



ACCREDITATION SANS FRONTIÈRES

ASF Training & Education Standards

Accreditation of training programs, curricula, and continuing education preparing professionals to meet ASF standards

Version 1 · 2026

Paris · Geneva · Tbilisi

Document Control

Document Title	ASF Training & Education Standards
Document Reference	ASF-TRAIN-STD-v1
Version / Edition	Version 1
Status	Published
Date of Publication	12 September 2026
Place of Publication	Paris, France
Issuing Authority	ASF International Standards Council, Accréditation Sans Frontières
Language of Origin	English
Effective Date	12 September 2026
Next Scheduled Review	12 September 2029
Supersedes	None — first edition

Table of Contents

About This Standard
Domain A — Program Eligibility and Scope
Domain B — Curriculum Design and Learning Outcomes
Domain C — Content Quality, Currency, and Faculty
Domain D — Delivery and Learner Access
Domain E — Assessment of Learner Competence
Domain F — Program Accreditation Governance
References
Annex A — Program Accreditation Self-Assessment
Annex B — Learner Competency Record
Annex C — Program Review Report
Index

Foreword

How ASF Develops and Revises Standards has, since its own first edition, described training and education accreditation as one of ASF's core pillars — alongside organizational standards, standards development itself, and surveyor training. Described is the operative word: until this document, ASF's fourth pillar existed as a commitment in prose, not as a published, criteria-based standard an actual training provider could be assessed against. This document closes that gap.

This standard governs the accreditation of training programs, curricula, and continuing education activities that prepare professionals to meet ASF's organizational standards — distinct from, and governed by different criteria than, the accreditation of the organizations themselves (ASF's seven organizational standards) or the training of ASF's own surveyors (the ASF Surveyor Training Standard). A training provider accredited under this document is not thereby an ASF-accredited healthcare organization, and an ASF-accredited surveyor is not thereby a training program accredited under this document; each is a genuinely distinct function, assessed on its own terms.

Consistent with ISQua EEA's own four-part accreditation structure — standards, external evaluation organizations, surveyor training programs, and quality and patient safety training programs — this document occupies the same position in ASF's own architecture that ISQua's Quality and Patient Safety Training Programme accreditation occupies in theirs.

About This Standard

Scope

This standard applies to any organization seeking ASF accreditation of a training program, curriculum, or continuing education activity intended to prepare healthcare professionals, administrators, or other personnel to meet an ASF organizational standard. This includes formal, credit-bearing courses; structured Continuing Professional Development (CPD) activities, including self-directed and portfolio-based models; and Continuing Medical Education (CME) specifically, understood as a component of the broader CPD landscape rather than a synonym for it, consistent with Section 16.8 of How ASF Develops and Revises Standards.

GMJ Academy, ASF's own continuing education platform, is eligible to seek accreditation under this standard on exactly the same terms as any other training provider, in any other country — consistent with the independence principle in Section 16.5 of How ASF Develops and Revises Standards, and assessed under the same conflict-of-interest procedures as any submission involving an ASF-affiliated entity.

Structure

This standard is organized into six domains:

- Domain A — Program Eligibility and Scope
- Domain B — Curriculum Design and Learning Outcomes
- Domain C — Content Quality, Currency, and Faculty
- Domain D — Delivery and Learner Access
- Domain E — Assessment of Learner Competence
- Domain F — Program Accreditation Governance

Each standard in this document follows the same format used across ASF's organizational standards and the ASF Surveyor Training Standard: a numbered requirement, explanatory text, and the specific evidence ASF's Council or its delegated reviewer expects to see demonstrated.

Domain A — Program Eligibility and Scope

Before a program's content or delivery is assessed, its basic eligibility for ASF accreditation under this standard is established.

Standard A1 Eligible Program Types

The program is a formal training curriculum, a structured Continuing Professional Development activity, or a Continuing Medical Education course, with a defined start and completion point or a defined structured cycle, directed at preparing identified learners to meet requirements found in an ASF organizational standard, an ASF surveyor certification requirement, or a comparable, clearly stated professional competency.

Evidence of compliance:

- A written program description stating its type, defined structure, and the specific competency or standard it prepares learners to meet

Standard A2 Eligible Providers

Any organization — including a healthcare organization's own internal training department, an independent education provider, an academic institution, or GMJ Academy — is eligible to apply for accreditation of a specific program under this standard, provided the applying organization is itself lawfully operating in the jurisdiction in which the program is delivered.

