

ASF STANDARDS · FITNESS & WELLNESS · STANDARD 10

Standard 10 — Sustainable Care

5 criteria · 0 core · 5 standard-level · Version 1.0 · Aligned to ISQua EEA
Principle 6, 6th Edition

CRITERIA IN THIS STANDARD

10.1 — Environmental Impact Is Genuinely Assessed, Appropriate to the Facility

10.2 — Procurement Genuinely Considers Environmental Impact

10.3 — Energy and Water Use Are Genuinely Monitored and Reduced Where Possible

10.4 — Members and Staff Are Genuinely Engaged in Sustainability Practice

10.5 — Sustainability Commitments Are Genuinely Reviewed, Not Static

10.1 Environmental Impact Is Genuinely Assessed, Appropriate to the Facility STANDARD

The facility genuinely assesses its environmental impact — energy, water, and consumables — proportionate to its scale as a fitness or wellness facility, not assumed unnecessary given its non-clinical operation.

In plain terms: The facility has actually looked at its real environmental footprint, scaled sensibly to what a gym or wellness facility actually uses.

Facility category	Crisis	Transition	Small	Standard
Applicability	Adapted	Full	Full	Full

WHY THIS MATTERS

A fitness or wellness facility’s environmental footprint is genuinely driven by different things than a clinical facility’s — pools, saunas, showers, and equipment power use rather than clinical waste. A real assessment reflects what this facility actually consumes, not a template borrowed from a healthcare setting.

WHAT GOOD LOOKS LIKE

- A genuine assessment exists, scaled appropriately.
- It genuinely covers energy, water, and consumables like towels.
- It's genuinely revisited periodically.

COMMON FAILURE MODES

- No assessment has ever been conducted.

WORKED EXAMPLE

IN PRACTICE	
<i>A gym with a pool and sauna that had never reviewed its utility use.</i>	
BEFORE	Utility bills were paid with no breakdown of what the pool, sauna, and general gym floor each actually consumed.
ACTION	A simple baseline was compiled breaking down consumption by area.
AFTER	The Monitor reviewed the baseline. Verified.

IF YOU ARE STARTING FROM ZERO — DO THIS FIRST

1. Compile a baseline covering energy, water, and major consumables.

The most common mistake: Assuming a non-clinical facility has no meaningful environmental footprint worth assessing.

1. Has the facility genuinely assessed its environmental impact? — A *real, documented assessment*.

Evidence: Baseline assessment document

2. Does this genuinely cover energy, water, and laundry where relevant? — *Real coverage of the facility's actual main resource uses*.

Evidence: Multi-dimensional data

3. Is the assessment genuinely revisited periodically? — *Real, periodic review*.

Evidence: Review schedule

COMMON REASONS FOR A PARTIAL ANSWER

- Overall utility cost is tracked but not broken down by area.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

When	What
Week 1-2	Compile a baseline assessment.

HOW THE MONITOR VERIFIES THIS

Method	What	Detail
DOCUMENT	Baseline review	Reviews the baseline for genuine coverage.

SUPERVISOR TIPS

- Ask about pool/sauna energy use specifically if present.

EVIDENCE BASE

World Health Organization. WHO Guidance for Climate-Resilient and Environmentally Sustainable Health Care Facilities. Geneva: WHO; 2020.

[ASF training courses on GMJ Academy →](#)

Foundation courses A-00 to A-03 are live. Criterion-specific modules are being developed and will link here when published.

10.2

Procurement Genuinely Considers Environmental Impact

STANDARD

Procurement decisions genuinely factor in environmental impact alongside cost — equipment, cleaning products, towels and consumables — not sustainability treated as an afterthought with purchasing decided purely on price.

In plain terms: When the facility buys cleaning products, towels, and equipment, it actually thinks about environmental impact — not purely the cheapest option.

Facility category	Crisis	Transition	Small	Standard
Applicability	Adapted	Full	Full	Full

WHY THIS MATTERS

Cleaning products used throughout a fitness facility's daily operation genuinely add up in environmental impact over time, and genuine consideration here — even at modest scale — is what distinguishes real sustainability practice from a stated value with no actual purchasing decision behind it.

