

ECL YOUTH AMBASSADORS FOR THE ECAC

MID-TERM EVALUATION

July 2020





EU FUNDING DISCLAIMER

Co-funded by the Health Programme of the European Union. ECL has received funding under an operating grant (SGA: 881569) from the Third Health Programme (2014-2020). The content of this report does not reflect the views of the European Commission, the Consumers, Health, Agriculture and Food Executive Agency or any other body of the European Union. The European Commission and the Agency do not accept any responsibility for use that may be made of the information it contains.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
The ECL Youth Ambassadors for the European Code Against Cancer programme	2
Background	2
Mission.....	2
Main goal.....	3
Objectives	3
Target groups and beneficiaries	3
Mid term evaluation – Rationale & Objectives	4
Rationale for the evaluation	4
Description of the evaluation	4
Evaluation Criteria	4
Objective 1: <i>To assess the added value of being a part of the programme from the perspective of existing YAs</i>	5
Objective 2: <i>To gather concrete recommendations for improving the Programme (so that YAs can increase their potential impact)</i>	5
Methodology of the evaluation.....	5
.....	6
Mid-term evaluation results	6
SWOT analysis and group discussion with the ECL YAs Advisory Group	6
Web-based survey.....	7
Semi-structured interviews.....	11
Relevance	11
Conclusions	13
Annex 1 – Youth Ambassadors Mid-Term Evaluation Survey	15
Annex 2 - Interview schedule and procedure.....	22

Executive Summary

This report presents the findings of the mid-term evaluation of the ECL Youth Ambassadors (YAs) for the European Code Against Cancer (ECAC) programme, whose pilot phase started in 2015. The evaluation was undertaken by the ECL Secretariat between January 2020 and March 2020. The key objective of the evaluation was to assess the relevance, responsiveness, effectiveness, and sustainability of the programme. The evaluation focused on reviewing, in quantitative and qualitative terms, progress on the current programme (including its strengths, weaknesses and main obstacles faced) and to identify possible needs for reorientation for the subsequent implementation phase. The assessment entails result of a SWOT analysis with the YAs Programme's Advisory Group, a Web-based Survey among the whole YAs cohort and individual semi-structured questions with randomly selected YAs.

Overall, the ECL YAs program has been positively evaluated. Nonetheless, several measures were identified to improve the programme by optimising workflows and practices. Based on the present evaluation, the following measures are recommended:

- Increase the program's focus on collaborative actions;
- Better define the role and composition of the YAs Advisory Group.
- Delineate a comprehensive strategy for the call's dissemination to reach candidates of different backgrounds and age.
- Increase the effectiveness of ECL Secretariat interactions with the YAs by communicating through direct, brief, and easy-to-read emails.
- Reinforce YAs-lead social media channels and external communication.

Overall, based on our findings, including a close reading of the mid-term evaluation itself, we can conclude that the ECL YAs programme provides a unique opportunity for students and young professionals in Europe to become effective cancer prevention advocates.

The ECL Youth Ambassadors for the European Code Against Cancer programme

Background

The idea to create the ECL Youth Ambassadors (YAs) for the European Code Against Cancer (ECAC) programme was first discussed as part of [The European Partnership for Action Against Cancer](#) (EPAAC). The suggestion to form an international network of ambitious public health enthusiasts came about from discussions among cancer leagues about the most appropriate ways to disseminate and promote the ECAC among the youth. Communicating positive health messages to people from a young age is crucial for instilling health-supporting behaviours that will last across the life-course. Thus, the programme is informed by the belief that providing cancer prevention advocates of the future with the skills and knowledge necessary to disseminate the ECAC will lead to long-term improvements in the cancer burden.

ECL launched the programme in 2015 to gather insights from young people on how to effectively spread the word about the 4th edition of the ECAC. The first cohort of Ambassadors came together in Czech Republic in May 2015 during European Week Against Cancer. The group comprised 18 Ambassadors from 15 different countries within the WHO European region. Since then, the ECL Youth Ambassador group has met annually, continued to grow, and undertaken an increasing number of actions to promote the ECAC at the national, regional, and local level. At the time of this evaluation, the group includes 65 members from 37 countries, falling broadly under those countries that are eligible for ECL membership.

