Program Observation Form for TPP Grantees

Grantee: Location:	Program Implementer(s):
Observer: Observation Date:	Session Number/Name: Duration of Session: # of Participants:

Introduction: The purpose of the observation form is to measure the fidelity and quality of implementation of the program delivery. Please use the guidelines below when completing the observation form and *do not* change the scoring provided; for example, do not circle multiple answers or score a 1.5 rather than a 1 or a 2.

You should complete the observation form *after viewing the entire session*, but you should read through the questions prior to the observation. It is also helpful to take notes during your viewing; for example, for Question 1, each time an implementer gives explanations, place a checkmark next to the appropriate rating.

Instructions: The following questions assess the overall quality of the program session and delivery of the information. Use your best judgment and do not circle more than one response.

1. In general, how clear were the program implementer's explanations of activities?

1	2	3	4	5
Not clear		**Somewhat clear**		**Very clear**

1 - Most participants do not understand instructions and cannot proceed; many questions asked.
3 - About half of the group understands, while the other half ask questions for clarification.
5 - 90-100% of the participants begin and complete the activity/discussion with no hesitation and no questions.

2. To what extent did the implementer keep track of time during the session and activities?

1	2	3	4	5
Not on time		**Some loss of time**		**Well on time**

1- Implementer 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).

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

1	2	3	4	5
Very rushed		**Somewhat rushed**		**Not rushed**

1- Implementer 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.

4. To what extent did the participants appear to understand the material?

1	2	3	4	5
Little understanding		**Some understanding**		**Good understanding**

Use your best judgment based on participant conversations and feedback.
Roughly: 1 - Less than 25% seem to understand; 3 - About half; 5 - 75-100% understand.

5. How actively did the group members participate in discussions and activities?

1	2	3	4	5
Little participation		**Some participation**		**Active participation**

Use your best judgment based on listening to the discussions and feedback.
Roughly, 1 - Less than 25% participate; 3 - About half participate. 5 - 75-100% participate

6. On the following scale, rate the implementer on the following qualities:

a) Knowledge of the program

1	2	3	4	5
Poor		**Average**		**Excellent**

1 - Cannot answer questions, mispronounces names; reads from the manual. 5 - Provides information above and beyond what's in the manual; seems very familiar with the concepts and answers questions with ease.

b) Level of enthusiasm

1	2	3	4	5
Poor		**Average**		**Excellent**

1 - Presents information in a dry and boring way; lacks personal connection to material; appears "burned out."
5 - Makes clear that the program is a great opportunity; gets participants talking and excited; outgoing.

c) Poise and confidence

1	2	3	4	5
Poor		**Average**		**Excellent**

1 - Appears nervous or hurried; does not have good eye contact.
5 - Does not hesitate in addressing concerns. Well organized, not nervous.

d) Rapport and communication with participants

1	2	3	4	5
Poor		**Average**		**Excellent**

1 – Doesn't remember names; does not "connect" with participants; acts distant or unfriendly.
5 - Gets participants talking and excited; very friendly; uses people's names when appropriate; seems to understand the community and its needs.

e) Effectively addressed questions/concerns

1	2	3	4	5
Poor		**Average**		**Excellent**

1 - Engages in "power struggles"; responds negatively to comments; gives inaccurate information; doesn't direct participants elsewhere for further info.
5 - 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.

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 implementer.

Excellent sessions looks like:

- 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
- Using effective checks for understanding.

Poor 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.
- Uninvolved participants
- Getting into power struggles with participants about the content.
- Judgmental responses
- Flat affect and boring style
- Unorganized and random
- Loses track of time.

Note: The following questions (8, 9, and 10) are for grantee's internal use only for program improvement purposes. These questions are optional and will not be reported to OAH or ACYF for performance measurement purposes.

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 started or finished, etc:

_____
_____
_____
_____

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 weaknesses of the session, particularly if there is anything that affected your ratings above.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____