



	Unsatisfactory → Borderline → Excellent					Total number
	N (%)					N
4. E-document distributed	2 (2.0)	7 (7.1)	20 (20.0)	44 (44.4)	26 (26.2)	99
5. Venue and its facilities	2 (1.9)	1 (1)	13 (12.5)	44 (42.3)	44 (42.3)	104
6. Foods and break	1 (1)	4 (3.9)	17 (16.5)	39 (37.9)	42 (40.8)	103
7. Accommodation	0 (0)	1 (1.1)	6 (6.7)	39 (42.4)	41 (45.6)	90
<b>8. The workshops</b>	<b>N (%)</b>					<b>N</b>
WS1: Neuro-Urology	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (4.9)	28 (45.9)	30 (49.2)	61
WS2: Enhancing mobility	0 (0)	1 (2)	3 (6)	19 (38)	27 (54)	50
WS3: Building capacity	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (12.0)	23 (54.8)	14 (33.3)	42
WS4: Building confidence	0 (0)	0 (0)	9 (20.4)	23 (52.3)	12 (27.3)	44
WS5: Tetraplegic hands	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (12)	24 (48)	20 (40)	50
WS6: Sexuality and disability	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (9.5)	20 (47.6)	18 (42.9)	42
WS7: Pressure ulcer	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (7.1)	27 (64.3)	12 (28.6)	42
<b>9. Special activities</b>	<b>N (%)</b>					<b>N</b>
7.1 Raising awareness of SCI prevention	1 (1.9)	1 (1.9)	7 (13.2)	24 (45.3)	20 (37.8)	53
7.2 Get together party	1 (1.2)	2 (2.4)	9 (10.8)	34 (40.1)	37 (40.9)	83

How would you rate the following?	Unsatisfactory → Borderline → Excellent					Total number
<b>10. Plenary sessions</b>	<b>N (%)</b>					<b>N</b>
PS1 Pressure ulcer	1 (1.6)	0 (0)	6 (9.2)	39 (61.9)	18 (28.6)	63
PS2 Improving mobility	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (7.8)	32 (50.0)	28 (43.8)	64
PS3 Cardiovascular and exercises	0 (0)	1 (1.5)	8 (11.8)	34 (50.0)	25 (36.7)	68
PS4 Fact and future of recovery after SCI	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (7.2)	37 (53.6)	27 (39.1)	69
PS5 Urological issues	0 (0)	1 (1.5)	4 (6.0)	30 (44.8)	32 (47.8)	67
PS7 How to make tetraplegic hands function?	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (1.0)	26 (41.3)	32 (50.8)	63
<b>11. Symposium sessions</b>	<b>N (%)</b>					<b>N</b>
SS1: After care	0 (0)	0 (0)	7 (12.7)	34 (61.8)	14 (25.5)	55
SS2 SCI rehab services from ASCoN	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (6.2)	39 (60.0)	22 (33.8)	65
SS3 Building and maintaining relationships	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (9.8)	34 (55.7)	21 (34.4)	61
<b>12. Free paper sessions</b>	<b>N (%)</b>					<b>N</b>
OP1 Pressure ulcer	0 (0)	0 (0)	9 (13.4)	50 (74.6)	8 (11.9)	67
OP2 Research contest for ASCoN award	1 (1.3)	1 (1.3)	7 (9.0)	45 (57.7)	24 (30.8)	78
OP3 Work and community life after SCI	0 (0)	0 (0)	10 (14.9)	40 (59.7)	17 (25.4)	67
OP4 Secondary conditions and prevention	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (7.6)	43 (65.1)	18 (27.3)	66

How would you rate the following?	Unsatisfactory → Borderline → Excellent					Total number
	N (%)					N
OP5 Digestive and metabolic dysfunctions	0 (0)	0 (0)	7 (11.5)	38 (62.3)	16 (26.2)	61
OP6 Voice of customer	0 (0)	0 (0)	7 (12.5)	32 (57.1)	17 (30.4)	56
OP7 Design and technology for mobility	0 (0)	1 (1.6)	6 (9.8)	38 (62.3)	16 (26.2)	61
<b>13. Structured poster presentation</b>	0 (0)	0 (0)	14 (15.9)	42 (47.7)	32 (36.4)	88
<b>14. Poster only</b>	1 (1.2)	2 (2.4)	22 (25.9)	43 (50.6)	17 (20.0)	85

## B. Relevance to your work

Relevance to your work: Using the scale from 1 to 5: 1 is the minimum and 5 the maximum

How would you rate the following?	Minimum → → → → → Maximum %				
1. Relevance of this conference to your current work or function	1	0	10.7	39.8	48.5
2. Relevance of the conference to your institution's need	1	0	10.8	43.2	46.1
3. Extent to which you have acquired information that is new to you	0	2.9	17.6	54.9	24.5
5. Extent to which the content of this conference matched the announced objectives	0	0	9.7	53.4	36.9
4. Usefulness for you of the information that you have acquired	0	0	11.7	49.5	38.8
6. Overall usefulness of this conference	0	0	10.7	41.7	48.5

## C. Other information

Would you like to attend the next/future ASCoN conference?

**Yes 98.1%**

**No 1.9%**

## **Supporters**

The International Spinal Cord Society (ISCOS)  
SPIRIT (Spinal Injuries Charity)  
Livability  
The International Neuro-Urology Society (INUS)  
Rick Hansen Institute  
Faculty of Medicine, Chiang Mai University  
The Chiang Mai Foundation for the Well-being of the Disabled

## **Key success factors according to the organizer's opinion**

1. Low registration fee with efficient management
2. Good venue with cheap accommodation (UNISERV) and location (Chiang Mai)
3. Experienced resource persons
4. Good supporters and enough funds
5. Variety of sessions covering all rehab disciplines
6. Relevance to their works and their institutes' needs
7. Most of the participants were allowed to present and share their works even though in limited time frames (8 minutes for oral presentation and 3 minutes for structured poster presentation): about 100

## **Conclusion**

1. The objective - sharing and learning for enhancing comprehensive rehabilitation management for SCI – was very well achieved.
2. Most of the participants were highly satisfied with all sessions.
3. The most satisfied dimensions were resource person contribution, registration fee, venue and facilities, and foods and break
4. The most satisfied workshops were 'enhancing mobility' and 'neuro-urology workshops'
5. The most satisfied plenary sessions were 'how to make tetraplegic hand function' and 'urological issues'.
6. Most of the participants rated that this conference was relevant to their current work and to your institution's need, and very useful.
7. Nearly all participants would like to attend the next/future ASCoN conference(s).