ECL aims to nurture young public health enthusiasts to become successful leaders in cancer prevention and the wider European cancer community. YAs are asked to organise and implement actions which align with their interests and expertise and lead to regional and local impact or aim to initiate a regional or local collaboration. YAs receive support, advice, financial assistance, and in-kind resources from the ECL secretariat and meet face-to-face every year on the occasion of the annual summer school. In return for supporting the dissemination of the ECAC, ECL provides YAs with opportunities for training, peer-to-peer learning, networking with experienced leaders, and participation in conferences and events.

To date, the YAs Programme remains the only youth-lead organisation promoting and advocating for cancer prevention at the European level. ECL stands by the idea that young people are an important resource in promoting preventive messages to mitigate risks, disseminate and augment these messages in their families and peer groups and in reaching out to their wider community.

Mission

The mission of ECL Youth Ambassadors programme is to contribute towards alleviating the burden of cancer across the WHO European Region through evidence-based preventative actions. ECL Youth Ambassadors envision a Europe where all avoidable cancer deaths are prevented through individual lifestyle choices, supported by coordinated governmental policies and actions.

Main goal

The objective of the programme is to raise awareness and communicate about the importance of cancer prevention and the ECAC among the general public, with a focus on children, adolescents, and young adults. Through the programme, ECL fosters collaboration among young public health enthusiasts across Europe, encouraging them to undertake creative and enterprising actions in their countries of residence and to participate in joint campaigns.

Objectives

- To tap into the professional, academic, and social networks of each YA to better disseminate the messages of the ECAC to the public in general and young people in particular;
- To provide regular training and learning opportunities to the Ambassadors to enable them to develop their advocacy, communication and project management skills;
- To support the Ambassadors to develop and implement personal and collaborative actions and campaigns to promote the ECAC by providing them with the necessary resources and connecting them with key stakeholders;
- To gather knowledge and insights from the Ambassadors about best practices, success stories and challenges related to their cancer prevention and health promotion communication efforts.

Target groups and beneficiaries

- The primary beneficiaries are young public health enthusiasts aged 18-35 years old, who are residing in a country within the WHO European Region.
- The secondary beneficiaries are the children, teens, young adults, and adults positively impacted by the Ambassadors' projects and actions.

Mid term evaluation – Rationale & Objectives

Rationale for the evaluation

The YAs programme currently receives support from an operating grant of the European Commission under the 3rd EU Health programme. This support covers the period 2018–2021. Therefore, at the mid-point of this grant, the ECL Secretariat has performed a mid-term evaluation of the ECL YAs programme in order to:

- (i) address issues or problems in design, implementation, and management of the programme; and
- (ii) reinforce those elements that demonstrate value with the aim of continuing and expanding the programme into the future.

Description of the evaluation

The key objective of the operational evaluation was to assess the *relevance, responsiveness, effectiveness, and sustainability* of the ECL Youth Ambassadors programme, including measuring the value of the programme to the Youth Ambassadors to help improve the functioning of the group. The long-term impact of the programme is beyond the scope of this evaluation and will be evaluated separately at the end of 2021.

The evaluation focused on reviewing, in quantitative and qualitative terms, the processes of the current programme (including its strengths, weaknesses and main obstacles faced), the general structure and governance of the programme, and the methods and means available (i.e. the joint and individual actions and campaigns, and microgrant resources).

It covers and assesses administrative capacity, the resource allocation, as well as the human resources and the structures and procedures to administer, implement and manage the programme. It also captures the state of the implementation of the programme highlighting its shortcomings and points for improvement from the perspective of the primary beneficiaries: the YAs themselves.

Evaluation Criteria

Relevance *The extent to which the programme is suited to the priorities of the target group and its value to the target group.*

Responsiveness *The extent to which ECL supported the target group and kept them informed about activities and opportunities.*

Effectiveness *The extent to which the programme's opportunities were taken advantage of by the target group.*

Sustainability *The extent to which the programme's administrative processes and governance is suitable.*

Objective 1: To assess the added value of being a part of the programme from the perspective of existing YAs

The evaluation aimed to understand the extent to which:

- YAs are equipped with a range of relevant skills and knowledge (including ECAC, cancer issues and civil society knowledge as well as project management, advocacy, leadership, communication);
- YAs engage in international, national, and local actions and campaigns both in real-life and virtual spaces.

It also aims to quantify the following:

- Satisfaction with the structure and organisation of the programme;
- Satisfaction with the recruitment process, number of YAs per country and profile of YAs;
- Satisfaction with the eligibility criteria and terms of reference of the programme.

