**TPPI Program Observation Form**

|  |
| --- |
| Grantee Name: |
| Implementation Site Name: | Date of Observation: |
| Program/Curriculum Used: | Session Number/Name/Description: |
| Program Facilitator(s):  | Duration of Session:  |
| Observer:  | # of Participants: |

Introduction: The purpose of the observation form is to measure the fidelity and quality of implementation of the program delivery. The questions assess both the extent of material covered and the performance of the facilitator. The scoring rubric is based on whole number increments.

Instructions: The following questions assess the overall quality of the program session and delivery of the information.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Question**  |  **1 Looks like:**  | **3 Looks like:** | **5 Looks like:** | **Rating** | **Comments** |
| **1. In general, how clear were the program facilitator ’s explanations of activities?** | 1 - Most participants do not understand instructions and cannot proceed; many questions asked.  | 3 - About half of the group understands, while the other half asks questions for clarification. | 5 - 90-100% of the participants begins and completes the activity/discussion with no hesitation and no questions. | [ ]  1 Not Clear [ ]  2[ ]  3 Somewhat Clear[ ]  4[ ]  5 Very Clear |  |
| **2. To what extent did the facilitator keep track of time during the session and activities?** | 1- Facilitator does not have time to complete the material (particularly at the end of the session); regularly allows discussions to drag on (e.g., participants seem bored or begin discussing non-related issues in small groups). | 3 - Misses a few points; sometimes allows discussions to drag on. | 5 - Completes all content of the session; completes activities and discussions in a timely manner (using the suggested time limitations in the program manual, if available). | [ ]  1 Not on time[ ]  2[ ]  3 Some loss of time[ ]  4[ ]  5 Well on time |  |
| **3. To what extent did the presentation of materials seem rushed or hurried?** | 1- Facilitator doesn’t allow time for discussion; doesn’t have time for examples; tells participants they are in a hurry; body language suggests stress or hurry. | 3 - Some deletion of discussion/activities; sometimes states but does not explain material. | 5 - Does not rush participants or speech but still completes all the materials; appears relaxed. | [ ]  1 Very rushed[ ]  2[ ]  3 Somewhat rushed[ ]  4[ ]  5 Not rushed |  |
| **4. To what extent did the participants appear to understand the material?** | 1 - Less than 25% seem to understand. | 3 - About half understand. | 5 - 75-100% understand. | [ ]  1 Little understanding[ ]  2[ ]  3 Some participation[ ]  4[ ]  5 Good understanding |  |
| **5. How actively did the group members participate in discussions and activities?** | 1 - Less than 25% participate | 3 - About half participate. | 5 - 75-100% participate.  | [ ]  1 Little participation[ ]  2[ ]  3 Some participation[ ]  4[ ]  5 Active participation |  |

**6. On the following scale, rate the facilitator on the following qualities:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Question**  |  **1 Looks like:** | **5 Looks like:** | **Rating** | **Comments** |
| Knowledge of the program | Cannot answer questions, mispronounces names; reads from the manual. | Provides information above and beyond what’s in the manual; seems very familiar with the concepts and answers questions with ease. | [ ]  1 Poor[ ]  2[ ]  3 Average[ ]  4[ ]  5 Excellent  |  |
| Level of enthusiasm | Presents information in a dry and boring way; lacks personal connection to material; appears burned out. | Makes clear that the program is a great opportunity; gets participants talking and excited; outgoing. | [ ]  1 Poor[ ]  2[ ]  3 Average[ ]  4[ ]  5 Excellent |  |
| Poise and confidence  | Appears nervous or hurried; does not have good eye contact. | Does not hesitate in addressing concerns. Well organized, not nervous. | [ ]  1 Poor[ ]  2[ ]  3 Average[ ]  4[ ]  5 Excellent |  |
| Rapport and communication with participants | Doesn’t remember names; does not "connect" with participants; acts distant or unfriendly. | Gets participants talking and excited; very friendly; uses people’s names when appropriate; seems to understand the community and its needs. | [ ]  1 Poor[ ]  2[ ]  3 Average[ ]  4[ ]  5 Excellent |  |
| Effectively addressed questions/concerns | Engages in "power struggles"; responds negatively to comments; gives inaccurate information; doesn’t direct participants elsewhere for further info. | Answers questions of fact with information, questions of value with validation; if doesn’t know the answer, is honest about it and directs them elsewhere. | [ ]  1 Poor[ ]  2[ ]  3 Average[ ]  4[ ]  5 Excellent |  |

**7. Rate the overall quality of the program session.**

[ ] **1** [ ] **2** [ ] **3** [ ] **4** [ ] **5**

**Poor Average Excellent**

Summary measure of all the preceding questions. Assesses both the extent of material covered and the performance of the facilitator.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Poor sessions look like:** | **Excellent sessions look like:** |
| * Lecture-style of presenting the content
* Reading the content from the notebook
* Stumbling along with the content and failing to make connections to what has been discussed previously or what participants are contributing
* Loses track of time
* Uninvolved participants
* Getting into power struggles with participants about the content
* Judgmental responses
* Flat affect and boring style
* Unorganized and random
 | * Participants are doing rather than talking about activities
* Non-judgmental responses to questions
* Answering questions of fact with information, questions of value with validation
* Good time management and well organized
* Adequate pacing—not too fast and did not drag. Facilitator keeps track of time
* Using effective checks for understanding
* Facilitator makes frequent use of open-ended questions; builds on comments from teens
* Facilitator engages teens throughout the session
 |

**8. Briefly describe any implementation problems you noticed, including any major changes to the content or delivery of the material; time wasted in getting the session**

**9. Please note at least one major strength of the session and/or facilitator’s delivery of the material:**

**10. Other Comments: Use the space below for additional comments regarding strengths or weakness of the session, particularly if there is anything that affected your ratings above.**

**Program Model Fidelity**

**11. Is the target population (age/grade, gender, ethnicity, etc.) appropriate for the model?** [ ] **Yes** [ ] **No**

**Comments:**

**12. Are facilitators trained in selected intervention?** [ ] **Yes** [ ] **No**

**13. Is the number of participants per facilitator appropriate for the model?** [ ] **Yes** [ ] **No**

**Comments:**

**14. Note any other major discrepancies in program setting, program activities, materials (manual, pamphlets, videos), and the planned implementation of the program.**

**Comments:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Acknowledgement** |
| **Observer’s Comments:*****I have discussed and reviewed the documentation with the facilitator.*** **Observer’s Signature: Date:** |
| **Facilitator’s Comments:****Facilitator’s Signature: Date:** |