Evidence of compliance:

- Confirmation of the applying organization's lawful operating status in its jurisdiction of delivery

Standard A3 Distinctness From Other ASF Accreditation Functions

Accreditation under this standard applies specifically to the named program submitted for review, and does not extend to, or depend upon, the applying organization holding ASF organizational accreditation, ASF surveyor certification, or any other ASF accreditation status. A hospital's own internal training department may seek accreditation of a specific training program under this standard independent of whether the hospital itself holds ASF organizational accreditation.

Evidence of compliance:

- A clear statement, in the application, of the specific program submitted for review, distinct from any other accreditation status the applying organization may separately hold

Standard A4 Non-Discrimination in Program Eligibility

Program eligibility for ASF accreditation is assessed consistent with the non-discrimination principle in Section 2.2 of How ASF Develops and Revises Standards, without regard to the applying organization's country, size, or resource level — a training program genuinely meeting this standard's requirements is eligible regardless of whether it originates from a large academic institution or a small, independent training provider.

Evidence of compliance:

- No eligibility criterion in this standard that is not genuinely necessary to assess program quality

Domain B — Curriculum Design and Learning Outcomes

A training program's curriculum is designed with the same outcomes-first discipline ASF requires of its own surveyor training, following ISO 21001's own management-system principle for educational organizations.

Standard B1 Learning Outcomes Defined Before Content

The program defines the specific competencies a learner must demonstrate on completion — not merely the topics the program will cover — before curriculum content, learning activities, or assessment methods are designed, consistent with ISO 21001's learner-centered, outcomes-first discipline [1].

Evidence of compliance:

- A documented set of learning outcomes, agreed before curriculum design began
- Evidence that content and assessment methods were designed to verify these specific outcomes, not selected first and outcomes written to match afterward

Standard B2 Alignment With the Standard or Competency the Program Prepares Learners to Meet

Where a program prepares learners to meet a specific ASF organizational standard, ASF surveyor certification requirement, or comparable stated competency, the program's learning outcomes map directly and specifically to that standard or requirement — not to a generic version of the underlying subject matter that happens to be broadly relevant.

Evidence of compliance:

- A documented mapping between the program's learning outcomes and the specific standard or requirement the program prepares learners to meet

Standard B3 Certification Represents Verified Skill, Not Attendance

Completion of the program's content alone does not constitute certification of a learner. Consistent with the ILO Human Resources Development Recommendation, 2004 (No. 195), which treats certification of skill as a substantive right connected to demonstrated competence rather than an administrative outcome of course attendance [2], certification is issued only on successful completion of the competency assessment defined in Domain E.

Evidence of compliance:

- Program documentation explicitly distinguishing course completion from certification
- A record of the specific competency assessment each certified learner passed

Standard B4 Curriculum Review Cycle

The program's curriculum is formally reviewed at an interval appropriate to how quickly the underlying subject matter changes, and no less often than every three years, aligned with the same revision cycle governing ASF's own standards under Section 12 of How ASF Develops and Revises Standards — shorter where the field itself changes faster than that default interval allows.

Evidence of compliance:

- A documented curriculum review completed within the applicable interval
- A stated rationale where the review interval is shorter than three years

Domain C — Content Quality, Currency, and Faculty

A program can have well-designed outcomes and still fail learners if its actual content is outdated, unsupported by evidence, or delivered by faculty without genuine standing to teach it.

Standard C1 Evidence-Based Content

Program content reflects current, credible evidence and recognized practice in the field it addresses, with sources identified and traceable — not content presented as authoritative without a stated basis. Where a program addresses a subject with genuinely contested or evolving evidence, the program presents that uncertainty honestly rather than overstating consensus.

Evidence of compliance:

- A reference list or bibliography underlying the program's content, current as of the program's last review
- Identification of any area of genuinely contested evidence and how the program addresses it

Standard C2 Content Currency

Program content is reviewed and updated consistent with the curriculum review cycle in Standard B4, with specific attention to any content that has become outdated, superseded, or contradicted by more recent evidence since the program's last review — not merely reviewed for continued relevance of its general topic area.

Evidence of compliance:

- A documented content currency review distinct from, though conducted alongside, the broader curriculum review in Standard B4

Standard C3 Faculty Qualification

Individuals teaching within the program hold genuine, current expertise or professional standing in the specific subject matter they teach — not merely general teaching experience unconnected to the program's actual content. Where a program prepares learners to meet a specific ASF standard or ASF surveyor certification requirement, faculty teaching that content have direct, verifiable experience with the standard or requirement itself.