Objective 2: To gather concrete recommendations for improving the Programme (so that YAs can increase their potential impact)

The evaluation aimed to understand YAs' opinions regarding the following:

- Governance of the programme;
- Strategic partnerships & communication plan for attracting YAs and promoting work;
- Resources available and required;
- Training needs.

Methodology of the evaluation

SWOT Analysis & Group Discussion at the ECL Annual Meeting with YAs Advisory Group

November 2019

Document Analysis of a sample of activity reports and other documentation

December 2019

Web-based Survey sent to 65 YAs through Qualtrics

January 2020/ February 2020

Online semi-structured interviews with 8 YAs from 8 countries

March 2020

Mid-term evaluation results

SWOT analysis and group discussion with the ECL YAs Advisory Group

In November 2019, the six members of the ECL YAs Advisory Group convened to discuss the future of the programme and analyse its strengths and weaknesses through a SWOT analysis.

Relevance

The Advisory Group praised the uniqueness of the programme, being the only European youth-led network of cancer prevention advocates. The main strengths were identified in its bottom-up and decentralised approach and in the opportunities of personal and professional development offered by the programme.

The Advisory Group also recognised a number of weaknesses. They highlighted the uneven engagement of YAs across countries, the scarce cooperation of many YAs with local partners and the stagnation of external communications on social and traditional media in certain times of the year. These result in the persistence of a scarce level of awareness about YAs actions both within and outside the network.

Responsiveness

Overall, members of the Advisory Group judged positively ECL responsiveness to the needs and requests of the YAs. As mentioned above, ECL succeeds in offering a wide variety of opportunities for personal and professional development to the YAs despite the difficulty of managing a very diverse group of young health advocates.

Effectiveness

The Advisory Group identified three areas that offer room for improving YAs program effectiveness: (1) Social media communication; (2) role of the Advisory Group; and (3) work streams.

- (1) There is room for improvement in the social media output. The Advisory Group deemed it crucial to increase the effectiveness of the YAs social media communication to boost the visibility of YAs actions and increase their impact. The main ECAC accounts on Facebook and Instagram should be more active especially during events such as the World Cancer Day and the European Week Against Cancer.
- (2) The Advisory Group recognised the importance of their role in providing guidance to ECL Secretariat. Nonetheless, they agreed that there should be more transparency as it appears that many YAs are not aware of the role and composition of this group. They also proposed that each member of the Advisory Group is given the responsibility of leading a number of YAs by providing them support and suggestions.
- (3) The Advisory Group agreed on the potential of having work streams within the programme to facilitate YAs engagement and allow for more structured collaborative actions. They recommended each work stream to elect a lead YA.

Sustainability

This component represents a key threat to the YAs programme, as the financial resources are derived solely from the ECL operating grant un the 3rd EU Health Programme. In addition, under-representation across Europe and the reliance on a few highly active YAs were deemed further threats to the sustainability of the programme. The Advisory Group recommended to advertise broadly and on different channels the annual call for new YAs. They suggested creating a list of websites and databases that could be used for dissemination. Overall, they believed calls should be country specific to give priority to underrepresented regions. As for the current members of the program, they advised to create an award system to motivate YAs and to make sure that successful actions are recognised by ECL and its partners.

Web-based survey

Responses to survey

- Out of 65 Youth Ambassadors, 47 completed the web-based survey.
- The survey is representative of the views of 72% of all Youth Ambassadors.

Respondents profiles

- Most respondents (80%) had been in the program for up to two years at the time of the survey.
- The remaining respondents (20%) had been in the program for longer than two years at the time of the survey.
- About half of respondents were working or volunteering in a cancer league in their country of residence at the time of the survey.
- The majority (50%) of respondents were employed (full or part time) at the time of the interview.
- Students and PhD candidates made up 38% of respondents.

Relevance

- In terms of country representativeness in the programme, most respondents assessed it *very* (53%) to *extremely* (23%) representative.
- The representativeness of young people (18-35) has been judged adequate (extremely representative – 31% – very representative – 38%). Nonetheless, a significant proportion of respondents assessed the programme *moderately* (25%), *slightly* (2%) to *not at all* (2%) representative.

“I feel like the YA’s are mostly higher educated young professionals, which doesn’t feel like a representation of all young people in Europe. If we want to address the ECAC among lower educated people, we might want to include them into the program.”

