



Score out of 64:

Percentage:

TOP Facilitator Feedback Rubric

Facilitator(s) _____ Lesson _____

Club _____ Observer _____ Date _____

Observation of Facilitator Behaviors	Yes, definitely 4	Yes, somewhat 3	Not really 2	No, definitely not 1	N/A	Specific examples of language or behavior to support rating
1. The briefing, experience, reflection, debrief and application phases were evident during the session and clearly flowed throughout the meeting.	The briefing, experience, reflection, debrief and application phases were evident during the session.	The facilitator included elements of experiential learning, but did not build on each phase. Processing activities were attempted but did not engage teens.	The facilitator asked brief reflection questions, but did not engage teens in any real conversation around those questions.	The facilitator's structure for the session lacked elements of experiential learning. No reflection, debrief or application was attempted.		Score:
2. The behavior and words of the facilitator were respectful, supportive and friendly.	All the words and actions of the facilitator were respectful and supportive, no teens appeared put off by facilitator.	Most of the words and actions of the facilitator were respectful and supportive, but very brief frustration or annoyance with teens was shown. A couple of teens may have been put off by facilitator.	Frustration or annoyance with the teens was shown. Many of the words and actions of the facilitator were harsh, sarcastic, teasing or inattentive to teens. Several teens seemed put off by facilitator.	The facilitator's words and actions were extremely harsh and negative. Teens were visibly upset and disconnected from facilitator.		Score:
3. The facilitator modeled healthy emotion management strategies. e.g., active listening, remaining calm, communicating effectively and honestly about emotion; respectfully acknowledging and validating emotions in others.	Facilitator engaged in active listening throughout session. Facilitator validated emotions in others and was open and honest about emotions.	Facilitator engaged in active listening for most of the session. Some emotions were validated, but not all.	Facilitator engaged in active listening less than half of the time. Emotions were not acknowledged.	Facilitator did not remain calm and did not engage in active listening. Emotions were dismissed or invalidated.		Score:

Observation of Facilitator Behaviors	Yes, definitely 4	Yes, somewhat 3	Not really 2	No, definitely not 1	N/A	Specific examples of language or behavior to support rating
4. The facilitator coached teens in handling their emotions. e.g., encouraged problem solving in response to challenging emotions; suggested strategies for dealing with them	Emotions were worked through in the moment with coaching from facilitator, using specific strategies.	Facilitators encouraged teens to deal with emotions, but did not suggest specific strategies.	Facilitator did not acknowledge emotions that came up during the session.	Facilitator discouraged display of challenging emotions and did not support teens dealing with them.		Score:
5. The facilitator modeled empathy skills with teens.	Facilitator sought to understand where teens are coming from; offered help; used supportive language; noticed teens' emotions.	Facilitator attempted to see teens' perspective on some things; used supportive language some of the time.	Facilitator was disconnected from teens and did not attempt to empathize with them.	Facilitator was hostile towards teens' point of view; did not offer help or support.		Score:
6. The facilitator cultivated a safe and caring space. e.g., employ appropriate structure for sharing different cultural backgrounds, personal beliefs, and stories (particularly those that are emotionally charged) without judgment.	Facilitator invited youth to share their experiences; reminded youth to be respectful of one another. Teens who shared differing opinions were supported. Disrespectful or intolerant language was not allowed.	Facilitators reacted mostly positively to teens sharing different opinions and experiences. Most disrespectful or intolerant language was not allowed.	Facilitators did not remind teens of being respectful when sharing. Disrespectful or intolerant language was not sufficiently addressed.	Facilitators attacked teens who shared differing opinions or experiences. Disrespectful or intolerant language was allowed or used by facilitator themselves.		Score:
7. The facilitator encouraged teens to persist through challenging work.	Facilitator encouraged and rewarded persistence.	Facilitator was supportive to some teens, or for some of the time.	Facilitator was not supportive to teens struggling with challenging work.	Facilitator was discouraging to teens struggling through challenges.		Score:
8. The facilitator provided assistance as needed to help teens learn and solve problems on their own.	Facilitator asked probing questions to help teens problem-solve. Teens were able to re-frame problems.	Facilitator asked some probing questions, but gave some answers to problems.	Facilitator gave answers rather than helping teens find them.	Facilitator did not provide any assistance to help teens learn and solve problems.		Score:

