

National Paralympic Committee Development Programme

External evaluation terms of reference

April 2019

Agitos Foundation

Adenauerallee 212-214
53113 Bonn, Germany

Tel. +49 228 2097-200
Fax +49 228 2097-209

www.agitosfoundation.org
info@paralympic.org

1 Background and rationale

1.1 Organisational background

The Agitos Foundation (AF) is the development arm of the International Paralympic Committee (IPC) and was formally established in 2012. Since its creation, AF has become the leading global organisation for developing Para sport as a tool for changing lives and contributing to an inclusive society for all. The vision of the IPC and the Agitos Foundation, comprising approximately 200 members (179 National Paralympic Committees (NPCs), 5 Regional Paralympic Committees, 15 International Sports Federations (IFs) and 4 International Organisations of Sports for the Disabled) is 'To enable Para athletes to achieve sporting excellence and inspire and excite the world.' It aspires 'To make for a more inclusive society for people with an impairment through Para sport' using the Paralympic values of courage, determination, inspiration and equality to drive programming.

To achieve these, AF engages in organisational capacity-building activities to promote strong leadership in NPCs, designs and implements awareness-raising initiatives with NPCs, strengthens the athlete pathway by enabling Para athletes in emerging countries to compete in sporting opportunities from grassroots to elite level and empowers Para athletes to become positive role models to challenge perceptions in society and to fulfil their potential in their post-sport career.

1.2 Programme background

Since 2017, AF has been implementing the National Paralympic Committee Development Programme (NPCDP). The overall goal of this programme is to increase the knowledge, skills and opportunities for NPCs to develop Para athletes and Para sport, with NPCs, IFs, athletes, coaches, technical officials and managers as the main target groups. The three outcomes, and main outputs of the programme as of the end of 2018, are as follows:

Outcome 1: Strengthen NPCs as active and transparent national entities developing Para sport and promoting Paralympic Movement's aspiration towards a more inclusive society

- Eight training workshops conducted for 111 NPC delegates in governance and planning, athlete development, and marketing and communication
- Creation of action plans based on the workshops
- Follow-up support provided to NPCs by mentors that are experts in the different subject areas

Outcome 2: Increase quality and quantity of sport technical personnel required to produce top quality Para athletes

- 21 courses organised; 12 organised directly by AF, 9 organised by IFs using a grant provided by AF
- 198 coaches trained
- 90 classifiers trained
- 106 technical officials trained
- 21 sport managers trained
- 83 athletes trained
- 55 athletes participated in training camps
- 67 coaches participated in training camps

Outcome 3: Ensure classification and competition opportunities for Para athletes for nations to qualify and prepare athletes for Paralympic Games

- 102 athletes supported to attend competitions
- Seven NPCs provided with equipment

Implementation of the NPCDP has been divided into two distinct phases: phase one, covering the period 2017 to 2019, is designed to implement the expected outcomes stated above in order to support NPCs to compete in the Tokyo 2020 Paralympic Games. Phase two, covering the period 2020-2024, will be designed based on the results of phase one and the needs of the main target groups. The primary users of this evaluation are the AF, the IPC and NPCPD participants, and will help to inform future strategic direction of the programme.

2 Objectives

The overall objective of the evaluation is: to analyse the impact of the programme to date in order to support the strategic planning of the programme from 2020 to 2024.

3 Key evaluation questions

The evaluation criteria to be assessed are impact, relevance, sustainability, efficiency, management and recommendations, with the following key evaluation questions:

Criteria	Evaluation question
Impact	What real difference has the programme made to the beneficiaries?
	Are the outcomes experienced different for women and men?
Relevance	How relevant is the programme to the needs and priorities of the different stakeholders (NPCs, IFs, athletes and IPC)?
	Is the programme relevant to the needs of both men and women?
	What other activities could be added to the programme that would help it to achieve the outcomes?
Sustainability	What are the factors that influence the sustainability of the programme?
Efficiency	Were activities cost-efficient?
	Were short-term outcomes achieved on time?
Management	How effective are the internal management and coordination structures established for the programme?
Recommendations	What changes are recommended for the design and implementation of the three main outcomes in the second phase of the programme (2020-2024)?

The full evaluation design matrix can be found in the annex.

4 Methodology

The evaluation will use a mixed method approach consisting of both quantitative and qualitative data collection through surveys, key informant interviews (KIIs) and observations, as well as a desk review of all relevant programme documentation (reports, participation databases, debrief summaries, survey results, workshop reports etc.). Data collection will take place both through site visits to select events which gather many of the target groups, through telephone interviews and through online-administered surveys. Site visits will be conducted to two events which will gather many of the target groups; the first event will take place in South Africa and is a five-day event, the second takes place in Bonn and is a three-day event. All costs for travel and accommodation should be included in the financial proposal submitted by the evaluator.

Following an initial review of relevant documentation, and prior to the start of data collection, the evaluator will provide AF with an inception report that outlines the framework, methodology, sampling and indicators that the evaluator intends to utilise.