“(…) make greater representation of individuals in the 25-30- and 31-35-years age bracket”

“Future calls should make every effort to try and create more diversity across qualified, allied health professionals, advocates and other professions (…)”

Responsiveness

- Slightly more than half of all respondents were satisfied with the support provided by ECL. About 40% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, while 4% were dissatisfied.
- Although most respondents were *very satisfied* with their role of YA for the ECAC, about 28% were *moderately satisfied*.
- Although most respondents were aware of the existence of a voluntary Advisory Group composed by 6 ambassadors, 34% did not know about the existence of this body.
- Respondent's opinion regarding the necessity of making YA Advisory Group a formal part of the programme is uncertain. About 60% did believe in this necessity whereas 40% were unsure.

<p>Making it more accessible to every YA</p>	<p><i>“Creation of a survey for the interested ambassadors to express their interests in formally joining the project (...)”</i></p> <p><i>“A formal call for YAs to join the advisory group (...)”</i></p> <p><i>“Members of advisory group should be chosen by voting among other YAs”</i></p>
<p>Sharing of info between Advisory Group and other YAs</p>	<p><i>“A live chat among the YAs, so that the members of the formal advisory group share the most important details with the rest of the YAs”</i></p> <p><i>“The advisory group can create a Drive folder for Q&As of YAs, recommendations for YAs, problems and practical solutions for YAs, activity ideas, etc...”</i></p>
<p>More defined role of Advisory Group</p>	<p><i>“(...) help create a strategy for the work of YA Ambassadors”</i></p> <p><i>“(...) help create the core common activities”</i></p> <p><i>“(...) help the new ambassadors with their experience, to involve them easier into the program”</i></p> <p><i>“I don’t know about the group and their objectives”</i></p> <p><i>“If they become formal, then what will be the benefits to the advisory group and other Youth Ambassadors? Do current YAs know who is the member of the advisory group? (...)”</i></p>

Effectiveness

- Most respondents stated they spend on average 1-5 hours a month in the programme.
- 27% spend more than 11 hours or more on the programme every month.
- In the past year (2019), 85% of YAs succeeded in the organisation of at least one initiative.

- During 2019, about 87% of respondents participated in at least one collaborative action coordinated by ECL or other YAs.
- Although most respondents did apply for a microgrant at any time in their capacity as YAs, 36% did not take advantage of this opportunity.
- Among those who applied for a microgrant, 63% received it.
- Reasons for not applying for a microgrant were:
 - 1) YAs are not aware of the existence of such funding opportunities
"I don't know about micro-grants."
 - 2) Lack of time to plan bigger events that would require funding.
"(...) the activity I've organized didn't require financial support. I didn't apply for the last call because these days I'm having my final exam and preparing my thesis is taking me full-time."
 - 3) Lack of understanding of application process, which type of actions can be funded and what is the funding budget of ECL
"Uncertainty of micro-grant application success and how much financial support ECL is willing to provide"
"(...) an infographic etc. that shows the main areas funded (e.g. conferences, printing material) could be easier to get through and might motivate more people to apply"
"(...)lack of information"
"(...) very detailed process"
 - 4) Lack of ideas
"Could not come up with the major ideas to apply"

Sustainability

- Most respondents believed that the call for applications to join the Youth Ambassador programme is *very well* (51%) to *extremely well* (12%) publicised.
- A considerable number of respondents believed that the call for application is *moderately well* (25%) to *slightly well* (10%) publicised.
- Most (74%) participants to the survey agreed that the call for new applicants should be held on an annual basis.
- Overall, the respondents were *moderately* (27%) to *extremely* (61%) satisfied with the application process.