Observation of Facilitator Behaviors	Yes, definitely 4	Yes, somewhat 3	Not really 2	No, definitely not 1	N/A	Specific examples of language or behavior to support rating
9. The facilitator successfully structured the dialogue within the group. e.g., frequent use of open-ended questions; built on comments of teens; brought relevant issues to teens into discussion; Most teens participated actively throughout discussion periods.	Facilitator made frequent use of open-ended questions; built on comments of teens; brought relevant issues to teens into discussion. Most teens participated actively throughout discussion periods.	Facilitator made occasional use of open-ended questions; used some comments of teens. Some teens participated actively.	Facilitator used mostly close-ended questions; did not build on comments of teens; made references that did not seem relevant to teens. Few teens participated actively.	Facilitator asked few questions and those were mostly closed-ended. Teen's comments were criticized or ignored; few teens participated in discussion.		
10. The facilitator kept the group focused and on topic, including redirecting any off topic comments in a firm but positive way.	Facilitator was able to gain the group's attention for almost all of the session. Teen comments, questions, and side conversations related to the subject matter. Distractions were minimal.	Facilitator was able to gain the group's attention for part of the session. Some teen comments, questions, and side conversations related to the subject matter and some did not. Distractions were managed	Facilitator was unable to gain the group's attention for most of the session. Teen comments, questions, and side conversations were unrelated to the subject matter. Distractions frequent and not managed.	Facilitator was unable to gain the group's attention at all. Teen comments, questions, and side conversations were unrelated to the subject matter. Distractions were continual and not managed.		

Score:
Score:

Observation of Facilitator Behaviors	Yes, definitely 4	Yes, somewhat 3	Not really 2	No, definitely not 1	N/A	Specific examples of language or behavior to support rating
11. The facilitator showed enthusiasm throughout the lesson/activity.	The facilitator was engaged with the teens throughout the session. There were no significant side conversations with co-facilitators or other adults and/or unrelated work being done during club time. The facilitator showed energy and interest in the teens and the topic.	The facilitator was engaged with the teens through some of the session. There were only one or two side conversations with co-facilitators or other adults and/or unrelated work being done during club time. The facilitator showed interest in the teens and the topic.	The facilitator was disengaged with the teens through most, but not all session. The facilitator took part in side conversations with co-facilitators or other adults and/or unrelated work being done during club time. The facilitator showed little energy and interest in the teens and the topic.	The facilitator was completely disengaged with the teens throughout the session. The facilitator took part in significant side conversations with co-facilitators or other adults and/or unrelated work being done during club time. The facilitator showed no energy and interest in the teens.		
12. The facilitator showed acceptance of teens' viewpoints, demonstrating a non-judgmental approach throughout the lesson/activity. e.g., facilitator's personal values were not evident during the session. No particular belief system was presented as better.	The facilitator's values stances were not evident during the session. No particular belief system was presented as better than others. The facilitator may have asked follow up questions of the teens, but the values expressed by the teens were not criticized.	The facilitator's values stances were not evident during the session. Some of the body language or words of the facilitator indicated a preference toward certain viewpoints. No particular belief system was presented as better than others. The facilitator asked follow up questions of the teens, and the values teens expressed by the teens were criticized.	The facilitator's values stances were evident during the session. A particular belief system was presented as better than others. The facilitator asked follow up questions of the teens, and the values teens expressed by the teens were criticized.	The facilitator's values stances were very evident during the session. A clear particular belief system was presented as better than others. The facilitator asked follow up questions of the teens, and the values teens were strongly criticized.		

Score:
Score:

13. The facilitator applied 3 or more 'multiple intelligence' approaches for participant engagement.	Three or more multiple intelligence approaches were observed during the session.	At least two multiple intelligence approaches were observed during the session.	Only one multiple intelligence approach was observed during the session.	The facilitator made no attempt to engage teens during the session.		MIs: verbal/linguistic, logical/mathematical, natural, bodily/kinesthetic, musical/rhythmic, interpersonal, intrapersonal, visual/spatial
Score:						

Observation of Teen Engagement/Behavior	Yes, definitely 4	Yes, somewhat 3	Not Really 2	No, definitely not 1		Specific examples of language or behavior to support rating
1. Teens were engaged and participating in the lesson or activity. e.g., may include verbally; in writing; or quietly listening, but attentive	Almost all the teens participated in the lesson or activity (verbally; in writing; or quietly listening, but attentive). Teens' side conversations were focused on the subject of the lesson/activity.	Most of the teens participated in the lesson or activity (verbally; in writing; or quietly listening, but attentive). A couple teens were distracted, disengaged, or engaged in off-topic side conversations.	Most of the teens did not participate in the lesson or activity. Many off-topic side conversations or distractions observed.	No teens appeared actively engaged in the lesson or activity. A few may have cooperated, but did not express enthusiasm or a desire to continue.		
2. High teen talk time during their participation in discussions. e.g., most of discussion was led by and/or contributed to by the teens.	Most of the discussion was by teens. The facilitator asked brief questions and drew participants to conversation.	Some of the discussion was by teens. The facilitator asked brief questions to attempt to draw participants to conversation.	Most of the discussion was by facilitator(s). The facilitator asked brief questions and but did not invite teens into the conversation.	All of the discussion was by the facilitator(s). The facilitator did not ask and restricted teen's participation in the conversation.		
3. Teens demonstrated positive relationships with their peers in the group. e.g., evident through supportive, trusting interactions among the teens.	Teens engaged in supportive, trusting conversations with their peers. Teens shared smiles and laughter with their peers.	Teens interacted positively with their peers, but did not engage in more trusting conversations.	Some teens interacted positively, but others did not. Some tension is evident.	Teens seem to dislike or be uncomfortable with one another. Teens did not have many or any positive interactions with their peers.		



Notes:

Total score: