ID#_____1

APPENDIX A

Feedback on the suprapubic catheter simulator

1. Number of years in practice _____
2. Type of practice
    a. Urology
    b. Radiology
3. Approximately how many suprapubic catheter insertions have you performed? _____
4. Age: _____
5. Sex: M/F

Anatomic realism (1 = not realistic at all; 5 = very realistic)

1. Anatomical structures are realistic

1 2 3 4 5

2. Anatomical size is realistic

1 2 3 4 5

3. Tissue feels realistic (by touch/feel)

1 2 3 4 5

4. Tissue feels realistic (by incising; subcutaneous injection; insertion of catheter)

1 2 3 4 5

5. Entry to "bladder" feels realistic

1 2 3 4 5

6. Ultrasonography looks realistic

1 2 3 4 5

Usefulness as a training tool (1 = not useful at all; 5 = very useful)

7. Useful for teaching anatomy

1 2 3 4 5

8. Useful for teaching suprapubic catheter insertion without ultrasound

1 2 3 4 5

9. Useful for teaching suprapubic catheter insertion with ultrasound

1 2 3 4 5

10. Useful for improving technique

1 2 3 4 5

11. Overall usefulness as a simulated training tool for suprapubic catheter insertion

1 2 3 4 5

Overall reactions to the model (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree)

12. I would recommend this suprapubic catheter model for training purposes

1 2 3 4 5

13. Working with this model would help trainees feel more confident in performing the procedure

1 2 3 4 5

14. This model should be incorporated into the urology training curriculum

1 2 3 4 5

15. Skills learned using this model are transferable to an *in vivo* setting

1 2 3 4 5

16. Working with this model would be as useful as working with an animal model

1 2 3 4 5

Do you have any suggestions that would improve the use of this model for simulation training?

_____
_____
_____
_____

Any additional comments?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____