<p>(Social media) Visibility</p>	<p><i>"(...) some more social media visibility"</i></p> <p><i>"(...) a greater effort to disseminate recruitment advertise beyond cancer leagues and medical faculties"</i></p> <p><i>"(...) effective dissemination by YAs to their networks would go a long way"</i></p> <p><i>"I think that we the YAs can be the best promotes of the call for applications by suggesting to our friends and colleges"</i></p> <p><i>"The decision to advertise the call through medical student association networks, such as EMSA, is a good one and should be maintained"</i></p> <p><i>"(...) we the YAs can be the best promotes of the call for applications by suggesting to our friends and colleges (...)"</i></p> <p><i>"(...) LinkedIn Ad (...)"</i></p> <p><i>"Use the youth ambassadors to publish in their own native language"</i></p>
<p>Short notice for Summer School</p>	<p><i>"Too short the time from the new ambassadors' confirmation and Summer School. Only after SS I started to feel involved, got more aware."</i></p>
<p>Vague information on YA actions on website & application form</p>	<p><i>"A bit more information on the website regarding actions- I thought it was a bit vague and wasn't fully sure of what I was supposed to be doing until summer school."</i></p> <p><i>"A FAQ section on the Youth Ambassadors program will also help prospective applicants."</i></p>
<p>Country specific calls</p>	<p><i>"(...) unclear clause about applications from countries without existing ambassadors."</i></p> <p><i>"(...) check where there's countries underrepresented and regarding those that make a greater effort to recruit."</i></p> <p><i>"(...) if a country is already very well represented consider do not open a call for that country (...)"</i></p> <p><i>"I think it should be open depending on the needs of the program because of the limited funds available for the group"</i></p>
<p>Communication</p>	<p><i>"Online meetings were not planned well."</i></p>
<p>Group heterogeneity</p>	<p><i>"Non-medical areas should be preferred for the heterogeneity of the group."</i></p>

Semi-structured interviews

Number of interviews

- A total number of 12 Youth Ambassadors were further invited to a brief phone interview. Ten Ambassadors agreed to the interviews.
- YAs were asked to provide their opinion on four main aspects of the programme:
 1. The perceived relevance of their role as ECL YAs;
 2. The effectiveness of the program of engaging YAs in advocacy actions and increasing their knowledge/skills in the field of cancer prevention;
 3. The responsiveness of ECL in supporting YAs in their actions;
 4. The sustainability of the programme;

Relevance

All interviewed participants believed in the relevance of their role as a YA for the European Code Against Cancer. Being an ECL YA has been described as *meaningful* and *necessary* when “*considering that 4 out of 10 cancer cases can be prevented*”. Although it seemed that all respondents perceived the objective of the programme (“*raising awareness on the ECAC among the European Youth*”) as *suitable* and *appropriate*, it emerged that they do not have a clear understanding of the impact of their actions on society and on their communities.

A view shared by all respondents, is that the scope of the programme is limited to individual actions that reach a small number of people. They believed that coordinated actions among YAs at the national and international level have a higher potential of reaching a larger number of people when compared to actions carried out by a single YA at the local level. “*I feel like YAs are doing many small things that are disconnected from one another, I believe we need to think bigger to increase our impact*”.

Nonetheless, all respondents but one, claimed to have noticed an increased interest in the topic of cancer prevention among their close contacts (family, friends, colleagues ...) because of their actions as YAs. Online actions also seem to have had the strongest perceived impact. According to one respondent “*when we all work together on the same project, like we did for the social media campaign for World Cancer Day, we are most effective in raising awareness and reaching the highest number of people*” and, on a similar note, “*we show our cohesion as YAs and demonstrate that we are a trustworthy group of youth cancer prevention advocates*”.

Responsiveness

All respondents were very positive about the degree and quality of support received by ECL secretariat. “*I have always felt valued by ECL Staff, which always provided me with prompt support when needed*”. What emerged as most appreciated features were:

- a. Timely and comprehensive answers to any query;
- b. Attention to YAs' individual interests;
- c. Suggestion or invites to attend conferences and other events happening in YAs countries of residence or of specific relevance for a YA background.

All but one interviewed YA were aware of the existence of an Advisory Group. Although most knew about its existence, none had a clear idea of its role and composition. *"I know there is an advisory group, but I do not know who part of it is and who is there to advise"*.

Effectiveness

Overall, the interviewed Ambassadors were *moderately to very satisfied* by the support received by ECL secretariat. Respondents were particularly pleased with the responsiveness of the secretariat to YAs queries. Unanimously, they agreed that any email or message they sent to the YA coordinator was timely and comprehensively answered. *"My emails were always answered within a day or two and ECL Staff always helped me in the best way they could"*.