WHAT GOOD LOOKS LIKE

- Environmental impact is genuinely weighed.
- A real instance shows this influencing a purchase.
- Cleaning products are genuinely reviewed for alternatives.

COMMON FAILURE MODES

- Purchasing is decided purely on cost.

WORKED EXAMPLE

IN PRACTICE	
A gym reviewing its cleaning supply contract.	
BEFORE	Cleaning products were chosen purely on cost with no review of their environmental profile.

PHIG	ACTION	A lower-impact cleaning product line was adopted at a comparable price.
	AFTER	The Monitor reviewed the documented decision. Verified.

IF YOU ARE STARTING FROM ZERO — DO THIS FIRST

1. Review the cleaning supply contract for genuine environmental consideration.

The most common mistake: Cleaning products chosen purely on cost with environmental impact never actually discussed.

SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Does procurement genuinely weigh environmental impact? —
Real, documented consideration.
Evidence: Procurement criteria
2. Is there a real, documented instance of this genuinely influencing a purchase? — *A concrete, real example.*
Evidence: Purchasing decision record
3. Are cleaning products genuinely reviewed for lower-impact alternatives? — *A real, ongoing review.*
Evidence: Review record

COMMON REASONS FOR A PARTIAL ANSWER

- **Environmental impact is discussed informally but never documented.**

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

When	What
Week 1-2	Add environmental criteria to supply evaluations.

HOW THE MONITOR VERIFIES THIS

Method	What	Detail
DOCUMENT	Procurement review	Reviews a purchasing decision for documented consideration.

- Ask about the cleaning supply contract specifically.

EVIDENCE BASE

NHS England. Delivering a Net Zero National Health Service. London: NHS England; 2022.

[ASF training courses on GMJ Academy](#) →

Foundation courses A-00 to A-03 are live. Criterion-specific modules are being developed and will link here when published.

10.3

Energy and Water Use Are Genuinely Monitored and Reduced Where Possible

STANDARD

The facility genuinely monitors its energy and water consumption — including pool, sauna, and shower facilities where present, which represent a genuinely significant resource use in this setting — pursuing real, achievable reductions.

In plain terms: The facility actually tracks energy and water use, especially pools and saunas if it has them, and takes real steps to reduce it where genuinely possible.

Facility category	Crisis	Transition	Small	Standard
Applicability	Adapted	Full	Full	Full

WHY THIS MATTERS

Pool heating, sauna operation, and shower water use are genuinely among the largest resource consumers a fitness facility has, and tracking consumption specifically for these areas surfaces real, achievable savings that an aggregated utility bill never reveals.

WHAT GOOD LOOKS LIKE

- Consumption is genuinely tracked, including pool/sauna where present.
- At least one real improvement has been

COMMON FAILURE MODES

- Pool and sauna consumption is never separately tracked.

- Progress is genuinely reviewed.

WORKED EXAMPLE

IN PRACTICE

A facility with a pool heated continuously regardless of occupancy.

BEFORE

The pool was heated at a constant temperature 24 hours a day, with no scheduling adjustment for low-occupancy periods.

ACTION

A scheduled temperature reduction was introduced during overnight closed hours.

AFTER

The Monitor reviewed the energy data showing a genuine reduction. Verified.

IF YOU ARE STARTING FROM ZERO — DO THIS FIRST

1. Track pool/sauna energy use separately from general facility use.

The most common mistake: Pool and sauna energy use lumped into general utility bills, hiding the genuinely largest savings opportunity.

SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Is energy/water consumption genuinely tracked, including pool/sauna? — *Real, ongoing tracking.*
Evidence: Consumption tracking record
2. Has the facility genuinely pursued at least one real improvement? — *A real, concrete improvement.*
Evidence: Specific improvement record
3. Is progress genuinely reviewed periodically? — *Real, periodic review.*
Evidence: Review schedule

- Tracking exists but pool/sauna isn't separately broken out.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

When	What
Week 1-2	Set up area-specific tracking.

HOW THE MONITOR VERIFIES THIS

Method	What	Detail
DOCUMENT	Tracking review	Reviews consumption data by area.

SUPERVISOR TIPS

- Ask specifically about pool/sauna scheduling if present.

EVIDENCE BASE

International Finance Corporation. Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction in Healthcare Facilities. Washington DC: IFC; 2021.

[ASF training courses on GMJ Academy →](#)

Foundation courses A-00 to A-03 are live. Criterion-specific modules are being developed and will link here when published.

10.4 Members and Staff Are Genuinely Engaged in Sustainability Practice

STANDARD

Staff genuinely understand and participate in the facility's sustainability practices, and members are genuinely made aware of relevant initiatives where appropriate — not a sustainability policy known only to management.

In plain terms: Staff actually know what the facility is doing to be more sustainable, and members are told about it where that's genuinely relevant.

Facility category	Crisis	Transition	Small	Standard
Applicability	Adapted	Full	Full	Full

Fitness facility members often genuinely value and actively engage with sustainability practices — many choose facilities partly based on this — making genuine staff awareness and member communication a real, practical benefit rather than only an internal policy matter.

WHAT GOOD LOOKS LIKE

- Staff can genuinely describe a real practice.
- Members are genuinely made aware where appropriate.
- Staff input is genuinely sought.

COMMON FAILURE MODES

- Staff are unaware of any specific practice.

WORKED EXAMPLE

IN PRACTICE	
A facility whose sustainability efforts were known only to the owner.	
BEFORE	A switch to refillable water stations had happened with no staff or member communication.
ACTION	A brief staff briefing and a small member-facing sign explained the change.
AFTER	The Monitor asked a staff member who could describe the change. Verified.

IF YOU ARE STARTING FROM ZERO — DO THIS FIRST

1. Brief staff on current sustainability practices.

The most common mistake: Sustainability decisions known only at owner/management level.

SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Can staff describe a genuine practice? — *Real, demonstrated awareness.*
Evidence: Staff interview

12. Are members genuinely made aware where appropriate? Real, visible communication.

Evidence: Member communication

3. Is staff input genuinely sought? — Real, two-way engagement.

Evidence: Staff suggestion record

COMMON REASONS FOR A PARTIAL ANSWER

- Some staff are aware but awareness isn't consistent.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

When	What
Week 1	Brief all staff.

HOW THE MONITOR VERIFIES THIS

Method	What	Detail
ASK	Staff interview	Asks a staff member to describe a specific practice.

SUPERVISOR TIPS

- **Ask a non-management staff member.**

EVIDENCE BASE

Health Care Without Harm. Global Green and Healthy Hospitals Agenda.
Reston: HCWH: 2020.

ASF training courses on GMJ Academy →

Foundation courses A-00 to A-03 are live. Criterion-specific modules are being developed and will link here when published.

10.5 Sustainability Commitments Are Genuinely Reviewed, Not Static

STANDARD

The facility's sustainability goals and practices are genuinely reviewed and updated as circumstances change — not a document written once and never genuinely examined for whether it still reflects the facility's actual practice.

In plain terms: The facility's sustainability goals actually get revisited — not written once and left to go stale.

Facility category	Crisis	Transition	Small	Standard
Applicability	Adapted	Full	Full	Full

WHY THIS MATTERS

A document written once and filed away stops genuinely reflecting the facility's current practice as equipment, suppliers, and circumstances change. Real, periodic review is what keeps the commitment meaningful.

WHAT GOOD LOOKS LIKE

- Goals are genuinely reviewed.
- A real revision instance exists.
- Responsibility is genuinely assigned.

COMMON FAILURE MODES

- A document was written once and never revisited.

WORKED EXAMPLE

IN PRACTICE	
A facility whose statement predated a cleaning supplier switch.	
BEFORE	The statement referenced a supplier no longer used.
ACTION	A named person was assigned annual review responsibility.
AFTER	The Monitor reviewed the updated, dated document. Verified.

IF YOU ARE STARTING FROM ZERO — DO THIS FIRST

1. Assign named review responsibility.

The most common mistake: A document nobody is specifically responsible for revisiting.

1. Are goals genuinely reviewed? — *A real, periodic review.*

Evidence: Review schedule

2. Is there a real revision instance? — *A concrete example.*

Evidence: Revision history

3. Is responsibility genuinely assigned? — *A real, named accountability.*

Evidence: Assigned responsibility documentation

COMMON REASONS FOR A PARTIAL ANSWER

- A schedule exists but hasn't been followed consistently.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

When	What
Week 1	Assign review responsibility and conduct the first review.

HOW THE MONITOR VERIFIES THIS

Method	What	Detail
DOCUMENT	Revision history review	Reviews the document's revision history.

SUPERVISOR TIPS

- Ask who is specifically responsible for review.

EVIDENCE BASE

United Nations Environment Programme. Sustainable Healthcare Facilities Guidance. Nairobi: UNEP; 2022.

[ASF training courses on GMJ Academy →](#)

Foundation courses A-00 to A-03 are live. Criterion-specific modules are being developed and will link here when published.

← **Fitness & Wellness Standards — all standards**

Self-assess against these criteria →

ASF STANDARDS · FITNESS & WELLNESS · STANDARD 11

Standard 11 — Digital Care and Artificial Intelligence Systems for Care

5 criteria · 2 core · 3 standard-level · Version 1.0 · Aligned to ISQua EEA
Principle 7, 6th Edition

CRITERIA IN THIS STANDARD

- 11.1 — Digital Systems Are Genuinely Evaluated Before Adoption
- 11.2 — Digital Access Never Disadvantages a Member Who Cannot Use It
- 11.3 — Biometric and Health-Tracking Data Is Genuinely Protected and Appropriately Used
- 11.4 — AI-Driven Recommendations Are Genuinely Reviewed for Appropriateness
- 11.5 — Accountability for AI-Assisted Recommendations Is Explicitly Defined
- 11.6 — Members Are Genuinely Informed When a Recommendation Involves AI

11.1

Digital Systems Are Genuinely Evaluated Before Adoption

STANDARD

Before adopting any new digital system — membership management, class booking, biometric tracking — the facility genuinely evaluates its cost, benefit, and

In plain terms: Before the facility adopts a new app or tracking tool, someone has actually checked it’s worth it and will genuinely work.

Facility category	Crisis	Transition	Small	Standard
Applicability	Adapted	Full	Full	Full

WHY THIS MATTERS

Fitness facilities are frequently offered membership apps, booking platforms, and wearable-integration tools, each promising genuine convenience — but a real evaluation is what confirms a tool actually fits this facility’s member base and existing systems rather than creating duplicate work or member confusion.

WHAT GOOD LOOKS LIKE

- A genuine cost/benefit evaluation happens before adoption.
- Compatibility is genuinely checked.
- Unintended consequences are genuinely considered.

COMMON FAILURE MODES

- A system is adopted on vendor demonstration alone.

WORKED EXAMPLE

IN PRACTICE	
A gym considering a new booking app.	
BEFORE	A vendor’s app looked appealing but no check was made of whether it would genuinely integrate with the existing membership database.
ACTION	A brief evaluation confirmed genuine integration before full rollout.
AFTER	The Monitor reviewed the evaluation notes. Verified.

IF YOU ARE STARTING FROM ZERO — DO THIS FIRST

1. Build a simple evaluation checklist before adoption.

The most common mistake: Adopting an app because it looks polished, without checking actual integration with existing systems.

SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Is a genuine cost/benefit evaluation conducted? — *A real, documented evaluation.*

Evidence: Evaluation checklist

2. Is compatibility genuinely checked? — *Real, verified compatibility.*

Evidence: Compatibility check record

3. Are unintended consequences genuinely considered? — *Real, proactive consideration.*

Evidence: Pre-launch risk review

COMMON REASONS FOR A PARTIAL ANSWER

- **Evaluation happens for major systems but is skipped for smaller add-ons.**

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

When	What
Week 1	Build an evaluation checklist.

HOW THE MONITOR VERIFIES THIS

Method	What	Detail
DOCUMENT	Evaluation review	Reviews the evaluation for a recently adopted system.

