking the right place for meeting, because there were several negative opinions. In total, the members of the Steering Committee assessed kick-off meeting as successful.
Appendix: Detailed results of ratings

Figure 2: In total, I was satisfied with the meeting; N=7

Figure 3: I was satisfied with the organisation of the meeting; N=7
Figure 4: The information in the forefront of the meeting was sufficient; N=7

Figure 5: I gained orientation what all the work packages will be about; N=7
Figure 6: I’m oriented concerning the next steps of the work process; N=7

Figure 7: I feel involved in the project and the work process; N=7
Figure 8: Organisational proceeding of the project is clear to me; N=7

![Bar graph showing the distribution of responses.]

Figure 9: Financial proceeding of the project is clear to me; N=7

![Bar graph showing the distribution of responses.]

Detailed open answers

Table 1: “Comments concerning coordination” (N=2)
The location was not ideal. For the next meeting we would like to know the date and place of the meetings more early. I think also the time-management of the meeting could be more sufficient. The financial discussion and questions about the finances for the EC should NOT take place during the kick-off meeting. This is a waste of time for the partners. Project is very complex, so it should be great to have figure from kick-off meeting in e-version (structure of the project).

Table 2: “Say it in your own words: What was good at the meeting?” (N=4)

Just to see each other and knowing what the project will be about. And making concrete appointments is really good. That we had at least one day the possibility to sit together with all work package coordinators and hear about other ideas. It was a good opportunity to get useful tips from the beginning of the project and make a clear view of the whole project process. Great team of “old” friends.

Table 3: “What didn’t suit you? What should be enhanced at further meetings?” (N=4)

Better agenda and time management. I think it is maybe a good idea to give everybody, before the meeting, some assignments. So everybody is really involved during the meeting (and not sending e-mails or something else during the meeting). The coordinators of the work packages should stay present at the meetings all the time. Setting the final date and place with a little less confusion and more in advance. EAHC facilities are not so great place for project meetings.

Table 4: “Further comments” (N=2)

Thank you for organising the kick-off meeting. See you next time! Great project with very ambitious goals.
1.2 Evaluation of the collaborative partners’ meeting in Bursa (16th – 18th May 2013)

Prepared by: Matej Košir, UTRIP

Evaluation of the meeting in Bursa, 16th – 18th May 2013

The evaluation questionnaire was developed online and the members of Let it hAPYN! project network (associated and collaborating partners) were asked to fulfil the questionnaire after the meeting. It contained 18 items for rating and four open answers. The participants had possibility to fulfil the questionnaire online (no paper work and no postal costs).

Sample

16 members of the project network among 18 answered the questionnaire. The number of feedbacks is N=16 (88,9 %).

Ranking of satisfaction with and outcome of the meeting

The participants’ satisfaction with the meeting in general (M= 4,25; range from 1: “Don't agree” to 5: “Totally agree”) and especially with the organisational matters (M=4,56) was very high, as well as satisfaction with the results of the meeting (M=4,19). The information in the forefront of the meeting was rated as sufficient (M=3,75). The participants gained orientation about all work packages (M=4,19) and a bit less about the next steps of the work process (M=3,75).

The members felt quite involved in the group and the work process (M=3,81). Organisational proceeding of the project was pretty clear to all (M=3,75) and the financial proceeding of the project was clear to most of participants (M= 3,94).

Detailed results of each item are listed in the appendix.
Figure 10: Rating of satisfaction and outcome (N=16)

Rating items and activities

The participants’ satisfaction with meeting venue was very good (M=4,88; range from 1: “Don’t agree” to 5: “Totally agree”). They were also very satisfied with the food (M=4,88). Also location was not a problem if we look at the ratings (M=4,81). Accommodation was also rated high (M=4,50).

On Friday morning, there was consultation on alcohol policy and the satisfaction of participants with it was very high (M=4,37). Also satisfaction with Let it hAPYN! project presentation was very good (M=4,25).

Other participants were also highly ranked (M=4,06). Presentation and revision of the strategic plan on Saturday afternoon was also ranked rather good (M=3,94), in comparison with consultation on Friday it was ranked a bit worse. And
General Assembly of APYN was ranked as good (M=3.81) too.

**Figure 11: Rating items and activities**

![Bar chart showing ratings for various activities.]

### Open answers

Beside the questions with the given categories, the participants could do further annotations. There have been four questions:

- comments concerning coordination
- what was good at the meeting
- what should be enhanced at further meetings
- further comments

The participants made use of this opportunity. In the following we will give an overview of the participants’ statements. You find the annotations in details in the appendix.

*Comments concerning coordination*
Just one participant has comment here, that it is great place for project meeting and nice people.

Say it in your own words: what was good at the meeting?

9 participants answered to this question. Two of them were very thrilled with the presentation of the project. One mentioned that the networking part was good. Most of them mentioned meeting the people with common goal and exchange of best practices. Two of them think that the international (rather than only European) environment is good for the meeting. There were positive opinion on location and atmosphere for meeting.

What didn’t suit you? What should be enhanced at further meetings?

8 participants answered that question. Most of them suggested more organised meeting and to have some rules that everyone knows what to do. More interactivity was suggested in order to get to know other participants better. They suggested more specific role for partners. There is too much discussion. One of them suggested that all the documents should be delivered in advance, that they have enough time to arrange everything. About location one participant mentioned, that it was not good, that it was a bit far from Istanbul airport.

Further comments

Two participants answered this question. One of them was very proud on Enes, second is waiting to go again on the meeting in Bursa.

Conclusion

All in all, the meeting in Bursa was assessed as successful. The participants got benefit from getting in contact and exchanging about work packages. It seems to be useful, to be more precise about the agenda and time management of the further meetings, and to deliver documents to participants in advance. In total, the members of the steering committee assess the meeting as very successful.
Appendix

Detailed results of ratings

**Figure 12:** In total, I was satisfied with the meeting; N=16

![Bar chart](chart12.png)

**Figure 13:** I was satisfied with the organisation of the meeting; N=16

![Bar chart](chart13.png)
Figure 14: The information in the forefront of the meeting was sufficient; N=16

Figure 15: I was satisfied with the results of the meeting; N=16
Figure 16: I gained orientation what all the work packages will be about; N=16

![Bar chart showing the distribution of responses to the statement regarding gaining orientation about work packages.]

Figure 17: I'm oriented concerning the next steps of the work process; N=16

![Bar chart showing the distribution of responses to the statement regarding orientation about the next steps of the work process.]
Figure 18: I feel involved in the project and the work process; N=16

Figure 19: Organisational proceeding of the project is clear to me; N=16
Figure 20: Financial proceeding of the project is clear to me; N=16

Figure 21: Accommodation
Figure 22: Food

Figure 23: Location (Bursa, Turkey)
Figure 24: Meeting venue

Figure 25: Let it hAPYN1 project presentation (Thursday)
Figure 26: Consultation on alcohol policy (Friday morning)

![Bar chart showing ratings for consultation on alcohol policy.]

Very poor (1) Poor (2) Average (3) Good (4) Very good (5)

Figure 27: General assembly of APYN (Friday afternoon – Saturday morning)

![Bar chart showing ratings for general assembly of APYN.]

Very poor (1) Poor (2) Average (3) Good (4) Very good (5)
**Figure 28: Presentation and revision of strategic plan (Saturday afternoon)**

![Bar chart showing feedback on coordination]

**Figure 29: Other participants**

![Bar chart showing feedback on meeting effectiveness]

**Detailed open answers**

**Table 1: “Comments concerning coordination” (N=1)**

Great place for project meeting and nice people :-)  

**Table 2: “Say it in your own words: What was good at the meeting?” (N=9)**
• The networking part.
• Meeting new people, presentation of the project.
• Presentation of the Let it hAPYN! project was good.
• The general involvement of all the participants for the common goal.
• The international environment, the exchange of best practices.
• Meeting in Bursa municipality.
• It was a better GA than last year, so the progress of APYN was visible.
• Atmosphere, people, the place.
• The municipality of Bursa was very welcoming. It was great to meet all local and national stakeholders at the meeting.
• Great commitment from authorities for alcohol policy.

Table 3: “What didn’t suit you? What should be enhanced at further meetings?” (N=8)

• General Assembly should be organised and led by some rules.
• More interactivity in order to get to know other participants better - not clear what is the role of all other partners
• The process about voting etc. must be clear. There is too much discussion about how things need to be done.
• All the documents should be delivered in advance and there should be a clear and structured agenda of the meeting (especially GA) as it will certainly help on the efficacy and efficiency of the meeting. Standing Orders would be a great plus and would help all the intervenient.
• All was great!
• I think persons who come only to play mobile phones shouldn’t be present at such events.
• General Assembly proceedings.
• It was a bit far from Istanbul and airport.

Table 4: "Further comments” (N=2)

• Congrats to Enes!
• Would be great to go back to Bursa …
1.3 Evaluation of the event »Empowering youth organisations working on the field of alcohol across Europe«

Prepared by: Daša Kokole, APYN

Collection of the data

The evaluation of the event »Empowering youth organisations working on the field of alcohol across Europe«, during which »Training on evidence based interventions«, »Training on youth research and law enforcement« and »Training on alcohol policy and national consultations« took place, consisted of two parts:

a) At the end of the event, a printed questionnaire was handed out to the remaining participants, asking them about general impressions of the event. 39 participants (out of 42) filled in the questionnaire.

b) Approximately month and a half after the event took place (in the second half of October 2014), additional web survey was sent out over e-mail to all of the participants. The survey aimed at getting more in depth information on participant experiences and also see if there has been any follow up after the event already. 18 participants took part in this survey.