The interviewed Ambassadors had conflicting opinions on the following;

- a. The length and frequency of the monthly email sent to all YAs for general updates and reminders.
 - i. Some respondents thought the emails were too long. *"We all work or study ... we are busy. When I receive a long email during the day I think 'I will read it tonight' but then I forget"*. *"(...) the emails should be brief and should be easily readable on a phone"*, they said. Therefore, they suggested sending more concise emails even if that meant having to send more than one email a month.
- b. The best way for ECL to communicate messages aimed at all Ambassadors (e.g. recurrent emails, Facebook, Instagram etc.)

Sustainability

All interviewed ambassadors agreed on the appropriateness of having a 5 years' mandate for ECL's Ambassadors. The underlying rationale was that a turnover of Ambassadors would guarantee the intake of fresh and new ideas in the programme. Nonetheless, a common view was that *"ECL should not exclude from the network Ambassadors who are still active but who reached the mandate time limit"*. This is because *"(...) old, experienced Ambassadors can be a valuable source of ideas and support for new Ambassadors."* Respondents advanced the following proposals:

- a. Constituting a body of former ambassadors (like an *alumnae organisation*) who, is kept up to date with news related to the programme and ECL and who is given the opportunity to join events such as the summer school on their own expenses;
- b. Constituting an advisory body composed by former Ambassadors that serve the role of advising new Ambassadors;
- c. Despite keeping the mandate time limit, giving active Ambassadors who still want to be part of the programme the possibility of doing so. This decision should be at the discretion of ECL Staff who can choose to give this opportunity to deserving Ambassadors.

Conclusions

Relevance

ECL YA programme is unique, meaningful, and necessary considering the widespread lack of awareness on modifiable risk factors for cancer.

Although YAs seem to be aware of the relevance of their role for their communities, they seem not to have a clear understanding of the impact of their actions on society. Overall, they believe collaborative actions to be more impactful as they have the potential of reaching a larger number of people. Individual, local actions are deemed to have a narrow scope as they reach a small number of people and their impact is difficult to assess.

According to YAs, the programme adequately represents countries across the WHO European Region. Nonetheless, the results reveal a moderate dissatisfaction with the overall representativeness of young Europeans. Older age groups (25+) are perceived as underrepresented. Similarly, current ambassadors do not seem to be sufficiently diverse in educational backgrounds and professional profiles. A higher representation of people with lower than tertiary level education is deemed necessary to increase the program representativeness.

Responsiveness

ECL responsiveness to the needs of YAs seem to be adequate and enough. The interviewed YAs praised the prompt availability of ECL staff in offering their support and the attention to YAs individual interests for instance when inviting them to events of specific relevance for their background. Nonetheless, there seems to be room for improvement as a significant portion of survey's respondents were not completely satisfied with the support provided by ECL Secretariat.

Surveys and interviews responses highlighted the scarce awareness of the YAs of the existence and role of the Advisory Group. Most YAs were also uncertain about the possibility of making the Advisory Group a formal body of the program.

Effectiveness

The YAs programme required an average commitment time of 1-5 hours a month. In 2019, the large majority of respondent Ambassadors succeeded in organising at least one individual activity and participated in at least one collaborative action. ECL granted financial support to slightly more than half of Ambassadors who applied for a microgrant. It emerged that some YAs were unsure about ways to apply and the eligibility criteria for microgrants. This shows room for improvement in the allocation of funding for YAs actions.

ECL's means of communicating with YAs is appreciated. Although respondents judged positively the use of different communication channels, emails seemed to be the most welcomed one. However, interviews revealed conflicting opinions on the optimal length and frequency. While some respondents appreciated the long monthly emails, some claimed they required too much time to be read.

Sustainability

YAs judged positively the possibility of welcoming new YAs in the programme on an annual basis as this guarantees the regular intake of new, fresh perspectives and ideas. However, the promotion of the calls could be improved by increasing the social media visibility also at local levels. Respondents also suggested sharing more practical information on YAs actions while advertising the call. YAs recommended successful applicants to be enrolled in the program in time to be able to join the summer school.

Overall, respondents agreed on maintaining the mandate time limit of 5 years to ensure a turnover in country representatives. Nonetheless, many suggested a flexible implementation of this rule: deserving YAs who still want to be part of the program should be given the chance of doing so even after the completion of the 5 years mandate.

