**Operative Performance Rating System (OPRS)**

**LAPAROSCOPIC APPENDECTOMY**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluator:** |  | | **Resident:** |  |
| **Resident Level:** | |  | **Program:** |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Date of Procedure:** |  | | **Time Procedure Was Completed:** |  | | | | **Date Assessment Was Completed:** | |  | **Time Assessment Was Initiated:** | |  | |

Please rate this resident's performance during this operative procedure. For most criteria, the caption above each checkbox provides descriptive anchors for 3 of the 5 points on the rating scale. "NA" (not applicable) should only be selected when the resident did not perform that part of the procedure.

**Case Difficulty**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Straightforward anatomy, no related prior surgeries or treatment | Intermediate difficulty | Abnormal anatomy, extensive pathology, related prior surgeries or treatment (for example radiation), or obesity |
|  |  |  |

**Degree of Prompting or Direction**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 | | 3 | |
| Minimal direction by attending. Resident performs all steps and directs the surgical team independently with minimum or no direction from the attending, to either the resident or to the surgical team. | Some direction by attending. Resident performs all steps but the attending provides occasional direction to the resident and /or to the surgical team. | | Substantial direction by attending. Resident performs all steps but the attending provides constant direction to the resident and surgical team. | |
|  | |  | |  | |

**Procedure-Specific Criteria**

**Incision / Port Placement**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5  Excellent | 4  Very Good | 3  Good | 2  Fair | 1  Poor | NA |
| Safe, efficient and optimal positioning of ports for procedure, and anatomy |  | Functional but somewhat awkward port positioning; generally safe technique; some difficulty inserting ports |  | Poor choice of port position; unsafe technique in insertion or removal |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Exposure**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5  Excellent | 4  Very Good | 3  Good | 2  Fair | 1  Poor | | NA | |
| Optimizes exposure, efficiently directs retraction and camera to maintain exposure and pneumoperitoneum |  | Adequate establishment and maintenance of pneumoperitoneum, camera angle and retraction but with occasional loss of exposure |  | | Poor/inadequate pneumoperitoneum, camera angle and retraction with frequent loss of exposure | |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | |  | |

**Appendix Dissection**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5  Excellent | | 4  Very Good | | 3  Good | 2  Fair | 1  Poor | NA |
| Expedient and efficient location of appendix and creation of mesoappendix window close to cecum | | |  | Adequate but inefficient dissection; some bleeding during creation of mesoappendix window |  | Dissection of appendix inadequate for safe staple placement |  |
|  |  | | |  |  |  |  |

**Appendix Division**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5  Excellent | 4  Very Good | 3  Good | 2  Fair | | 1  Poor | NA | |
| Safe and secure staple placement across base of appendix and mesoappendix with clean division of appendix |  | Adequate but inefficient dissection; stapled securely but spacing not ideal | |  | Dissection of appendix inadequate to place staples and divide safely; multiple attempts to place staples | |  |
|  |  |  |  | |  |  | |

**Appendix Removal**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5  Excellent | 4  Very Good | 3  Good | 2  Fair | 1  Poor | NA | |
| Efficient placement of appendix within bag and removal from field without spillage or contamination; field irrigated |  | Inefficient placement of appendix within bag; some contamination; inadequate irrigation |  | Inadequate division of appendix or mesoappendix (multiple attempts); did not cleanly remove appendix; or caused spillage or contamination | |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | |

**General Criteria**

**Instrument Handling**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5  Excellent | 4  Very Good | | 3  Good | | 2  Fair | | 1  Poor | | NA | | |
| Fluid movements with instruments *consistently* using appropriate force, keeping tips in view, and placing clips securely |  | | Competent use of instruments, *occasionally* appeared awkward or did not visualize instrument tips | |  | | Tentative or awkward movements, *often* did not visualize tips of instrument or clips poorly placed | |  |
|  |  |  | |  | |  | |  | | |

**Respect for Tissue**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5  Excellent | 4  Very Good | 3  Good | 2  Fair | 1  Poor | NA |
| *Consistently* handled tissue carefully (appropriately), minimal tissue damage |  | Careful tissue handling, *occasional* inadvertent damage |  | *Frequent* unnecessary tissue force or damage by inappropriate instrument use |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Time and Motion**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5  Excellent | 4  Very Good | 3  Good | 2  Fair | 1  Poor | NA |
| Clear economy of motion, and maximum efficiency |  | Efficient time and motion, some unnecessary moves |  | Many unnecessary moves |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Operation Flow**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5  Excellent | 4  Very Good | 3  Good | 2  Fair | 1  Poor | NA |
| Obviously planned course of operation and anticipation of next steps |  | Some forward planning, reasonable procedure progression |  | Frequent lack of forward progression; frequently stopped operating and seemed unsure of next move |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Overall Performance**

Rating of 4 or higher indicates technically proficient performance (i.e., resident is ready to perform operation independently, assuming resident consistently performs at this level)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5  Excellent | 4  Very Good | 3  Good | 2  Fair | 1  Poor | NA |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Please indicate the weaknesses in this resident’s performance:**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Please indicate the strengths in this resident’s performance:**

|  |
| --- |
|  |