Results

1. Questionnaire (N=39)

The questionnaire primary aim was to gather impressions of the event while they were still fresh and was for that reason handed out right after the event ended.

Participants were first given to rate various aspects of training based on how they felt about it with 1 meaning most negative and 5 most positive.

First, their ratings concerning logistical matters are shown. From the Figure 1 it can be seen that participants were most highly satisfied with the location of the training (Amsterdam), as well as with organisers and other participants. Things with participants on average felt mostly negative about were food, accomodation and amount of free time.
Next, the participants were asked further questions about opinion of the content of the event with the response scale being same as before. From the figure below it can be seen participants were generally satisfied with different parts of the programme and thought they learned quite a lot on the event.

Since there were three trainings taking place parallely for the two days of the event, we also divided their satisfaction with trainings in three groups, based on the training they participated in:
- 17 respondents were taking part of the Training on the evidence based interventions, their average rating of this training was 4.0
- 9 respondents were taking part of the Training on the youth research and law enforcement, their average rating of this training was 3.9
- 10 respondents were taking part in the Training on alcohol policy and national consultations, their average rating of this training was 4.5
- 3 respondents did not indicate which training they attended and their results were not taken into consideration in this part of the analysis

**Figure 3:** Satisfaction with different trainings

From the figure above it can be seen that the participants gave highest ratings to the National consultations training, second highest to Evidence based interventions training and then after that Youth research and law enforcement training.

In the end, respondents were asked to rate their interest in working on topics related to alcohol before they participated in this event and at this point at the end of the event.

**Figure 4:** Indications of interest for working on the topics related to alcohol before and after the event
From the figure above, it can be seen that the interest in working on topic related to alcohol has increased to a great extent after the event compared to before it.

Also individual participants and their indications of change were taken into account. The analysis showed that 3% of participants became less interested after the training, 33% of participants had no change in interest (out of those, all but one had indicated highest rating before and after anyway) and 64% of the participants became more interested in working on topics related to alcohol.

2. *Web survey (N=18)*

In order to further explore participants’ opinions and gather greater insight into areas to improve, as well as to give the participants opportunity for self-reflection and comment on follow up after the training, a second survey was sent out over e-mail.

When the respondents were asked to rate their general level of satisfaction with the event on a scale from 0 to 100%, the average answer was 72.8%.

As best parts of the training, participants mentioned the following:

- Participants (coming from different backgrounds, open-minded, hardworking, creative)
- Working groups/workshops/trainings (focused on the certain topic participants have been interested in the most) and sharing the ideas with other groups.
- In general sharing experiences with others and exchanging ideas
- Training duration and time.
- Location (Amsterdam)
- Speakers and organizers
- Getting new ideas to implement in the organisations

The main learning points of the participants were:

- Different experiences around Europe and the similarities in them
- Advocacy training
- New possible ideas for projects
- Base for further development in the topic
- More about the alcohol abuse problem
- About importance of multi-sector approach to prevention and importance of changing environment
- Alcohol policy in general
- Contacts from other countries
- About current situation on the field of alcohol and what organisations are doing

The bad points of the event were:

- Substandard lodging and the food provided for lunch
- Not that much use of non-formal education as expected, at times the approach was too formal
- Certain situations in certain countries weren’t taken into consideration when it comes to information presented in the workshops. Certain methods were only relevant to certain countries,
- Not enough time for the training (to work more on the project development)
- More European examples on the first day rather than just Dutch examples
- Not enough new things to learn

The participants also thought that the next time the following this could be improved

- It is important all trainers for all workshops have the same mind set when it comes to the goals of the training and that they are all working towards achieving them
- Workshops being more interactive
- Practical things (venue, food, hotel)
- More free time
- The training could be done in even smaller groups and for different levels of participants (beginner, advanced)
- More time for preparation and research
- The training could be longer
- Adapt the information so participants from different professional backgrounds would be able to relate it to their own field

Participants were also asked from which areas of the programme they felt they gained the most and the greatest number of participants said that they got the most out of the discussions and interactions with other participants.
Figure 5: Areas from which the participants gained the most during the training

Additionally, they were asked to reflect on their own contribution to the training – how do they feel they performed in certain areas.

![Pie chart showing the distribution of areas participants gained the most from]  

- Workshops: 28%
- Discussions and interactions with other participants: 61%
- Presentations from speakers: 11%

Figure 6: Participants ratings of their own contributions to the training

Certain questions about the follow up of the training were asked as well and as it can be seen from the table below, 61% of the respondents made some specific plans as result of the training and 50% also made any kind of action in respect to that after the training.

Also, big majority of the participants is interested in participating in the future events and recommend them to others, as well as interested in the future collaboration with the Let it hAPYN consortium.
Table 1

*Follow up intentions of the participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intention</th>
<th>% of answer &quot;Yes&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Made any specific plans as result of the training</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made an action in relation to the training after they got back</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like to attend another event organised by the project partners</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would recommend others to attend another event organised by the project partners</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would be interested in future collaboration with project partners (eg. projects) on the level of their organisation</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions and recommendations

Generally, the satisfaction with event as a whole was rather high, with points towards certain improvements:

- Participants really liked the location of the training (Amsterdam), but were less satisfied with the hostel, venue and certain food options during the training. Since attractive location means also greater expenses for quality accommodation in food (within limited budget of the project), for the future it should be taken into account that with the limited budget in these kind of projects we can either have an attractive location and less attractive accommodation and food, or give that up in order to have a less familiar, but cheaper location, so the return for the money invested on accommodation and food will be higher.

- There were some comments on importance of non-formal education and not having too much lectures – this should be taken into account for the future events in order to prepare the methods well in advance and make sure the methods are youth friendly.

- These kind of events have a great potential for engaging young people and making them interested in working on the alcohol field; and it shouldn't be forgotten that what participants get great motivation out of, are also the other participants from different background and possibility to share experiences from various European countries, so wide representation of young people from all across Europe should be assured.
1.4 2nd European Alcohol Policy Youth Conference Evaluation

Prepared by: Rok Primožič, APYN

Summary

The general level of satisfaction with the 2nd European Alcohol Policy Youth Conference was very high, as the average level marked by the participants was 85%. The participants were mostly coming from European countries and have not been to APYN events before.

The motivation for participation in the conference was mostly to network with other young people as well as the interest in alcohol policy and alcohol prevention.

Participants were satisfied with the majority of the programme, mentioning especially good organisations, good trainers and interactive work methods. The only complaint made more than once was the need for more free time. Participants stated they have learned from all 3 strands of the programme (project management, advocacy and research), with a joint learning point of the damages alcohol can cause.

The conference will have a positive impact on the alcohol-related activities, as the level of interest to work on this topic has risen for 42%, with all the participants planning at least one follow-up activity. The event was also good for networking, as several participants mentioned the newly-formed partnerships, which they will continue after the conference finishes.

General statistics/demographics:

Out of 150 participants, 54 of them have submitted the final feedback form. Majority have indicated they are coming from Europe (62%). The event was predominantly attended by participants that have not attended any previous APYN activities, as only 13% of them have checked yes on that question. From the participants that have indicated they have attended a previous APYN event, 3 have attended the 1st EAPYc in 2012 in Slovenia and 3 have attended the Let it hAPYN training event in Amsterdam.
Motivation, personal expectations and satisfaction:

The general level of satisfaction with the event was 85%, with only 7 responses below 80% (only 1 mark below 60%). The majority of the participants have estimated their satisfaction with levels between 80% and 90% (29 altogether), and 9 participants have marked it between 95-100%. The median of the marks is also 85.
Majority of participants stated that they applied for the EAPYC because they are interested in alcohol policy and alcohol prevention as well because it would give them an opportunity to network with peers from other countries. More than half of participants have stated that their motivation was interest in campaigning and volunteering and learning more about APYN and its activities, while the topic’s relevance to their work or their studies and recommendations from others was motivation to apply for less than 30% of participants.

Most participants have learned about the event through social media (21) or different websites (14), while others have learned about the event by e-mails from APYN (8) or others (9) as well as because their office has invited them to join.

**Motivation to attend EAPYC (multiple choices allowed):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To learn more about APYN and its activities</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to network with peers from other countries</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation from my office, colleagues of friends</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in campaigning and volunteering</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in alcohol policy and alcohol prevention</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic has direct relevance to my studies</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic has direct relevance to my work</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Motivation to attend EAPYC (multiple choices allowed)](image)

**Figure 3: Motivation to attend EAPYC (multiple choices allowed)**

Other:
- To learn from other youth workers in different regions beyond Africa (1)
- Besides I’m Alcohol Policy Marker (1)
How did you get to know about EAPYC (multiple choices allowed):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Information</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Doctors Worldwide</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFMSA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in Amsterdam</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From a friend</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My office invited me to join</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail received from others</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB/Twitter/other social media</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the websites (apyn.or, salto-youth, heysuccess)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail from APYN</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: How did you get to know about EAPYC (multiple choices allowed)

General level of satisfaction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Nr. of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quality of the programme

The participants were satisfied with the programme, with highest marks for informal introduction, workshops and get-to-know each other activities. The only two parts of the programme with a bit lower average marks were the roots camp and closing plenary. Comments reflect these opinions, mentioning some organisational issues regarding the roots camp (late confirmation and no computer at one of the venues). The closing plenary mostly got lower marks due to the tiredness of participants as well as some complaints about one of the speakers (but could not surmise which one).

