Pediatric Esophagoscopy And Foreign Body Removal Evalua	tion Sheet.		
Date: (MM/DD/YY)			
Trainee Name: (Last) (First)			
Level of Training:			
Evaluator Name: (Last)(First)			
Task-Specific Items	Not Done	Done	Not
	or Done	Correctly	Observed
	Incorrectly		
Surgical goals, preparation and potential challenges			
<ol> <li>Reviews history, physical examination, imaging (rule out battery) and</li> </ol>			
anatomical and patient factors to identify goal of procedure and whether flexible			
or rigid esophagoscopy +/- bronchoscopy are indicated.			
<ol><li>Appreciates urgency of removal depending on type of foreign body, where</li></ol>	0		
applicable.			
Preparation of instruments			
<ol><li>Selects appropriate esophagoscope(s) (diameter and length).</li></ol>			0
Selects appropriate telescope(s) (diameter and length).			
<ol><li>Selects appropriate suction (flexible or rigid).</li></ol>			
<ol><li>Selects appropriate grasper(s) (type, length, optical telescope, works on</li></ol>			
duplicate foreign body) and ensures it passes through and beyond			
esophagoscope.			
<ol><li>Ensures telescope +/- bridge/rubber guide fit in/on esophagoscope.</li></ol>	0		0
Rigid Esophagoscopy			

Number of items performed correctly:
Was this a standard case? □ Yes □ No If not, Why?
Is this resident competent to perform this procedure?   Yes   No

8. Protects lips, teeth, oral mucosa and esophagus from injury.9. Identifies foreign body without accidentally pushing it distally.

Total score (sum all numbers): \_\_\_\_\_ Was this a standard case? \_ \_ Yes

□ No

Is this resident competent to perform this procedure?  $\ \square$  Yes

If not, why?

□ No

lobal	Rating Scale					
1.	Respect for tissue	1 Frequently used unnecessary force on tissue or caused damage by inappropriate use of instruments	2	3 Carefully handled tissue but occasionally caused inadvertent damage	4	5 Consistently handled tissues appropriately with minimal damage
2.	Time and motion	1 Many unnecessary moves	2	3 Efficient but some unnecessary moves	4	5 Clear economy of movemen and maximum efficiency
3.	Instrument handling	1 Repeatedly made tentative or awkward moves by inappropriate use	2	3 Competent use of instruments but occasionally appeared stiff or awkward	4	5 Fluid moves and no awkwardness
4.	Knowledge of instruments	1 Frequently asked for wrong instrument or used inappropriate instrument	2	3 Knew names of most instruments and used appropriate instruments	4	5 Obviously familiar with instruments and their names
5.	Use of assistants	1 Consistently placed assistants poorly or failed to use assistants	2	3 Appropriate use of assistants most of the time	4	5 Strategically used assistants the best advantage at all time
6.	Flow of operation and forward planning	1 Frequently stopped operating or unsure of next move	2	3 Some forward planning with reasonable progression of procedure	4	5 Obviously planned course o operation with effortless flow from one move to the next
7.	Knowledge of specific procedure	1 Deficient knowledge. Needed specific instruction at most steps	2	3 Knew all important steps of operation	4	5 Demonstrated familiarity with aspects of operation

2020.
ppe 2
gosc
-aryngos
et al. l
cett e
Fau