**Operative Performance Rating System (OPRS)**

**OPEN INGUINAL HERNIA**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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**

**Identification of Indirect Hernia Sac**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5  Excellent | 4  Very Good | 3  Good | 2  Fair | 1  Poor | NA |
| Meticulous search for indirect sac, with careful and efficient dissection; with high ligation of sac if present |  | Some attempt to identify an indirect sac (neck), some inefficiency in sac dissection |  | Did not  specifically search for indirect sac (neck) and/or poor dissection of sac |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Identification of Anatomic Landmarks for Mesh Placement**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5  Excellent | 4  Very Good | | | 3  Good | | 2  Fair | | 1  Poor | | NA | |
| Accurately identifies medial, lateral landmarks without prompting for attachment of mesh in region of deep ring and/or inguinal floor | | |  | Identifies landmarks after some prompting | |  | | Did not identify landmarks until prompted or directed to do so | |  | |
|  | |  | | |  | |  | |  | |  |

**Mesh Insertion**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5  Excellent | 4  Very Good | 3  Good | 2  Fair | 1  Poor | NA |
| Excellent securing of mesh with consistently appropriate tissue bites, and appropriate tension |  | Good placement of sutures to secure mesh with only occasional inaccurate bites |  | Demonstrated inconsistency in accurate placement of mesh sutures, redundancy of mesh or too much tension |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

**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:**

|  |
| --- |
|  |