For other items, the participants were very satisfied with organisers, trainers, working methods used and cultural programme. The only complaints made were for more free time, as most have noted they were not used to this many sessions and were tired.
Average level of satisfaction with each part of the programme:

![Graph showing average level of satisfaction with each part of the programme](image)

Figure 5: Average level of satisfaction with each part of the programme (on a scale 1-5, 5 is the highest)

Assessment of other items:

![Graph showing assessment of other items](image)

Figure 6: Assessment of other items (scale from Unsatisfactory (1) to Excellent (4))

All marks are between good and excellent, with the exception of free time, which is ranked between fair and good.
Comments: The participants have mostly complained because they were lacking free time, as most of them said they were not used to this and were very tired after the full day of activities. There were several participants that have praised the organisers and have stated that the organisation was very good. Some participants have also commented that the trainers were very good.

**From which areas of the programme did you gain the most?**

As the participants had to choose only one item, most of them have chosen trainers and workshops (32), 21 of them have chosen discussions and interaction with other participants, and 13 have chosen presentations from speakers.

Comments from the participants reflect different views on this, but most of them have praised all 3 areas of the programme. They have stated that the speakers were very experienced and informative, with only one remark that they could have been more interactive. The participants have repeatedly stated that the trainers and facilitators were very good and that they like the interactive methods they have used. A lot of participants have also pointed out that they had a lot of opportunity for getting to know other people and for networking, which was appreciated.

**What are your main learning points out of EAPYC?**

Responses from the participants have reflected different focuses of the sessions they have attended, as some of them pointed out they have mainly learned project development, other that they have familiarised themselves with the research and some that they are now aware of how to plan and implement advocacy actions. A joint learning point, mentioned by the majority of the participants, was the realisation that alcohol can be harmful and that there need to be actions taken (by young people) to address this issue.

**What have you learned about yourself?**

Participants have several times mentioned that they have learned how to work with other people, especially ones coming from different cultures than their own. They also pointed out the realisations regarding alcohol consumption and their own behaviour towards alcohol. Some have commented they realised they will need to improve their English to be able to work in this kind of environment. A
lot of the participants have mentioned they now realise there is a lot to learn still and that they will plan that as a follow-up of the conference.

**What is your general impression of the other participants?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The combination of participants was suitable and constructive.</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The combination of participants was not suitable and constructive.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The professional/intellectual background of the participants was relevant.</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The professional/intellectual background of the participants was not relevant.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 7: General impression of other participants**

**How would you estimate your own contribution?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bringing ideas to the group work</td>
<td>3,32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting other participants</td>
<td>3,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing information and experience</td>
<td>3,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcoming language barriers</td>
<td>3,43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your active participation</td>
<td>3,38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 8: Estimation of own contribution**

**Administration**

Participants were in general quite satisfied with the administration and venues, as can be seen from the Figure below.
Figure 9: Satisfaction with information and venues

Impact

All of the participants have stated that they have made at least one specific plan of action as a result of their attendance. Most have planned for a sharing session in their organisation or university (37) or that they will develop a project (31), while a lower number of participants have planned for advocacy activities (19) or online collaboration (16).

The conference has significantly increased the interest of participants in working on the alcohol related field, as it has increased for 42%. All of the participants also stated that they intend to continue building networks with contacts they made during the event. Most of them (37) intend to build on contacts with people from other regions, while 21 have chosen to continue with contacts in their own country and their own region.

All of the respondents (with 2 answers missing) would recommend others to participate in APYN events.
Have you made any specific plans as a result of EAPYC?

Figure 10: Specific plans as a result of EAPYC

Please rate your interest in working on the alcohol related field before and after the conference:

Figure 11: Changes in the interest in working on the alcohol related field
Do you intend to continue building networks with the contacts you made during the event?

![Figure 12: Intention of continuing building networks after the conference](image)

Would you recommend others to participate in APYN projects?

All of the respondents would recommend other to participate in APYN projects.

Quotes:

- I am a change agent on alcohol policy.
- Thanks to EAPYC for creating opportunities and networking among European and non-European countries.
- I feel improved to change my country in a near future.
- I appreciate the conference and I have to thank the organization and all the sponsors for their commitment in this great topic concerning alcohol for the wellbeing of the youth.
- If the world would know the harms caused by alcohol and understands the larger the alcohol industries put them in, they will learnt.
- EAPYC rocked! EAPYC rocks! EAPYC will rock! Thank you very much for this amazing and lovely event again and again!!! :))))
- It's not about your religion or beliefs: it's about the how of alcohol and how much you care about yourself.
- It is really good to be here. I met very nice people and organisations.
- Drink responsibly or don't drink at all. However, drinking responsibly is bullshit. Thanks for everything, and especially for giving us awareness of cons of alcohol. I am happy to participate in EAPYC :)
- I would really love to say something smart but in this moment nothing crosses my mind. I would just like to say I am happy to be a part of this big family =) <3
• It was on honour to participate in such a youth group which had a group of people who intended to change the world and some people.
• It was EAPYC; here is to building EAPYC times in the future in the alcohol advocacy sector based on what we learnt :)
• For the 1st time in a long time, I’ve thought of my actions and decided maybe it's time I gave up the bottle!
• Be the change you want to see in the world! Start with yourself!
• I meet so many people here, thank you :) 
• Youth are our capital. Youth are our generator.
• Eye opening.
• It was one of the best experiences of my life. I tried to give back as much as I received but I fell short. It was a wonderful learning experience.
• Alcohol is a drug. It is not normal to have marijuana, cocaine or heroin producers as stakeholders, then why is the alcohol industry still on the table?!!
• I could learn not only about alcohol but also about different cultures and I made great friends!! I want to join the next conference!!
• Be a dreamer and then be realistic and find evidence to support your ideas and be methodical and professional when designing and implementing your organization’s projects.
• I have thoroughly enjoyed my experience with a well organised event and am delighted to have made some contacts for the No Name club organisation.
• This conference helps young people to know more about alcohol and to find solutions to reduce it.
• In EAPYC you learn lots about alcohol industry
• What we do today, changes tomorrow. (It is not mine, but I use it ;D)
• Sip away to your grave
• I learned how I can make project development. Actually it was very good an experience for me
• I had an EAPYC time.
• Thanks for conference, good luck
• EAPYC is a great way to learn something new and to meet other people.
1.5 Final Let it hAPYN project conference evaluation

Prepared by: Tina Mervic, APYN

Introduction
The final event of the European Commission funded project Let it hAPYN that has been empowering young people and youth organizations across Europe towards more effective and evidence-based alcohol interventions for the last three years, did focus again on the main three areas of APYN’s work: capacity building, advocacy and youth research on alcohol and youth. This conference was a great opportunity for networking and learning from the showcased products that were carried out in the last three years by youth organizations themselves.

The main goals of the conference were to:
• present outcomes of the Let it hAPYN project,
• raise interest among young people and youth organizations about prevention and reduction of alcohol related harm and alcohol policy,
• empower participants with necessary skills to effectively work on the field of alcohol,
• empower participants with necessary tools to engage in advocacy for more comprehensive alcohol policies on the regional, national and international level,
• provide necessary tools and training for participants to be able to conduct projects to prevent and reduce alcohol related harm, and
• give participants an opportunity to exchange expertise and good practices among peers.

The conference was aimed at both young people from across Europe who are beginners on the alcohol topic and the ones who are already actively working in the field (also some of the workshops were divided by the knowledge background). The conference format was a combination of lectures, workshops and non-formal activities. Speakers from European leading institutions in the field of alcohol did join us for the plenary and parallel session, and workshops were held by our experienced APYN trainers.
Report

We provided this report of participant’s feedback form analysis and evaluation to conclude the conference and to summarize participant’s opinions and suggestions.

Method

Questionnaire

We prepared questionnaire (feedback form) for all conference participants. We were interested in their fulfilment of their expectations, their opinion about quality of the programme, and about how much did they learned and gain from the conference. We also asked about the opinion regarding administration (accommodation, food...). Additionally, and most importantly, we were interested in the impact of conference on participant’s future behaviour.

Evaluation form is long five A4 page and it is quite detailed. It includes close and open type questions, with a possibility to give comments on every topic. Participants answered it before closing ceremony in paper-pen version.

The purpose of the questionnaire is to collect opinions and suggestion from participants. According to which we can improve our service in the future.

Participants

The idea of the conference is to bring together up to 100 young people between the age of 18 and 30 from all around Europe to commonly plan the next stages of youth mobilization on the field of alcohol in Europe. This year there was 64 participants and 50 of them have submitted the final feedback form. The event was predominantly attended by participants that have not attended any previous APYN activities (68%), and 24% of all participants have checked yes on that question. Some of the participants did not answer that question (8%). From the participants that have indicated they have attended a previous APYN event, some attended the 1st or 2nd CONFERENCE and some have attended the Let it hAPYN training event in Amsterdam.
Motivation, personal expectations and satisfaction

The general level of satisfaction with the event was 85% on level from 0-100%, with only 13 responses below 80%, and not even one below 60%. The lowest level was 67%. The majority of the participants have estimated their satisfaction with levels between 80% and 90%. There were also 9 responses with level 100% and one with 101%, so the expectations were fully reached and also exceeded.

Participants were mostly really satisfied with everything. The most common disadvantages were too packed schedule and not enough free time and not enough informal activities. Some of participants also stated that they did not gain enough new information or that workshops could be more advanced or related to youth work.