Evidence of compliance:

- Faculty credentials specific to the subject matter each individual teaches within the program
- Where applicable, evidence of faculty members' direct experience with the specific ASF standard or requirement being taught

Standard C4 Faculty Conflict of Interest

Faculty members disclose any financial or professional interest that might reasonably affect the objectivity of the content they teach — for instance, a financial relationship with a product or service the program's content addresses — consistent with the conflict of interest principles in Section 10 of How ASF Develops and Revises Standards, adapted here for a teaching context rather than a standards revision context.

Evidence of compliance:

- Documented conflict of interest declarations for all faculty members
- A stated process for managing a disclosed conflict, where one is identified

Domain D — Delivery and Learner Access

How a program is delivered, and who can genuinely access it, is assessed with the same rigor as its content.

Standard D1 Technology-Enhanced and Blended Delivery Standards

Where a program is delivered online, remotely, or in blended format, it meets a defined quality standard for technology-enhanced learning — informed by the Open ECBCheck peer-review quality framework UNITAR itself helped develop and continues to apply to its own e-learning activities [3] — covering platform accessibility, learner engagement design, and technical support, not merely content uploaded to a delivery platform.

Evidence of compliance:

- Documentation of the specific quality criteria applied to online or blended components
- Evidence of platform accessibility testing, including for low-bandwidth environments

Standard D2 Access Across Countries, Languages, and Resource Settings

The program is genuinely accessible to learners across multiple countries and resource settings where it claims to serve them, not designed by default around the assumptions of a single well-resourced context. Where a program is delivered in a single working language, the program states this clearly rather than implying broader accessibility than actually exists.

Evidence of compliance:

- A documented learner population showing genuine geographic and resource-setting diversity, where the program claims multi-country reach
- A clear, accurate statement of the program's working language(s)

Standard D3 Reasonable Accommodation

The program provides reasonable accommodation for a learner's disability, in delivery format, materials format, or assessment arrangement, consistent with the non-discrimination principle in Section 2.2 of How ASF Develops and Revises Standards, and maintains a documented process for a learner to request such accommodation without it affecting their competency assessment outcome under Domain E.

Evidence of compliance:

- A published accommodation request process available to every learner
- Records confirming accommodations provided did not affect competency assessment scoring

Domain E — Assessment of Learner Competence

This is the domain the rest of this standard exists to serve. A program that satisfies every requirement in Domains B, C, and D still fails ASF's purpose if it cannot actually verify that a learner achieved the competencies the program set out to teach.

Standard E1 Assessment Method Matched to the Competency Being Verified

The program's assessment method is genuinely capable of verifying the specific competency defined in Domain B — a knowledge-based written assessment for a knowledge-based outcome, a structured observed demonstration or simulation for a practical skill, or a portfolio-based review for a competency built over time — not a single default assessment format applied regardless of what the program actually claims to teach.

Evidence of compliance:

- A documented rationale connecting the assessment method used to the specific learning outcome it verifies

Standard E2 Defined Pass Threshold and Retake Policy

The competency assessment applies an explicit, published pass threshold, and a stated maximum number of permitted attempts, following the discipline of UNITAR's own certification policy, which sets a defined pass threshold and permits a maximum of three attempts at objective assessment of learning [4]. A learner who does not meet the threshold within the permitted attempts is not certified, and the specific competency gap is documented and shared with the learner.

Evidence of compliance:

- A published pass threshold and maximum-attempts policy, applied consistently across learner cohorts
- Documented competency-gap feedback provided to any learner who does not pass

Standard E3 Assessment Coverage of Every Stated Outcome

Every learning outcome defined under Standard B1 is genuinely assessed — a program does not define outcomes it never actually verifies, and does not assess only the outcomes most convenient to test while leaving others unassessed. Where a program defines multiple distinct outcomes, its assessment addresses each of them, not only the subset that happens to fit a single assessment format.

Evidence of compliance:

- A documented mapping between every stated learning outcome and the specific assessment component that verifies it

Standard E4 Independent Quality Assurance of Assessment Results

Certification decisions are subject to a documented quality assurance check — at minimum, periodic review of a sample of assessment results by someone other than the individual who conducted the original assessment — to confirm the assessment was applied consistently and the stated pass threshold was genuinely met, not merely recorded as met.