Recommendations

Considering the findings of the present evaluation, the following actions could be taken to further improve ECL YAs programme:

- a. Focus on collaborative actions. The creation of subgroups within the YAs network could allow for more structured cooperation and well-defined collaborative actions. This will likely have a dual effect:
 - (1) increase YAs commitment to the programme by easing their cooperation with fellow YAs;
 - (2) broaden the scope of YAs actions while increasing the outreach of beneficiaries.
- b. Better define the role and composition of the YAs Advisory Group. The existence of an intermediary body between the YAs and ECL Secretariat can be beneficial for both parties. The Advisory Group can guide YAs in carrying out their function as well as advise ECL secretariat on how to best support the programme. One or two particularly capable YAs could be appointed by ECL secretariat as leaders of the subgroups and be responsible for reporting back.
- c. Keep holding open calls for new YAs on an annual basis and delineate a strategy for the call's dissemination so as to reach candidates of different backgrounds and ages. A subgroup could be made responsible for creating such a strategy.
- d. Emails should be the preferred means of communication between YAs and ECL secretariat. Send regular monthly emails. Include a brief and easy-to-read summary in each email to allow YAs to quickly assimilate the main messages.
- e. Reinforce YAs social media channels by creating clear guidelines for YAs and investigating new and creative ways for communicating ECAC messages to online followers.

Annex 1 – Youth Ambassadors Mid-Term Evaluation Survey

Q1 How long have you been a Youth Ambassador?

- Less than 1 year (1)
 - About 2 years (2)
 - About 3 years (3)
 - About 4 years (4)
 - About 5 years (5)
-

Q2 Are you currently working or volunteering for a cancer league?

- Yes (1)
 - No (2)
-

Q3 Which of the following best describes your current situation?

- Full-time student (Bachelor/Master level) (1)
- Full-time research student (PhD) (4)
- In employment (full/part-time/own business) (2)
- Other (3)

Q4 To what extent do you agree that the call for applications to join the Youth Ambassadors programme is well publicised by ECL?

- Extremely well (1)
 - Very well (2)
 - Moderately well (3)
 - Slightly well (4)
 - Not well at all (5)
-

Q5 Do you agree that the call for applications to join the Youth Ambassadors programme should be held on an annual basis?

- Yes (1)
 - No (2)
-

Q6 Thinking back to the time when you applied to become a Youth Ambassador, how satisfied were you with the whole process of application?

Note: the whole process covers the period from when you first learned about the programme up until when you were accepted into the programme.

- Extremely satisfied (1)
 - Moderately satisfied (2)
 - Slightly satisfied (3)
 - Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (4)
 - Slightly dissatisfied (5)
 - Moderately dissatisfied (6)
 - Extremely dissatisfied (7)
-

Q7 Do you have any suggestions for ECL could how improve future calls for applications to join the Youth Ambassadors programme?

Q8 In terms of the number of countries that are covered by the Youth Ambassadors programme at present, how representative of Europe do you feel the programme is overall?

Note: all 53 countries within the WHO European region are eligible to be included in the programme.

- Extremely representative (1)
- Very representative (2)
- Moderately representative (3)
- Slightly representative (4)
- Not representative at all (5)
-

Q9 In terms of the variety of people within the Youth Ambassador programme, how representative of young people (aged 18-35) in Europe is the programme overall?

- Extremely representative (1)
- Very representative (2)
- Moderately representative (3)
- Slightly representative (4)
- Not representative at all (5)
-

Q10 Are you aware that there is a voluntary advisory group of 6 current Youth Ambassadors who assist ECL with the organisation of the Youth Ambassadors programme?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)
-

Q11 In your opinion as a Youth Ambassador, should ECL make the advisory group a formal part of the Youth Ambassadors programme in 2020?

- Yes (32)
- Unsure (33)
- No (34)
-

Q12 Please add any suggestions you may have regarding the possibility to create a formal advisory group:

Q13 According to your own estimation, how many hours per month do you spend on the Youth Ambassadors programme?

- Less than 1 hour (365)
- 1-5 hours (366)
- 6-10 hours (367)
- 11-15 hours (368)
- 15 hours or more (369)

Q14 During the past 12 months, in your personal capacity as a Youth Ambassador, have you organised any activities on your own initiative?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)
-

Q15 During the past 12 months, in your personal capacity as a Youth Ambassador, have you participated in any collaborative action organised by ECL or other Youth Ambassadors?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)
-

Q16 At any time in your capacity as a Youth Ambassador, have you applied for a Micro-grant from ECL?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Skip To: Q17 If At any time in your capacity as a Youth Ambassador, have you applied for a Micro-grant from ECL? = Yes

Skip To: Q19 If At any time in your capacity as a Youth Ambassador, have you applied for a Micro-grant from ECL? = No

Display This Question:

If At any time in your capacity as a Youth Ambassador, have you applied for a Micro-grant from ECL? = Yes

Q17 Were you successful with your Micro-grant application?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Skip To: Q18 If Were you successful with your Micro-grant application? = Yes

Skip To: Q20 If Were you successful with your Micro-grant application? = No

Display This Question:

If Were you successful with your Micro-grant application? = Yes

Q18 Did the activity covered by your Micro-grant application take place?