Some of explanations:

- It was very educational, I loved my workshop, because we had enough time to discuss everything, but it was also tiring a little, because we had to attend all the parallel sessions as well.
- All the conference and the workshops was well organized and I took all the experience I thought I could receive from CONFERENCE
- Everything was the best!
- High quality of workshops, nice participants, sad that there is no official program in the evenings - we could party without alcohol.
- For youth research classes maybe is better if you used a more examples and to be more interactive with participants; organizers must be more friendly with the participants
- I did not know what to expect, especially regarding the huge amount of people being there. I was generally very satisfied with your management of all these people, I would still ask you to send information earlier and get more various fields involved
- Amazing work and amazing people doing great work and changing world step by step
- There was a lot of useful information, best practise for examples. Program was really long, which is not necessarily bad thing, but somehow it is
- Good accommodation, nice organizational team, but too much time for workshops (I was tired and had no concentration)
- I am more than satisfied in every possible way
- The agenda was a bit too stuffed
• I know it is still a formal event, but I think it was too serious sometimes → social programs, party in the evening (showing an example of sober party
• I missed new information about alcohol
• I missed more free time to really be able to see Bled; some snacks during the coffee break would be nice. One cannot think on an empty stomach :)
• Very well prepared professionals; up-to-date, evidence-based knowledge; looking at several aspects; shortness of time in workshops; didn’t get answer for some of my interests

Majority of participants stated that they applied for the conference because they are interested in alcohol policy and alcohol prevention (68%) as well because it would give them an opportunity to network with peers from other countries (66%). More than half of participants have stated that their motivation was to learn more about APYN and its activity (54%) and almost half of participants had interest in campaigning and volunteering (46%). While the topic’s relevance to their work or their studies and recommendations from others was minor motivation to apply. One of the participants (2%) chose option other (group of high school student that rehabilitate the one who has problems with alcohol).

Figure 1. Motivation to attend the conference (multiple choices allowed) showed with percentage of responses.

Most participants have learned about the event from e-mails from APYN (38%) or different websites (28%). Some participants found out through social media (24%) and some from their office, who has invited them to join (26%). There were also some answers that they got e-mail from others (Jozo Schmuz; Jan Peloza) and from some different sources (Ministry of health, IFMSA March meeting).
Figure 2. *How did participants get to know about conference (multiple choices allowed) showing in percentage of participants answers.*
Quality of the programme, other participants and your own contributions

Quality of the programme

The participants were satisfied with the programme, with average around 4 mark on the scale between 1 and 5 (5 being the highest satisfaction. The highest marks were given for parallel sessions (4,5) and workshops (4,3). The lowest grade was given for intercultural night (3,8). Participants could not grade closing plenary, because evaluation forms were given before it. Marks reflect real quality about scientific program and a room for improvement for informal program. There were no additional comments regarding the quality of the programme.

![Average level of satisfaction with each part of the programme (on a scale 1-5, 5 being the highest).](image)

Figure 3. Average level of satisfaction with each part of the programme (on a scale 1-5, 5 being the highest).

For other items, the participants were very satisfied with organisers, trainers and working methods used. As already stated they were a bit less satisfied with informal programme and free time. All marks were between good and excellent, with the exception of free time, which is ranked between fair and good.

The only complaints made were for more free time, for example:

- *More free time, but I understand we had a lot to discuss.*
- *The agenda was too stuffed.*
- *I would like more free time for socializing.*

Participants also stated some suggestion for better informal programme:
• We could maybe have a party with music and dancing without alcohol and try out how it works.
• Maybe there could have been some organized excursion in Bled.
• The only recommendation that I’ve is related to cultural evening. We can dance and teach others how to dance our national dances. Participants them self can arrange a programme.

![Graph showing assessment of other items](image)

Figure 4. Assessment of other items (scale from Unsatisfactory (1) to Excellent (4)).

Comments from the participants reflect different views on this, but most of them have praised all 3 areas of the programme. They have stated that the trainers were excellent, well-prepared and concerned, with only one remark that they could have been more interactive and motivating. The participants have repeatedly stated that the trainers were very good and that they like the interactive methods they were using.

**Other comments about trainers and workshops:**

• Plenaries and parallel sessions were great, but working methods of workshop were not that great. Could focus more on information and sharing good practices rather that rushing to make some quick example project.
• Parallel session wasn’t very interesting for me. I choose the wrong one.

Participants were also relay satisfied with organization, they stated that everything went smoothly and they were impressed how good young people can be as organizer.

As the participants had to choose only one between areas of the programme that they gain the most, most of them have chosen discussions and interactions
with other participants (42%), 34% of participants have chosen trainers and workshops. Other 22% have chosen presentations from speakers, and remaining 2% have chosen other.

Figure 5. Areas of the programme that participants gain the most (showing in percentage of all participants).

**Other participants**

Most of participants stated that the combination of participants was suitable and constructive (84%), half of participants thought that the professional/intellectual background of the participants was relevant, only 2 of participants disagree with that statement.

**Participant’s own contributions**

Participants thought that in general their contribution was good, almost excellent. Mostly they were happy that they could speak freely, asked a lot of questions and showed their opinions.
Figure 6. Assessment of participant’s own participation (scale from Unsatisfactory (1) to Excellent (4)).

Comments:

- I really liked that I could speak freely and ask a lot of questions and that overall I felt accepted and understood. I learned so much and not just about alcohol. I learned how to be an independent thinker and participants in debates.
- I am not working in the field but I tried my best to include everything that I know.
- I felt very positive and motivated that I can be active and learn at the same time.
- Maybe sometimes I was too active.
Learning

Separated by workshops

Participants were offered four different workshops. Participants have chosen the workshop in advance based on their choice and previous experiences.

The beginner workshop on project development was dedicated to different aspects of alcohol drinking, how it is influencing young people and our societies in general. It also gave participants the tools and knowledge how to create a small scale actions regarding reducing alcohol related harm, how to develop a project idea and how to implement it in your local environment.

The aim of Advanced workshop on project development was to offer a space to participants with previous experiences in alcohol prevention projects. One of the objectives of this workshop was to offer some hints and insights on how to increase the impact of projects and on the other hand to raise awareness on how to disseminate the results.

In the Youth research in alcohol field workshop on the youth research we were looking into why doing research on the alcohol field is important and how can young people contribute by participating in and carrying out research. We looked into various tools and methods that can be used in research, such as drinking habits’ questionnaires, mystery shopping process and marketing monitoring.

Intermediate workshop on advocacy attempted to provide a practical “step by step” tool for implementation of evidence-based alcohol policy at the local, national and international levels with a particular focus on protecting children and young people from alcohol harm. Objectives of the workshop were to introduce participants to effective alcohol policies and the concepts of advocacy and policy making.
Figure 7. Number of participants attending each workshop.

**Beginner workshop on project development**
Participants stated that most important thing they learned during workshop is how to develop the project and how it works in other countries. They learned some new tricks for projects and what does and does not work. They also got motivated to change the way of thinking and to realise that there are a lot of opportunities to participate in the field of alcohol. They became more aware about what is the main problem of alcohol, alcohol related harms, alcohol policies and status in many countries, how to help young people with abuse alcohol. The best things were cool trainers, easy going environment, good organization, a lot of new information and team work. They did not complain about anything.

**Advanced workshop on project development**
Most important thing that they have learned during workshop was something more about social marketing, importance of evaluation, effectiveness of communication channels, best sponsorship searching strategies and that collaboration is necessary. They also learned some new facts related with alcohol policy and issues related with alcohol use among youth. The greatest strengths of the workshop were open discussions, interesting presentations, engaging participants, interactive methods, very well explained things and multicultural workshop (different aspects from different cultures, backgrounds). Some weaknesses were stated:

- mostly participants were giving their knowledge from activities they have done, trainer should tell us something about it too,
- not advanced enough; should be more focused on best practices and guidelines and not based so much on participants experiences,
- lack of time.
Workshop on youth research
Participants learned about new tools and methodology (mystery shopping), how to make a research for alcohol, how to communicate and present it (also connected with media). They are now also more aware about importance of being more critical about references. The best things were helpful and prepared trainers, opportunity to network with peers from other countries, learned more about research generally and about alcohol policy youth network and good time management. As a weakness participants stated that doing a rushed research in one day searched, was a little bit pointless and that there were a problem with language barrier and background knowledge among participant.

Intermediate workshop on advocacy
As a most important thing that they have learned participants stated that only educating children is not enough, you have to work effectively with governments, importance of complex approach and coordination, and that teamwork is the most important thing in social work. They also learned about how to build a campaign, about advocacy strategies and how to improve alcohol free society promotion. As good points they wrote similar things as in other workshops (teamwork, good practice, sharing experiences etc.) And as bad points they said that it was too long and that it was lacking practical examples.

In general
Participants were very satisfied with methodology and interactions of workshops. They learned about how to do an international teamwork and how to stay productive. They also all gained at least something new. All of the workshops have average level of satisfaction higher that 4 (on a scale 1-5, 5 being the highest).
Figure 8. *Average level of satisfaction with each workshop (on a scale 1-5, 5 being the highest).*

**Main learning points out of conference**

Responses from the participants have reflected different focuses of the sessions they have attended, as some of them pointed out they have mainly learned project development, other that they have familiarised themselves with the research and some that they are now aware of how to plan and implement advocacy actions. A joint learning point, mentioned by the majority of the participants, was the realisation that alcohol can be harmful and that there need to be actions taken (by young people) to address this issue. They also learned a lot about how alcohol industry really works. They stated that they learned new facts, new tools, and they got new contacts. Some also learned more about APYN and how do conferences look like.

