

# ACT for Youth

---

## Facilitator Observation Form



This form was adapted from FYSB by Healthy Teen Network and RTI International, under contract #HHSP233200951WC Task Order 25 with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration on Children, Youth and Families, Family and Youth Services Bureau.

## Facilitator Observation Form

GENERAL INFO:	
Provider:	Facilitator:
<i>If the session was co-facilitated, complete a separate form for each facilitator.</i>	
Location:	Date: / /
SESSION INFO:	
Observer(s):	Duration of session:
EBP Name & Module(s):	
PARTICIPANT INFO:	
Approximate grade/age range:	
Special Setting or Participant Characteristics:	

**Prior to the observation**, you should review the curriculum and become familiar with the session(s) you will observe. Find out if there are any planned adaptations in advance.

**Please ask the facilitator to indicate which module(s) was observed for the evaluation packet for this cycle.**

The following questions assess the overall quality of the curriculum session and delivery of information. Use your best judgment. After completing this form, enter the information online to submit the record of your observation within 48 hours.

## Facilitator Observation Form

**1. In general, how clear were the facilitator’s instructions for activities?**

1	2	3	4	5	N/A
<b>Not clear</b>		<b>somewhat clear</b>		<b>Very clear</b>	

1- The facilitator’s instructions were vague, unclear or incorrect; many questions were asked; participants exhibited confusion and hesitation in carrying out the activity/discussion.

5- The facilitator’s instructions were very clear; participants appeared to understand directions, did not hesitate, and were able to carry out the activity/discussion.

**2. To what extent did the facilitator manage time well during the session and activities?**

1	2	3	4	5	N/A
<b>Managed Time Poorly</b>				<b>Managed time extremely well</b>	

1- The facilitator did not manage time well; shortened or omitted activities; spent too much time on off-topic discussions

5- The facilitator completed all content, activities, and discussions as planned (using the suggested time limitations in the program manual, if available).

**3. To what extent did the presentation of materials seem rushed or hurried**

1	2	3	4	5	N/A
<b>Very rushed</b>		<b>Somewhat rushed</b>		<b>Not rushed at all</b>	

1- The facilitator did not allow time for discussion, did not have time for examples/questions and/or told participants that they are in a hurry. The facilitator’s body language suggested stress or hurriedness. Spoke quickly, stated repeatedly that s/he is short of time.

5- The facilitator delivered activities at a relaxed pace; handled questions in a timely fashion but still completed all the materials and appeared relaxed.

**4. To what extent did the facilitator manage participant behavior during the session and activities?**

1	2	3	4	5	N/A
<b>Not well managed</b>		<b>Managed somewhat</b>		<b>Extremely well managed</b>	

1- The facilitator poorly managed inappropriate behavior.

3- The facilitator had a few difficulties managing participant behavior.

5- The facilitator responded effectively to inappropriate behavior.

**5. To what extent did participants appear to understand the material? (Use your best judgment based on participant conversations and feedback.)**

1	2	3	4	5	N/A
<b>Little understanding</b>		<b>Some understanding</b>		<b>Good understanding</b>	

1- Less than 25% of participants seemed to understand.

3- About 50% of participants seemed to understand.

5- 75%–100% of participants seemed to understand.

## Facilitator Observation Form

6. **How actively did participants engage in discussions and activities?** (Use your best judgment based on discussions and feedback.)

1	2	3	4	5	N/A
<b>Little participation</b>		<b>Some participation</b>		<b>Active participation</b>	

1- Less than 25% of participants actively engaged in discussions and activities. Students appeared unenthusiastic and bored.

3- About 50% of participants engaged in discussions and activities.

5- 75%–100% of participants engaged in discussions and activities; students appeared enthusiastic and engrossed.

7. **Rate the facilitator on the following qualities.**

a. **Knowledge of the program**

1	2	3	4	5	N/A
<b>Poor</b>		<b>Average</b>		<b>Excellent</b>	

1- The facilitator could not answer questions, mispronounced words, stumbled a lot, read from the manual; appeared uncertain.

5- The facilitator provided relevant information beyond exactly what is written in the manual, seemed very familiar with the concepts, and answered questions with ease and confidence.

b. **Level of enthusiasm**

1	2	3	4	5	N/A
<b>Poor</b>		<b>Average</b>		<b>Excellent</b>	

1- The facilitator presented information in a dry and boring way, lacked personal connection to material, and/or appeared “burned out;” made comments reflecting disapproval of the material.

5- The facilitator presented the information in an animated way, got participants talking and excited, appeared very interested in material.

c. **Poise and confidence**

1	2	3	4	5	N/A
<b>Poor</b>		<b>Average</b>		<b>Excellent</b>	

1- The facilitator appeared nervous and did not have good eye contact with participants; was not able to address participants concerns.

5- The facilitator was well organized, was not nervous, had good eye contact; was able to address participants’ concerns without hesitation.

d. **Rapport and communication with participants**

1	2	3	4	5	N/A
<b>Poor</b>		<b>Average</b>		<b>Excellent</b>	

1- The facilitator did not remember participants’ names, did not “connect” with participants, and acted in a distant or unfriendly manner.

5- The facilitator was very friendly and outgoing, used participants’ names when appropriate, and seemed to understand the target population and its needs.

**e. Effectiveness in addressing questions/concerns**

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Poor</b>		<b>Average</b>		<b>Excellent</b>	

1- The facilitator was not able to address participants' questions/concerns; responded negatively to comments, gave inaccurate information, and/or did not direct participants elsewhere for further information.

5- The facilitator answered questions of fact with information, and questions of value with validation. If the facilitator did not know the answer, he or she was honest about it and directed participants elsewhere.

**f. (If applicable) Coordination with co-facilitators**

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Poor</b>		<b>Average</b>		<b>Excellent</b>	

1- Transitions between facilitators were not smooth, one facilitator did not participate in the session, or facilitators did not appear to have planned their respective roles in the session.

5- Transitions between facilitators were smooth, both facilitators played a role, and each facilitator's role appeared to be defined.

**8. Rate the overall quality of the program session.** (This item assesses both the extent of the material covered and the performance of the facilitator.)

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Poor</b>		<b>Average</b>		<b>Excellent</b>	

Characteristics of poor sessions:

- The facilitator uses lecture-style presentation of content.
- The facilitator reads content from the manual.
- The facilitator stumbles along with content and fails to make connections with what has been discussed previously or what participants are contributing.
- The facilitator gets into power struggles with participants about content.
- The facilitator responds judgmentally.
- The facilitator has a flat and boring style.
- The facilitator presents material in unorganized or random manner.
- The facilitator loses track of time.
- Participants are uninvolved.

Characteristics of excellent sessions:

- Participants are *doing* rather than talking about activities.
- The facilitator responds to questions nonjudgmentally.
- The facilitator answers questions of fact with information and questions of value with validation.
- The facilitator practices good time management and is well organized.
- The facilitator has adequate pacing. The presentation is not too fast but does not drag.
- The facilitator uses effective checks for understanding.