5 Timeline

The evaluation is expected to commence in June 2019 and should be completed no later than November 2019. AF estimates that the evaluation will take approximately 61 working days; the table below summarises the key tasks as well as an estimate of how much time AF believes should be dedicated to these tasks. The working days for the evaluation need not be consecutive:

Task	Time required
Briefing in Bonn	2
Desk review of relevant documents	5
Inception report	1
Creation of data collection tools	5
Survey data analysis	3
KIIs with sport technical courses participants	7
KIIs with athlete support participants	4
KIIs with organisational capacity programme participants	4
KIIs with NPC/IF KIIs	7
KII data analysis	5
Event 1 KIIs/observations (OCP South Africa)	5
Event 1 data analysis	1
Event 2 KIIs (GA Bonn)	3
Event 2 data analysis	1
Report writing	5

Presentation preparation and debriefing in Bonn	2
Finalisation of report	1
TOTAL	61

The evaluator can propose a different timeline based on the information provided here; the proposed timeline should be explained in the technical proposal.

6 Deliverables

The **final deliverables** for this evaluation will include:

- *An inception report* due to the AF for approval within the first 9 working days
- *A draft report* detailing key findings, supporting evidence, and concrete recommendations due to AF for feedback within 58 working days
- *One oral presentation of key findings* with relevant AF staff following submission of the draft report
- *A final report* incorporating all relevant feedback, (due within 61 working days and prior to 30 November 2019). The final report should provide brief, clear and pragmatic conclusions and recommendations in response to the evaluation questions, as well as an executive summary

7 Qualifications

The selected evaluator (or evaluation team) should have the following:

- Fluency in English, French and Spanish
- Outstanding oral and written communication skills
- Bachelor's degree in international development, social sciences, or related field
- At least four years of experience in designing, implementing and overseeing project evaluations or a combination of education, training and experience
- Demonstrated experience working in the field of international sport management, sport development or sport for development is desirable
- Demonstrated understanding of gender issues
- Inter-cultural communication skills
- Strong facilitation, presentation, and communication skills
- Strong ability to communicate effectively in English, both verbally and in writing
- Team player with the ability to closely collaborate with AF staff, grantees, and project stakeholders

8 Application and selection process

A technical and financial proposal, including the names and contact information for three recent references and the CV of the evaluator (or each member of the evaluation team) should be sent in electronic format with the subject "**NPCDP evaluation proposal**" to the following email address: info@agitosfoundation.org. The technical proposal should include details on the methodology and timeline proposed by the evaluator. Applications close 1 May 2019 at midnight.

Proposals will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

- Quality of the technical proposal with regard to what is outlined in the terms of reference.
- Profile and experience of the evaluator/evaluation team
- Suitability of the proposal in terms of budget and timeline

AF reserves the right to ask candidates to clarify aspects of the technical or financial proposal if necessary. AF may ask for examples of previous work after reviewing the application materials.

Annex 1: Evaluation design matrix

Criteria	Evaluation question	Data required	Data collection method
Impact	What real difference has the programme made to the beneficiaries?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If and how the capacity of NPCs on an individual and organisational level has changed - If and how the capacity of athletes, coaches, technical officials participating in sport technical courses and athlete support components has changed - Any intended and unintended outcomes of the programme 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review of event reports - Review of narrative reports - Interviews with participants - Interviews with NPC representatives - Interviews with AF staff - Interviews with IPC staff and leadership - Interviews with IFs
	Are the outcomes experienced different for women and men?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How the outcomes of the programme have been experienced by women and men - If the outcomes have been experienced equally by women and men 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews with NPC representatives - Interviews with participants of different components
Relevance	How relevant is the programme to the needs and priorities of the different stakeholders (NPCs, IFs, athletes and IPC)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Needs of the different stakeholders at the outset of the programme compared with the design of the programme and the expected outcomes - The relevance of the tier mover criteria and categorisation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews with NPCs, IFs, athletes and IPC - Interviews with staff involved in tier mover process
	Is the programme relevant to the needs of both men and women?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Needs of men and women, and if these are different - What the different programme components do to incorporate these needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews with NPCs - Interviews with participants of training courses - Interviews with AF staff - Review of event reports - Review of narrative reports
	What other activities could be added to the programme that would help it to achieve the outcomes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Other needs that NPCs have related to the AF Pathways and Representation programme areas that are not being met by the programme 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews with NPCs - Interviews with IPC - Interviews with IFs - Interviews with participants of training courses

Sustainability	What are the factors that influence the sustainability of the programme?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reasons why the benefits of the project would continue or end once the funding has ceased 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews with NPCs - Interviews with participants of training courses
Efficiency	Were activities cost-efficient?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Comparison of projected budget with current spend 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review of programme budget at outset of the programme - Review of financial spend reports
	Were short-term outcomes achieved on time?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Perceptions of different stakeholders on the short-, medium- and long-term outcomes of the programme - If the expected outcomes planned at the outset of the project were achieved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review of proposal - Review of narrative reports - Interviews with NPCs - Interviews with participants of training courses
Management	How effective are the internal management and coordination structures established for the programme?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information on coordination mechanisms established with IPC, IFs and internally, how effective these have been and how they can be improved - Whether or not the monitoring and reporting mechanisms are adequate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews with AF staff - Interviews with IPC - Interviews with IFs - Review of narrative reports - Review of M&E system
Recommendations	What changes are recommended for the design and implementation of the three main outcomes in the second phase of the programme (2020-2024)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Based on responses to previous evaluation questions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Based on responses to previous evaluation questions