**Things participants learned about themselves**

Participants have several times mentioned that they have learned how to work with other people, especially ones coming from different cultures than their own. They also pointed out the realisations regarding alcohol consumption and their own behaviour towards alcohol. Some have commented they realised they will need to improve their English to be able to work in this kind of environment or that their English is actually better than they thought. A lot of the participants have mentioned they now realise there is a lot to learn still and that they will plan that as a follow-up of the conference. Some wrote that know they know that
they would like to start a career in public health and changing the public behaviour by implementing alcohol or other health-related policies in governments, or at least do something on behalf of this problems. Some were also joking that now they now that they can sit in a chair for a long time or that they are able to choose between the workshops and parallel sessions correctly. They are now also aware about importance of their experiences and that you can learn even more if you exchange it and if you communicate with active and motivated people and plan and organize projects which can make a difference.
Impact and future

Specific plans as a result of conference in the future

All of the participants have stated that they have made at least one specific plan of action as a result of their attendance. Most have planned for a sharing session in their organisation or university (60%) or that they will develop a project (54%), while a lower number of participants have planned for advocacy activities (32%) or online collaboration (24%).

Participants wrote that they already connected with 2 different NGOs that work in Slovenia and we planned on joined collaboration and that they arranged some meetings with people they met there.

![Chart](chart.png)

Figure 9. Answers about specific plans (multiple choices allowed) showing in percentage of participant’s answers.

Interest before and after conference

The conference has significantly increased the interest of participants in working on the alcohol related field. Average interest before conference was 3.1 (1 being not interested at all and 5 being very interested) and after the conference was 4.4.

Self – assessment of knowledge and skills before and after training

We asked participants to give some thought to what they knew before the training and what they learned during the training. Since some did not answer to all questions we had to exclude some data. The number of participants who answered to all statements was 40.
As we can see in the Figure there was change on all stated fields. The biggest improvement was on overall knowledge and skills and the smallest one on knowing the basic facts on alcohol and addiction.

![Figure 10. Differences in averages of knowledge and skills before and after trainings (1 - low; 3 – medium; 5 – high).]

**Continuing of building network**

All of the participants also stated that they intend to continue building networks with contacts they made during the event. Most of them (60%) intend to build on contacts with people from other regions, while 52% of participants have chosen to continue with contacts in their own region and 44% of participants decided to continue in their own country. There were also 2 participants who said that they will not continue to build networks.
Figure 11. Answers to the question “Do you intend to continue building networks with the contacts you made during the event?” (multiple choices allowed) showing in percentage of participant’s answers.

**Recommendations**

94% respondents (with 2 answers missing) would recommend others to participate in APYN events, except 1 who did not stated the reason why.

**Logistics**

Participants were in general quite satisfied with the logistics and organisation of the conference, as can be seen from the Figure below. Regarding living and working conditions they stated that accommodation were almost excellent and they though that meals and workshop venue were good. Participants were the less satisfied with information provided before CONFERENCE, because they have received email about all information really late. They were also less pleased with support before CONFERENCE, but the support from the organizer on side was really good.
Participants wished to receive information about Ljubljana, programme and workshops sooner. They also complained that there was not enough information about content of workshops. Also timetables were not clear until arriving to conference, which made it hard to plan trips. Furthermore, additional payments (single room) should be known sooner and information on travel options was not up to date (direct possibility from airport to Bled). Some also complained that the responding time was not efficient and that there were too much different online forms to fill out and that it would be great to receive mail after filling in the application.

Based on comments participants were pleased with the view and beautiful surroundings. The hotel was great, accept it was a bit annoying to be in the room with 4 people and don't know about it because description said 1-2.

Figure 12. Average marks regarding accommodation (scale from Unsatisfactory (1) to Excellent (4)).
Conclusion

Overall

The general level of satisfaction with the conference was very high, as the average level marked by the participants was 85%. Majority of participants stated that they applied for the conference because they are interested in alcohol policy and alcohol prevention as well because it would give them an opportunity to network with peers from other countries.

The participants were satisfied with the programme, with average around 4 on the scale between 1 and 5. Marks reflect real quality about scientific programme and a room for improvement for informal programme. They were especially satisfied with good organisations, good trainers and interactive work methods. The only complaint made more than once was the need for more free time. Participants were very satisfied with methodology and interactions of workshops. They learned about how to do an international teamwork and how to stay productive. They also all gained at least something new. A joint learning point, mentioned by the majority of the participants, was the realisation that alcohol can be harmful and that there need to be actions taken (by young people) to address this issue. They also learned a lot about how alcohol industry really works. They stated that they learned new facts, new tools, and they got new contacts. Some also learned more about APYN and how do conferences look like.

The conference will have a positive impact on the alcohol-related activities, as the level of interest to work on this topic has risen for 68%, showing that all of the participants have stated that they have made at least one specific plan of action as a result of their attendance. The event was also good for networking, as several participants mentioned the newly-formed partnerships, which they will continue after the conference finishes.

And all of the respondents would recommend others to participate in APYN events, except 1 who did not stated the reason why.

Good points

As stated before good point of the conference was quality scientific programme, living and working conditions, leaving positive impact on the participants and motivate them to work more and more effective on the field of prevention of alcohol. Good points are also improving their knowledge and skills regarding topics of alcohol prevention.
Suggestions, improvements

Participants want, suggest:

- more free time
- trip together, sightseeing
- more experts
- more cultural/country learning activities and better social part and get to know games
- to have access to the material from the others workshops/sessions
- shorter workshops
- outside sessions
- less full agenda, make it longer so it would be more relaxed and cancel late night presentations - it was too much
- to be asked before for food, arrivals, special needs etc.
- more talking about the myths
- more time to ask questions after session
- Also information regarding conference could be sent sooner.

Quotes

- It was very useful conference. It was my first one (I was scared), but people help me. You put together very good group of people (beginners and experts)
- I really, really loved it; I will definitely come next time as well :) Thank you for the experience!
- I am very grateful for opportunity of being part of this wonderful conference.
- We all need to work together to impact the lives of society and improve their overall health.
- I am glad because I was a participant in this conference. I am richest now, because I know, meet new 80 people. But also i am glad for my new knowledge from this conference. Thank you so much for everything. Cheers :)
- Daša and Lucas are the best! :)
- I know that industry f***s with us, but I’m still drinking if I want to :) I had a nice time though.
- Keep on working on what makes you feel good
- During this conference the awareness of the harm of the alcohol is raising.
- It makes you think about things you would never start doing on your own.
- I will come again.
• creativity mixed with knowledge can change and influence other people as as stimulate our owns
• Amazing! Amazing!
• Here are people who will shape the future of alcohol policy. The will change it to better also because of the CONFERENCE.
• Many ideas from different backgrounds can make a difference
• We are wise because we don’t drink, we don’t drink because we are wise. Mahaloo!
• Strong knowledge delivered well for future prospective collaborators for a healthier, happier world. Lovely.
• Amazing opportunity to meet youth workers and share competences
• Every change that you want to see already started when you moved one step. You are one of the others, be aware!
• It was good to hang out with like-minded people
• Great experience, great people
• I was great to share experiences and get new ideas from others
• I learned a lot, especially from Daša and Lucas workshops
• Great experience, great people, I gained a lot of knowledge, connections and motivation for continuing my work in alcohol field
• Great people, great inspiration and motivation
• It was exactly what I was expecting; so, good job!
2. Process evaluation of project as a whole

2.1 Interim process evaluation of the project among associate partners

Prepared by: Matej Košir, UTRIP

Interim process evaluation of the project

The 1st process evaluation of the Let it hAPYN! project was realized by an online questioning. The questioning was opened and announced at March 2nd 2015. Only associated partners (all staff in the project) were asked to give feedback. The questionnaire contained questions concerning the satisfaction with coordination of project, the partners' involvement in the network, the estimation of expected attainment of project's aims, items concerning the satisfaction with those project's deliverables that were already available, as well as further remarks concerning the project in general. The partners were reminded of the process evaluation once by email. The questioning was closed at 17th March 2010. It was answered by 7 persons; as 8 persons were asked to answer the questionnaire, this is a share of 87.5%.

Sample

7 members of the project consortium among 8 answered the questionnaire. The number of feedbacks is N=7 (87.5 %).

Ranking of satisfaction with coordination of the project

The partners' satisfaction with the organisational proceedings (M= 3.43; range from 1: “Very unsatisfied” to 5: “Very satisfied”) was the highest. The satisfaction with coordination in total (M=3.14) as well as satisfaction with the transparency of coordination (M=3.14) were rated as sufficient. The partners were least satisfied with financial proceedings (M=3.00) (see Figure 1).
Comments concerning coordination

There were some additional comments written by partners, such as “all information were sent too late”, “APYN could be more proactive in making sure everybody does their own WPs as they should do”, “it’s important to make a new actual planning of all the tasks to come”, “too short time between announcements and organisation of project meetings” and “no feeling of regular and continuous coordination (very little communication during the project between coordinator and other partners - very last time emails etc.)”.

Ranking of cooperation with other partners

The partners’ cooperation with other partners differs a lot depending on the statement in the questionnaire (see Figure 2). Most of partners (5 of 7) are “actively involved in the realization of a work package”, which is rather logical as all associated partners in the project are responsible for at least one work package. The partners less “actively collaborate with other project partners” and they don’t “feel themselves well informed on the different products and
outcomes of the project”. Only two of them “see the chance to realise several aspects of the project in her/his country” etc.