SUPERVISOR TIPS

- **Ask about the most recently adopted digital tool.**

EVIDENCE BASE

World Health Organization. Global Strategy on Digital Health 2020-2025. Geneva: WHO; 2021.

[ASF training courses on GMJ Academy →](#)

Foundation courses A-00 to A-03 are live. Criterion-specific modules are being developed and will link here when published.

11.2 Digital Access Never Disadvantages a Member Who Cannot Use It

CORE

A genuine process ensures that members who cannot use digital devices, lack internet access, or prefer not to use an app are never disadvantaged in booking classes, accessing services, or managing their membership — not digital convenience purchased at the cost of real access for members least able to adapt.

In plain terms: A member who can't or doesn't want to use the facility's app still gets exactly the same real access to classes and services.

Facility category	Crisis	Transition	Small	Standard
Applicability	Adapted	Full	Full	Full

WHY THIS MATTERS

This is marked Core because fitness and wellness facilities genuinely serve a wide age and ability range, and an app-only booking system quietly excludes real members — often older adults, who make up a genuine and valuable part of many facilities' membership — unless a real, equally functional alternative is maintained.

WHAT GOOD LOOKS LIKE

- A genuine, equally functional alternative exists.
- New services are genuinely pre-tested with affected members.
- Real evidence shows equivalent service.

COMMON FAILURE MODES

- Front-desk booking becomes genuinely slower or deprioritised once an app launches.

WORKED EXAMPLE

IN PRACTICE

A gym that moved class booking to an app.

PHIG	BEFORE	After the app launched, front desk staff began directing members to “just use the app,” with in-person booking becoming genuinely slower and less prioritized.
GILS	ACTION	Front-desk booking was reaffirmed as an equally supported option, with staff specifically trained not to discourage its use.
Labour Studies	AFTER	The Monitor tested in-person booking directly and found it genuinely as fast and welcoming as the app. Verified.
GMU		
Journal		
GMU News		
GMU Academy		

IF YOU ARE STARTING FROM ZERO — DO THIS FIRST

- 1. Test your own non-digital booking channel directly.

The most common mistake: Staff informally steering members toward the app, quietly degrading the in-person alternative.

SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- 1. Is there a genuine, equally functional alternative? — *A real, equivalent alternative.*
Evidence: Documented alternative channel
- 2. Was a new digital service genuinely pre-tested with affected members? — *Real, prior testing.*
Evidence: Pre-launch testing record
- 3. Is there real evidence the alternative delivers equivalent service? — *A real, demonstrated instance.*
Evidence: Direct test

COMMON REASONS FOR A PARTIAL ANSWER

- An alternative exists but staff informally discourage its use.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

When	What
Week 1	Test the non-digital channel directly and brief staff.

Method	What	Detail
ASK	Direct test	Tests the non-digital alternative directly.

SUPERVISOR TIPS

- Book a class in person and see how staff actually respond.

EVIDENCE BASE

World Health Organization. Ethics and Governance of Artificial Intelligence for Health. Geneva: WHO; 2021.

[ASF training courses on GMJ Academy →](#)

Foundation courses A-00 to A-03 are live. Criterion-specific modules are being developed and will link here when published.

11.3

Biometric and Health-Tracking Data Is Genuinely Protected and Appropriately Used

CORE

Any biometric or health-tracking data collected through digital fitness tools — heart rate, body composition, activity tracking — is genuinely protected with real data security measures and used only for its stated purpose, with the member’s genuine, informed consent, not collected broadly with no real limit on its use.

In plain terms: A member’s heart rate, body composition, and activity data is actually kept secure, and only used for what they genuinely agreed to.

Facility category	Crisis	Transition	Small	Standard
Applicability	Adapted	Full	Full	Full

WHY THIS MATTERS

This is marked Core because biometric and health-tracking data is genuinely sensitive personal information, and fitness facilities increasingly collect it through wearables, body composition scanners, and app integrations — often through third-party platforms whose own data practices the facility may not have genuinely scrutinized. A

member sharing this data deserves real, specific assurance about how it's protected and used, not a generic platform privacy policy nobody has actually reviewed.