- Yes (1)
- Not yet (2)
- No (3)

Skip To: Q20 If Did the activity covered by your Micro-grant application take place? = Yes

Skip To: Q20 If Did the activity covered by your Micro-grant application take place? = Not yet

Skip To: Q20 If Did the activity covered by your Micro-grant application take place? = No

Display This Question:

If At any time in your capacity as a Youth Ambassador, have you applied for a Micro-grant from ECL? = No

Q19 What are the reasons that have prevented you from applying for a Micro-grant?

Q20 On a scale from 0-10, how satisfied are you with the support ECL provides for Youth Ambassadors?

- 0 (0)
- 1 (1)
- 2 (2)
- 3 (3)
- 4 (4)
- 5 (5)
- 6 (6)
- 7 (7)
- 8 (8)
- 9 (9)
- 10 (10)

Q21 Overall, are you satisfied to be a member of the Youth Ambassador programme? Using the slider, adjust the face to make either a smile or a frown.



- 1 (1)
- 2 (2)
- 3 (3)
- 4 (4)
- 5 (5)

Annex 2 – Interview schedule and procedure

Semi-structured online interviews through Zoom, Skype and WhatsApp were used to elicit in-depth accounts of YAs' first-hand and individual experiences of being part of the programme and carrying out actions and projects in their capacity as ECL YAs in their countries of residence. 8 YAs were selected for the interviews through a random number generator.

Interviews were carried out by the newly appointed EU Solidarity Corps trainee, who had started working at ECL at the end of January 2020 and with whom YAs were not familiar, so as to reduce bias and allow the YAs to open up and be honest in their answers. The data collected were kept confidential and the interviews were made anonymous. The interviews were not recorded.

The interviewer managed the interviews by explaining the purpose of the interview and how the information collected in this discussion was going to be used. After having received and understood all the research-related information, the participating YAs were asked to voluntarily confirm their willingness to participate. Participants were allowed to withdraw from the study at any time without providing any explanation. The time needed to conduct such interviews and the guiding questions were agreed jointly with ECL's Cancer Prevention Manager.

The guiding questions of the interviews are reported below. Additional follow-up questions were spontaneously asked by the interviewer to prompt the participants to expand on interesting points or to ask additional questions when appropriate. Interviewees raised other questions and issues, so some questions were taken out or modified during several interviews.

1- Relevance – overall program perception

- a. Do you feel like your volunteering actions are meaningful?
 - Do you think that the current objectives of the programme are suitable and appropriate?
- b. Does being an ECL YA meet your expectations?
- c. Do you have a clear understanding of the impact of your volunteering?

2- Responsiveness

- a. In your experience as a YA do you think you received enough and appropriate support from ECL staff? If not, on which occasion/s? How would you have expected to be supported?
- b. Have you received enough training opportunities? If not, which type of training and in what format would like to receive?
 - To what degree has the programme equipped you with knowledge about cancer issues and the ECAC?
- c. Are you aware of the existence of an Advisory Group within the programme and its role?

3- Sustainability

- a. Do you think the current membership composition and eligibility criteria are appropriate?

- b. In your opinion, is the current rule that YAs can be a member for a period of up to 5 years right for the programme?

4- Effectiveness

- a. Do you feel that ECL respects and values its volunteers?
- b. Do you know your rights and responsibilities as a volunteer?
- c. Do you agree with the proposal to establish work streams for the YAs to focus on more specific topics relevant to ECAC?
- d. Were there any disappointments or times when the volunteering activity did not meet your expectations?
- e. Do you think ECL communicates well with its YAs and keeps them up to date with relevant information?

5- Overall impression and recommendations

- a. How would you improve the programme? What sort of volunteers should we have and what activity should we undertake?
- b. What do you think are the major strengths and pitfalls of the programme?