**Figure 2: Rating of cooperation with other partners**

![Graph showing ratings of cooperation with other partners]

**Comments concerning cooperation with other partners**

There were some additional comments written by partners, such as “better and more regular communication between partners” is needed, there is “no feeling of being part of European project” and “there is no feedback from other partners concerning the products”.
General objectives of the project

The associated partners were asked to estimate the attainment of general objectives of the project during its duration. The responding persons have very different expectations concerning the general objective attainment.

They mostly agree that the project will “produce materials that can be applicable also to other youth organisations after the end of the project” and that the project will “raise awareness among youth organisations that alcohol is a harmful legal drug”. They have the lowest confident in attaining the objectives such as “scientifically tested good or best alcohol intervention practices in youth organisations” and “stimulated initialisation of new alcohol interventions programmes with the right stakeholders” (see Figure 3).

Figure 3: Expected attainment of general objectives of the project

Asked about fears and expectations concerning the general objectives of the project, one partner expressed his/her fears if the project is “going to manage to fulfill all the task on time (he/she believes the project can do that, but the partners need to do careful time planning and put in extra effort)”. One partner expressed the fear that “some partners (especially the scientific ones) are not enough skilled” to do the job properly. Another partner’s fears are related to the fact that only a part of the European countries are involved in the project and that the northern and western European countries are not involved at all. One partner fears that “the youth organisations have to less time to keep being
actively involved and get the interventions done in time and that the alcohol policy focus of them is too diverse to get comparable results”. Another partner fears that “youth organisations are not willing to disinvest or decommission from ineffective interventions (science does not support most of their present activities (e.g. short lectures/workshops in schools, media campaigns as a main activity etc.)

**Specific objectives of the project**

The associated partners were also asked to estimate the attainment of specific objectives of the project during its duration. The responding persons have again very different expectations concerning the specific objective attainment.

They mostly agree that the project will enable a “better overview of evidence-based alcohol interventions in/for youth organisations and ways of implementation in youth organisations” and that the project will enable a “better overview of existing national and international regulations addressing young people in Europe and suggestions for their improvements”. They have the lowest confident in attaining the objectives such as “empowerment of youth organisation through law enforcement” (see Figure 4).

**Figure 4: Expected attainment of specific objectives of the project**
Asked about fears and expectations concerning the specific objectives of the project, one partner expressed his/her fears that “not enough good practices were looked into”. One partner expressed the fear that “only a part of the European countries are involved in the project and that the northern and western European countries are not involved at all”. One partner fears that “the change in thinking and accepting scientific evidence in youth organisation will be very difficult to reach in short term”. Another partner mentioned that “the objectives as stated in the questionnaire could be more realistic and achievable”.

Satisfaction with key deliverables

The feedback on the deliverables spans the report and manual (WP 4), the draft report and toolkit (WP 5), and the conference in Bursa (WP 2). The partners’ satisfaction with two written deliverables (report/manual and draft report and toolkit; range from 1: "Very unsatisfied" to 4: "Very satisfied") was rather good for both of them (a bit better mean for draft report and toolkit from WP5).

Figure 5: Satisfaction with deliverables in WP4 and WP 5
Report and manual on evidence-based alcohol interventions in/or for youth organisations and how to implement these interventions (WP4)

Regarding the (draft) report and manual on evidence-based alcohol interventions, the answering persons are rather satisfied regarding the deliverable in general (see Figure 5). Five partners commented the review/manual (see Table 1). One partner commented (on what was good/what could be improved) that “the report itself gives some interesting results and the narrative can be clearly seen - first seeing what youth organisations like to work on and then seeing how effective that is. However, the report could be structured more in the way it was written in the Grant Agreement - it would already be more structured if the 1st part would be written as report on the research based on the current results of research report (but complete in IMRAD form) and then 2nd part as the literature review (based on what is now the Deliverable 1) - also there could be more written on the interventions that don’t work. Also, the list of the organisations should be amended to only include organisations working on alcohol and maybe add some info on what kind of things they are working from the survey”. Another partner commented that “it would be great if report would be accepted for publishing as an article”.

Table 1: Open answers: Comments concerning report/manual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments concerning report/manual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The deliverable has definitely some added value and new insights, but it’s not completely in line with what EC expects of us based on what was written in the application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s completed and it shows what works and what does not work in prevention in the field of alcohol. Evidence is clear, now it’s time for action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is based on existing evidences and therefore offers a good overview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not see the latest version of the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments will be sent in track changes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Draft) report of and toolkit for the »Training for project leaders« and implementation of "pilot-testing projects" (WP5)
The answering project partners are satisfied with the draft report of and toolkit for training and implementation of pilots (see Figure 5). Five partners used the possibility to give open comments concerning the draft report/toolkit (see Table 2). One partner commented (on what was good/what could be improved) that the deliverable should be in “more youth-friendly format”. Another partner commented that “the comments were added to the partner directly”.

Table 2: Open answers: Comments concerning draft report/toolkit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments concerning draft report/toolkit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It’s a promising document, which can help us with increasing the number of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evidence-based interventions in youth organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is very clear, and it coincides with the project product about youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organisations and interventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a draft it’s very promising output.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not ready yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiting for final product</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

European Alcohol Policy Youth Conference (Bursa)

The partners’ satisfaction with the European Alcohol Policy Youth Conference in Bursa (Turkey) (range from 1: “Very unsatisfied” to 5: “Very satisfied”) was very good (see Figure 6).

Figure 6: Satisfaction with the conference in Bursa
Four persons took the advantage to comment the conference among those two of them just mentioned the absence (see Table 3). One partner commented (on what was good/what could be improved) that “it was good that trainers had a chance to meet before and plan their trainings”. He/she added that “it was good that there was local organising committee taking care of logistic matters and that the communication between APYN EB and the trainers with the OC could be a bit better though”. Another partner commented that there should be “more focus on how to develop/adapt evidence-based and evaluated interventions which are proven and ready to use (e.g. mystery shopping, advocacy)”. 

**Table 3: Open answers: Comments concerning the conference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments concerning the conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We managed to professionally organise an event in which we motivated many new young people to start working in the field of alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still too much focus on ineffective interventions with no critical approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was not at this conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfortunately not present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remarks concerning the project in general**

The possibility to do further remarks concerning the project in general was used by several (5) project partners.
Asked concerning the **additional benefit from the project**, one partner stated that “one of the conclusions is that most youth organisations are not willing to change their practice and still keep doing activities which are scientifically proven ineffective or even harmful”. One partner stated that there should be “better collaboration with project partners and exchange of information and knowledge”. Another partner added that the project should “contact youth organisations from Southern and Eastern Europe and better understand them”. One partner commented that there should be more “networking” within the project and to some extent “also an overview on what works and what doesn’t work in the field of alcohol policy”. He/she added that he/she “met some very competent young people and experts on alcohol”. Another partner stated that the project produces “new networks and contacts within youth organisations in Europe - the momentum is growing and there are more and more young people willing to participate”.

Asked about **which aspects of the project don’t suit him/her or should be modified**, one partner stated that the project has to “be sure that what we get from scientific partners is undisccussable and can be unconditionally used”. Another partner commented that “we have so far perhaps focused too much on the aspect of the bringing the project to young people and not enough on what is required by the EC (they want to have it done in a more structured way)”. One partner added that “the objectives could be modified”.

So far, according to the opinion of three quarter of partners we didn’t managed to keep the time schedule of our **work packages**. The steps which were foreseen have not yet been realized as planned, especially “the report on youth and alcohol laws” and the draft report/toolkit (one partner commented that “this is not ready yet. It is not youth friendly yet - content and look”). Another partner stated that “some steps are a bit behind the schedule and also some other activities in the project (e.g. national trainings), but will be realized soon and still early enough”.

About the **problems appeared**, one partner stated that some partners are “too busy with some other urgent projects and less time is available to focus on this project”. “But it’s getting better and things will be improved soon”, he/she added. Another partner stated that the project “started with the survey but due to other workload it’s on hiatus now”. One partner commented that “the website could
provide more information” and another one added that there is a “bad time management by STAP and APYN”.

About how the problems will be solved, one partner sees the solution in “gathering information from partners and project leader”. Another partner suggested “investing more time in urgent tasks”. It was mentioned by one partner that “the new APYN General Secretary will take over some of the dissemination tasks and help produce a report”. One partner wrote “try to send it as soon as possible to all youth organisations”, but it’s not clear what.

About the need of additional support / resources from other partners, one partner stated that “additional support or resources are not needed for now and that it will be needed maybe later with dissemination”. He/she added that “we have to think about appropriateness of this survey tool” (not clear which survey) – he/she just “spent almost an hour writing the comments in details and then when he/she tried to submit, the session has expired and everything was lost. Either we should make people aware of saving their results or think about using some other tools” (not clear which tools). Another partner commented that he/she would need a help from partners in a way that “information must be sent to Eurocare to be uploaded”.
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2.2 Final process evaluation of the project among associate partners

Prepared by: Urša Šetina, APYN

Final process evaluation of the project

The final process evaluation of the Let it hAPYN! project was realized by an online questioning. Only associated partners were asked to give feedback. The questionnaire contained questions concerning the satisfaction with coordination of project, the partners’ involvement in the network, the evaluation of the attainment of general and specific objectives. It offered as well an opportunity to express the opinion on the negative aspect of the project, which gave some directions for future project planning. The survey was answered by 3 people; as 4 people were asked to answer the questionnaire, this is a share of 80%. As the total number of people remaining in the steering committee of the project has decreased compared to the time of interim evaluation, also the number of respondents is lower.