Evidence of compliance:

- A documented quality assurance process for certification decisions
- Records of periodic sample review, including any corrective action taken where inconsistency was identified

Domain F — Program Accreditation Governance

A training program that never examines its own outcomes cannot demonstrate it is producing genuinely competent learners — only that it is producing certificates.

Standard F1 Program-Level Outcome Tracking

The program tracks defined performance indicators across cohorts — including first-attempt pass rate, retake rate, and, where available, downstream evidence of competency retention — reviewed at least annually, not only at the point of program re-accreditation.

Evidence of compliance:

- A documented set of tracked program indicators, updated at least annually

Standard F2 Accreditation Cycle, With a Defined Timeline

Program accreditation is reviewed on a three-year cycle, aligned with the same cycle governing ASF's organizational standards under Section 12 of How ASF Develops and Revises Standards. Consistent with ISQua EEA's own re-accreditation timeline [1], the Council initiates contact with the accredited program no later than nine months before the current cycle expires, and the review is completed no later than three months before expiry.

Evidence of compliance:

- A documented program review completed within the three-year cycle
- Records showing the nine-month and three-month timeline milestones were met

Standard F3 External Review

ASF's own accreditation of training programs under this standard is included within the external review of the Council's practice required under Section 7.5 of How ASF Develops and Revises Standards — examining whether Domains A through E of this standard are genuinely applied in practice, not only documented. This applies without exception, including to any program submitted by GMJ Academy.

Evidence of compliance:

- Documentation confirming training program accreditation decisions were included in the most recent external review under Section 7.5

References

- [1] ISQua External Evaluation Association. International Accreditation Programme. Dublin: ISQua EEA; 2026.
- [2] International Organization for Standardization. ISO 21001:2025, Educational Organizations — Management Systems for Educational Organizations — Requirements with Guidance for Use. Geneva: ISO; 2025.
- [3] International Labour Organization. Human Resources Development Recommendation, 2004 (No. 195). Geneva: ILO; 2004.
- [4] United Nations Institute for Training and Research. Quality Assurance Framework; and Open ECBCheck Quality Standards for Technology-Enhanced Capacity Building. Geneva: UNITAR; 2026.

Annex A — Program Accreditation Self-Assessment

Completed by any organization seeking Council accreditation of a training program under Domain F.

Organization name: _____

Program name: _____

Domain B–D Compliance

- ☐ Learning outcomes documented before curriculum design (B1)
- ☐ Outcomes mapped to the specific standard or competency (B2)
- ☐ Evidence-based content, sources traceable (C1)
- ☐ Faculty credentials specific to subject matter (C3)
- ☐ Reasonable accommodation process published (D3)

Supporting Evidence Attached

[List of documents submitted in support of this self-assessment.]

Submitted by: _____ Date: _____

Council decision (accredited / not accredited / conditional): _____

Annex B — Learner Competency Record

Completed for every learner competency assessment under Domain E.

Learner name: _____

Program name: _____

Assessment date: _____ Attempt number (max. 3, per Standard E2): _____

Outcomes Assessed

[List each learning outcome from Domain B and the result recorded against it, per Standard E3.]

Outcome

- ☐ Pass — threshold met
- ☐ Fail — competency gap documented below

Competency gap detail (if applicable): _____

Assessed by: _____ QA sample-reviewed by (per Standard E4): _____

Annex C — Program Review Report

Completed at each three-year review under Standard F2, or upon a Council decision to accredit, decline, or condition a program.

Program name: _____

Review period covered: _____

Outcome Indicators (per Standard F1)

First-attempt pass rate: _____ Retake rate: _____

Findings

[Council or delegated reviewer's findings against Domains A through F.]

Decision

- ☐ Accreditation confirmed ☐ Conditional ☐ Revision required ☐ Accreditation withdrawn

Decided by: _____ Date: _____

This standard governs every training program, curriculum, and continuing education activity ASF accredits — including those delivered through GMJ Academy — on the same terms, assessed by the same Council, under the same three-year cycle that governs every other ASF standard.

Index

Assessment of Learner Competence, Domain E
Content Quality and Currency, Domain C
Curriculum Design, Domain B
Delivery and Learner Access, Domain D
Faculty Requirements, Domain C
Learner Competency Record, Annex B
Program Accreditation Governance, Domain F
Program Eligibility, Domain A
Program Review Report, Annex C