



## Operative Performance Rating System (OPRS)

### LAPAROSCOPIC CHOLECYSTECTOMY

Evaluator:

Resident:

Resident Level: 1 2 3 4 5

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 of Calot's triangle, efficiently directs gallbladder retraction and camera to maintain exposure and pneumoperitoneum		Adequate establishment and maintenance of pneumoperitoneum, camera angle and retraction but with occasional loss of exposure of key structures		Poor/inadequate pneumoperitoneum, camera angle and retraction with frequent loss of exposure of key structures	

### Cystic Duct Dissection

5 Excellent	4 Very Good	3 Good	2 Fair	1 Poor	NA
Expedient dissection, safe clip placement and duct division		Adequate but inefficient dissection, clips secure but spacing not ideal		Dissection of duct inadequate to place clips and divide safely	

### Cystic Artery Dissection

5 Excellent	4 Very Good	3 Good	2 Fair	1 Poor	NA
Expedient dissection, safe clip placement and artery division		Adequate but inefficient dissection, clips secure but spacing not ideal		Artery dissection inadequate to place clips and divide; excessive hemorrhage; used more than 8 clips	

**Gallbladder Dissection**

5 Excellent	4 Very Good	3 Good	2 Fair	1 Poor	NA
Efficient; maintained clean plane between gallbladder and liver bed throughout, no parenchymal injury or bile spillage		Removed gallbladder intact but strayed from plane, somewhat inefficient, minimal bile spilled; extra cautery needed for liver bleeding		Inefficient; did not cleanly remove gallbladder; excessive bile spillage; repeated injury to liver parenchyma	

**General Criteria****Instrument Handling**

5 Excellent	4 Very Good	3 Good	2 Fair	1 Poor	NA
Fluid movements with instruments <i>consistently</i> using appropriate force, keeping tips in view, and placing clips securely		Competent use of instruments, <i>occasionally</i> appeared awkward or did not visualize instrument tips		Tentative or awkward movements, <i>often</i> 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
<i>Consistently</i> handled tissue carefully (appropriately), minimal tissue damage		Careful tissue handling, <i>occasional</i> inadvertent damage		<i>Frequent</i> 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**

<b>5</b> <b>Excellent</b>	<b>4</b> <b>Very Good</b>	<b>3</b> <b>Good</b>	<b>2</b> <b>Fair</b>	<b>1</b> <b>Poor</b>	<b>NA</b>
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)**

<b>5</b> <b>Excellent</b>	<b>4</b> <b>Very Good</b>	<b>3</b> <b>Good</b>	<b>2</b> <b>Fair</b>	<b>1</b> <b>Poor</b>	<b>NA</b>

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

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