Ranking of satisfaction with coordination of the project

The partners’ satisfaction with the transparency of coordination (M=4,3; range from “Very unsatisfied” to “Very satisfied”) was the highest. In comparison to the interim process evaluation report the transparency of coordination was marked as sufficient (M=3,14; N=7). The satisfaction with organisational proceedings was evaluated the highest in the interim process evaluation report (M=3,43; N=7), but in the final evaluation it was marked as satisfying (M=4; N=3). The satisfaction with coordination in total was also marked as satisfying (M=4; N=3), but in the interim report was only sufficient (M=3,14; N=7). Once again the partners were least satisfied with the financial proceedings (M=2,3; N=3). See figure 1.

Figure 1: Ranking of satisfaction with the coordination in interim in final evaluation
Comments concerning coordination

Partners wrote some additional comments such as “there was not clear communication from EC’s side regarding the financial amendments (especially towards the end), which made it harder for project to proceed smoothly”, “I feel a too less informed about what happened within the participating youth organizations” and “after the first part when we thought that all of us are clear on the roles and not much additional (than the classic meetings) coordination is needed, we manage to get proactive on leadership and results show it”.

Ranking of cooperation with other partners

The partners’ cooperation with other partners depends on the statement in the questionnaire (see Figure 2). Partners are mostly in contact with other project partners and the project enhances their cooperation with youth organisations. They do not feel entirely informed on different products and outcomes of the project, are not all actively involved in the realization of work packages or actively collaborate with other partners. One of the partners doesn’t see a chance to realise several aspects of the project in his/her country.

Figure 2: Ranking of cooperation with other partners
Comments concerning cooperation with other partners

There was an additional comment written by one of the partners: “There is a understandable gap between the goals of the project and what happened so far within the participating youth organizations. I expected in the beginning a more strict implementation strategy”.

General objectives of the project

The partners were asked to estimate the attainment of general objectives of the project during its duration. The responding persons have very different opinions concerning the general objective attainment. The possible answers were on the scale from 1 – Not reached to 5 – Completely reached.

They mostly agree that the project produced materials that could be applicable also to other youth organisations, that it raised awareness among youth organisations that alcohol is a harmful legal drug and also that the project empowered YO by giving them tools how to work with alcohol intervention programmes. The biggest differences in comparison with the interim report are in raising awareness and empowerment of YO:
both were evaluated much higher in the final evaluation. Evaluation of the produced materials is comparable in both reports.

On average the partners have evaluated the “scientifically tested good/best alcohol intervention practices in YO” only as reached, but in this question the differences in evaluation were the highest.

Also in the interim report this objective was evaluated as the least attainable of all general objectives and by the end of the project the degree of attainment did not improve much (M from 2,86 to 3,3).

“Better understanding of the harm caused by alcohol consumption among organised [...] and non-organised youth [...]” was evaluated almost only slightly higher than in the interim report.

The evaluation of the objective of stimulation of the initialization of new alcohol interventions improved significantly since the interim report (M from 3 to 4,3). The objective to “raise the percentage of alcohol interventions in YO that are evidence-based” was evaluated as very reached (M=4), which is also an improvement since the interim report (M=3,14).

Figure 3: Evaluation of the attainment of project’s general objectives

![Diagram](image)

Specific objectives of the project
The partners were also asked to estimate the attainment of some specific objectives of the project during its duration. The responding persons have very different opinions concerning the general objective attainment.

The partners were most united in evaluating the following two specific objectives: “better overview of existing national and international regulations addressing young people (YP) in Europe and suggestions for their improvements” and “empowerment of YO through law-enforcement”, although the average degree between them is quite different – the empowerment of YO through law-enforcement was evaluated the highest of all specific objectives (M=4,7), and the better overview of existing national and international regulations was also evaluated as almost completely reached (M=4,3). In comparison with the interim report the biggest progress was precisely in the field of empowerment of YO, which was evaluated the lowest in the interim report (M=3), but at the end of the project the attainment of this specific objective is evaluated the highest.

The objective of a better overview of existing national and international regulations is also evaluated much better than in the interim report (M raised from 3,71 to 4,3).

The “adaptation of existing best practices in participating YO for pilot-testing purposes” has been on average evaluated the same as the attainment of a better overview, but here the partners’ opinions quite differ, since two of them evaluated it as completely reached and one only as reached. The attainment of this objective was also evaluated better than during the interim report (M raised from 3,57 to 4,3).

Expectations for a better overview of evidence-based alcohol interventions in/for YO were on average evaluated with 3,71 in the interim report. The evaluation of this objective differs the least in the final report (which is now on average 4).

**Figure 4: Evaluation of the attainment of project’s specific objectives**

![Figure 4](image-url)
Remarks concerning the project in general

The partners were asked two additional questions about the project in general. First question was concerning the additional benefits gained from the project and it was answered by two partners. One sees the additional benefit in “momentum-creation among youth organization and young people in europe on alcohol policy and alcohol prevention” and the other has “discovered that young people can be really motivated to participate in the alcohol policy process... we have to find a way to continue this....”.

The survey was concluded with a question about the negative aspects of the project and what should be modified. One partner answered: “a better starting phase... looking back, ‘next time’ I [would] prefer to start with more open sessions in order to narrow the gap between the actual situation/options/possibilities of the youth organizations on the one hand and the project goals on the other”.
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2.3 Final evaluation with the collaborating partners

Prepared by: Daša Kokole and Urša Šetina, APYN

Evaluation meeting

Evaluation meeting among collaborating partners took place on 17th and 18th May in Ljubljana, Slovenia.

Apart from presenting the projects outcomes, general attitude to the project and its activities was evaluated. Below there are collected some of the main outcomes and conclusions of the meeting.

The main impressions and strengths of the project from the perspective of collaborative partners were summarized as follows:

- The project established good and bad practices about alcohol prevention programmes and produced useful tools for youth NGOs to work in the alcohol field
- It was a long term project, which helped to establish a community and help with sustainability of the project
- It enabled young people to change the discourse on the alcohol topic, it had a positive impact on the youth field with empowering the organisations and making the word of the youth louder
- It gave an opportunity of intercultural exchange of practices and collaboration

As strengths of the project the following things were pointed out:

- Giving possibility to get relevant information – as youth organisation you are usually provided with lots of information but you don’t know which one is relevant and which is not
- Giving opportunity to meet other people from the same field and exchange good practices
- Creating awareness about the alcohol problem and giving the feeling that there was continuous activity in the field
- Providing funds through Boost my project initiative was very useful for youth organisations in order to support start of the work, without that it would be harder for any bigger project to take place
- It also helped the organisations with visibility in their local environment as a relevant player on alcohol field
- The events (trainings, conference) were a good opportunity to present the alcohol problem and empowered the participants to improve their work in the
field of prevention and alcohol policy, as well as connected the participants of the conference and made possible an exchange of experience and practices

- The received materials were really useful, the boost my project idea was also great
- Encouraged the involvement of many youth in active alcohol prevention and advocacy
- Providing youth organisations with evidence-based options for reducing alcohol related harm
- Exchange of knowledge and evidence based programs; potential cooperation on preventive programs
- Showing that an alternative healthier social model exists

As points of improvement were mentioned:

- It would be interesting to hear about other people's initiatives already throughout the project and not at the end only
- This was useful for new, inexperienced organisations more than for the older, established organisations

As main lessons that were learned were emphasised:

- In national consultations, the concept of event with presenting what is alcohol related harm, what is effective alcohol policy and how to advocate, has been shown to be very useful
- Lithuania in particular was a very good example of how to advocate successfully and other countries could look up to it how to create a successful coalition and advocate for better alcohol policy
- Certain initiatives had challenges as there was one main person which was pushing everything forward and it was a great challenge and a lot of work to get all the different stakeholders involved in the activity (for example research)

**Survey among collaborating partners**

Additionally, survey was disseminated among people participating at the project activities in order to assess their attitudes and perception of achieving the project's goals.

The survey was realized by means of online questionnaire, shared through direct e-mail with participants in Let it hAPYN activities. 42 people answered the survey, although not all of them finished it (38 participants finished the survey).
The survey was answered by 31 females (74%) and 11 males (26%).

The age of survey participants ranged from 18 to over 31, with 29% being between 18 and 24 years old and 71% being between 25 to 31+ years old.

Participants come from 24 different countries, out of which 15 are EU countries, which represents 62.5%.

**Figure 1: Country of origin (n = 41)**

The participants were either working in the field of alcohol professionally (37%), as a volunteer (24%) or were interested in the topic (39%).

Participants were asked how their involvement in Alcohol Policy Youth Network's activities contributed to their interest in and understanding of the topic of alcohol and how much to their active involvement in working on the field of alcohol prevention and harm reduction. They had to evaluate the level of influence on their actions or attitude in a range from “not at all” to “very much”.

**Figure 2: Contribution of participant’s involvement in APYN activities to certain outcomes (n=35)**
In next question, the participants were asked to what extend do they agree with several statements related to alcohol policy. Their agreement had to be expressed in a range from “completely disagree” to “completely agree”.

**Figure 3: To what extent do you agree with the following statements regarding alcohol and alcohol policy? (n = 34)**
In following question the participants were asked to evaluate in what measure the specific objectives of the Let it hAPYN project were achieved, based on their knowledge and understanding of the project. Only people who had closer involvement with the project were asked that question. This question was answered by 21 respondents and they had six possible answers – a 5-grade scale from “not reached” to “completely reached” and the sixth possible answer was “I don’t know”.

**Figure 4: Achievement of specific objectives of Let it hAPYN project**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Percentage Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Better overview of evidence-based alcohol interventions in/for youth organisations (YO)</td>
<td>0% 4% 33% 33% 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Adaptation of existing best practices in participating YO for pilot-testing purposes</td>
<td>0% 38% 33% 19% 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Better overview of existing national and international regulations addressing young...</td>
<td>5% 29% 38% 5% 19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Empowerment of YO through law-enforcement</td>
<td>5% 29% 38% 5% 19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Improvement of existing alcohol prevention interventions in YO and intensify their...</td>
<td>0% 24% 48% 14% 10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 1 - Not reached
- 2 - Predominantly not reached
- 3 - Partially reached
- 4 - Predominantly reached
- 5 - Completely reached
- I don't know
Appendix: evaluation instruments

Since similar questions were used and adapted based on the event/activity, sample questionnaires are presented here, which were adapted based on the specifics of the event/activity.

1. Sample questionnaire for meetings evaluation
2. Sample questionnaire for events evaluation
3. Sample questionnaire for project evaluation

1. Sample questionnaire for meetings evaluation

1st Let it hAPYN! Associated Partners' Meeting

Luxembourg, 6th – 7th May 2013

Evaluation of the kick-off meeting

Dear associated members of the Let it hAPYN! project, please fill in this questionnaire concerning the kick-off meeting in Luxembourg and send it back to Matej Košir by email (matej@institut-utrip.si)!

(Please select one box per question that suits most your opinion!)

Satisfaction with and outcome of the kick-off meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Don’t</th>
<th>agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In total, I was satisfied with the meeting.  

I was satisfied with the organisation of the meeting.  

The information in the forefront of the meeting was sufficient.  

I was satisfied with the results of the meeting.  

I gained orientation what all the work packages will be about.  

I’m oriented concerning the next steps of the work process.  

I feel involved in the project and in the work process.  

---

**Coordination of the project**

- Organisational proceeding of the project is clear to me.  
- Financial proceeding of the project is clear to me.

Comments concerning coordination:
Say it in your own words: what was good at the meeting?

What didn’t suit you? What should be enhanced at further meetings?

Further comments:
2. Sample questionnaire for events evaluation

3. PARTICIPANT FEEDBACK FORM EAPYC 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONAL PARTICULARS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name (optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of origin (Europe/Non Europe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you participated in a previous APYN activity (which one)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONAL EXPECTATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a. What motivated you to attend EAPYC? (You may tick more than one)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic has direct relevance to my work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic has direct relevance to my studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in alcohol policy and alcohol prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in campaigning and volunteering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation from my office, colleagues or friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to network with peers from other countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To learn more about Alcohol Policy Youth Network and its activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others. Please specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1b. How did you get to know about EAPYC? (You may tick more than one) | |
E-mail from APYN

On the websites (Apyn.org, salto-youth, heysuccess)

Facebook/Twitter/Other social media

E-mail received from others, namely ________________

My office invited me to join

Others. Please specify:

1c. In a scale 1-100% (100% being the highest), what is your general level of satisfaction with EAPYC?

Score:

Please explain:

QUALITY OF THE PROGRAMME

2a. Referring to each part of the programme, please rate the level of your satisfaction (5 being the highest)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Did not attend</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal introduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening plenary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get to know each other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General topical intro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roots camp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing plenary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. What is your rate for the quality of the following items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>□</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trainers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Methods used</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cultural Programme – Dervishes, Ottoman night etc  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisers</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Time</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please share any comments regarding the items mentioned in 2b

2c. From which areas of the programme did you gain most? (tick one item)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Please specify why:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussions and interactions with other participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainers and workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations from speakers:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, namely:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEARNING

3a. What are your main learning points out of EAPYC?
3b. What have you learnt about yourself?
3c. What is your general impression of the other participants? (you may tick more than one)

☐ The combination of participants was suitable and constructive.

☐ The combination of participants was not suitable and constructive (please state reasons below).

☐ The professional/intellectual background of the participants was relevant.

☐ The professional/intellectual background of the participants was not relevant (please state reasons below).

☐ Others, please specify:

3d. My participation: How would you estimate your own contributions to the course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your active participation</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overcoming language barriers</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing information and experience</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting other participants</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bringing ideas to the group work</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please share any comments regarding your participation:

ADMINISTRATION

4a. Please rate the following items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information provided before EAPYC</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support from the organisers before EAPYC</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from the organisers on side</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please share any comments about the topics above (4a)
4b. Please rate the following items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>□</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop venues</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please share any comments about the topics above (4b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUTURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5a. Have you made any specific plans as a result of EAPYC?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ sharing sessions in your organisation/university □ project development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ advocacy activities back home □ others, please specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ online collaborations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please rate your interest in working on the alcohol related field before and after the conference:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before</th>
<th>Not interested</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Interested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**5b. Do you intend to continue building networks with the contacts you made during the event?**

| □ No | □ Yes, with contacts in my own country | □ Yes, with contacts in my own region |
| □ Yes, with contacts in my own country | □ Yes, with contacts in the other region |

**5c. Would you recommend others to participate in APYN projects?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>□ Yes</th>
<th>□ No, please comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6a. Any suggestion for the next EAPYC?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6b. Please provide us with a one or two-sentence quote about your participation in EAPYC. We may use this quote in our reports and/or future promotional materials.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR CONTRIBUTION 😊

3. Sample questionnaire for project evaluation

Let it hAPYN! Project
Interim process evaluation of the project

Dear partners of the Let it hAPYN! project, please fill in this questionnaire concerning the process evaluation of the project and send it back to Matej Košir by email (matej@institut-uptrip.si)!

(Please select one box per question that suits most your opinion!)

Coordination of the project

Very

unsatisfied

satisfied

Satisfaction with coordination in total

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑
| Satisfactory with organisational proceedings |  □ |  □ |  □ |  □ |
| Satisfactory with financial proceedings |  □ |  □ |  □ |  □ |
| Transparency of coordination |  □ |  □ |  □ |  □ |

Comments concerning coordination: Do you have further needs or suggestions concerning coordination?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Cooperation with other partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am in contact with other project partners.  □  □

I actively collaborate with other project partners.  □  □

I am actively involved in the realisation of a work package(s).  □  □

I’m oriented concerning the project’s work process.  □  □
I feel informed on the different products and outcomes of the project. □ □

I get benefit from the networking and exchange in the project. □ □

I see the chance to realise several aspects of the project in my country. □ □

The project enhances my cooperation with youth organisations. □ □

Comments concerning cooperation: Do you have further needs or suggestions concerning the project?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

General objectives of the project

*In your opinion: To which extend will the following general objectives of the project be reached during the project’s duration?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Reached</th>
<th>Reached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Better understanding of the harm caused by alcohol consumption among organised (youth associations, national |
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|   | youth councils, student unions, international youth organisations)  
and non-organised youth (youth clubs, student unions, individuals). |   |   |   |   |
|   | (2) Raise awareness among youth organisations (YO) that alcohol  
is a harmful legal drug. |   |   |   |   |
|   | (3) Stimulate the initialization of new alcohol interventions  
programmes with the right stakeholders (excluding the alcohol  
industry that has the legitimate interest to raise consumption  
levels to sell more products). |   |   |   |   |
|   | (4) Empower YO by giving them tools (different evidence-based  
methodologies) how to work with alcohol intervention programmes. |   |   |   |   |
|   | (5) Raise the percentage of alcohol interventions in YO that are  
evidence-based. |   |   |   |   |
|   | (6) Scientifically test good/best alcohol intervention practices in YO. |   |   |   |   |
|   | (7) Produce materials that can be applicable also to other YO after |   |   |   |   |
the end of the project. □ □ □ □

Which fears and expectations do you have concerning the general objectives of the project?

__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

Specific objectives of the project

In your opinion: To which extend will the following specific objectives of the project be reached during the project’s duration?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely</th>
<th>Reached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Better overview of evidence-based alcohol interventions

in/for youth organisations (YO) and ways of implementation in YO □ □ □ □

□
(2) Adaptation of existing best practices in participating YO for pilot-testing purposes

(3) Better overview of existing national and international regulations addressing young people (YP) in Europe and suggestions for their improvements

(4) Empowerment of YO through law-enforcement

(5) Improvement of existing alcohol prevention interventions in YO and intensify their involvement in the alcohol policy processes

Which fears and expectations do you have concerning the specific objectives of the project?
Satisfaction with key deliverables

Very satisfied

Very unsatisfied

WP4 - Report and manual on evidence-based alcohol interventions

in/or for YO and how to implement these interventions (Utrip) □ □ □ □ □

Please explain your answer for this deliverable:

__________________________________________________________________________________
What was good/what could be improved:

__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

WP5 – (Draft) report of and toolkit for the »Training for project leaders« and implementation of “pilot-testing projects“ (STAP)

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

□

Please explain your answer for this deliverable:

__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
What was good/what could be improved:

_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

Very
satisfied

Very
unsatisfied

WP2 – European Alcohol Policy Youth Conference (Bursa) (APYN)

☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐

Please explain your answer for this deliverable:

_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________

What was good/what could be improved:
Remarks concerning the project in general:

What kind of additional benefit did you gain from the project so far?

Which aspects of the project don’t suit you / should be modified?

Own work package (following questions only address to WP leaders! Please fill in this questions only once per WP):

Name of the work package:

Progress of the work package:

Yes

No

So far, we managed to keep the time schedule of our work package.
Which steps foreseen have not yet been realised?

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

Why? Which problems appeared?

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

How will the problems be solved?

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

Do you need additional support / resources from other partners?

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________