WHAT GOOD LOOKS LIKE

- Genuine, specific security measures protect member data.
- Data is used only for its genuinely stated purpose, with real consent.
- Members can genuinely access or request deletion of their data.

COMMON FAILURE MODES

- A third-party platform's data practices were never actually reviewed.

WORKED EXAMPLE

IN PRACTICE

A gym offering a body composition scanner through a third-party vendor.

BEFORE	The scanner's data was uploaded to the vendor's cloud platform, with nobody at the gym having actually reviewed the vendor's data security or retention practices.
ACTION	The vendor's data practices were reviewed and documented, and a clear member consent form was introduced specifically covering this data use.
AFTER	The Monitor reviewed the vendor assessment and the consent form. Verified.

IF YOU ARE STARTING FROM ZERO — DO THIS FIRST

1. Review the data practices of any third-party biometric tool used.
2. Introduce a clear, specific member consent process.

The most common mistake: Assuming a vendor's platform

SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Is member biometric data genuinely protected with specific security measures? — *Real, documented protection.*

Evidence: Data security review

2. Is data used only for its genuinely stated purpose, with real consent? — *A real, specific limit on use.*

Evidence: Member consent form

3. Can a member genuinely access, correct, or request deletion of their data? — *A real, functioning process.*

Evidence: Data-rights process documentation

COMMON REASONS FOR A PARTIAL ANSWER

- **A consent form exists but the underlying vendor's data practices were never checked.**

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

When	What
Week 1-2	Review third-party vendor data practices and introduce consent process.

HOW THE MONITOR VERIFIES THIS

Method	What	Detail
DOCUMENT	Data practice review	Reviews the vendor assessment and consent documentation.

SUPERVISOR TIPS

- **Ask whether anyone has actually read the third-party vendor's data policy.**

EVIDENCE BASE

European Union. General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), Article 9: Special Categories of Data. Brussels: EU; 2016.

[ASF training courses on GMJ Academy →](#)

Foundation courses A-00 to A-03 are live. Criterion-specific modules are being developed and will link here when published.

AI-Driven Recommendations Are

11.4 Genuinely Reviewed for Appropriateness

STANDARD

Any AI-driven fitness or nutrition recommendation tool is genuinely reviewed for appropriateness and safety before being offered to members, with genuine awareness that automated recommendations can be inappropriate or unsafe for a member’s actual health status — not assumed inherently safe because it’s automated.

In plain terms: Before an AI tool suggests workouts or nutrition plans to members, someone has actually checked it won’t recommend something unsafe for a real person’s situation.

Facility category	Crisis	Transition	Small	Standard
Applicability	Adapted	Full	Full	Full

WHY THIS MATTERS

AI-driven fitness and nutrition tools genuinely cannot account for every member’s real medical history, injuries, or physical limitations, and an automated recommendation that looks reasonable in general can be genuinely inappropriate or unsafe for a specific individual. A real review process before offering such a tool to members is what catches this gap.

WHAT GOOD LOOKS LIKE

- A tool is genuinely reviewed before being offered to members.
- Members have a genuine, clear way to flag an inappropriate recommendation.
- A documented instance shows a flagged issue leading to genuine review.

COMMON FAILURE MODES

- A tool is offered with no review, assumed safe because it’s automated.

IN PRACTICE

A gym offering an AI-generated workout plan tool.

BEFORE

The tool was activated with no review of whether it accounted for common injury limitations or flagged when a member should consult a trainer first.

ACTION

A qualified trainer reviewed sample outputs and confirmed the tool included an appropriate disclaimer and injury-flagging prompt, with a clear member feedback channel added.

AFTER

The Monitor reviewed the trainer's assessment and the feedback channel. Verified.

IF YOU ARE STARTING FROM ZERO — DO THIS FIRST

1. Have a qualified staff member review sample tool outputs before launch.

The most common mistake: Assuming an AI recommendation tool is inherently safe because it's automated and widely used elsewhere.

SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Is the tool genuinely reviewed before being offered to members?

— *A real, documented review.*

Evidence: Review record

2. Do members have a genuine way to flag an inappropriate recommendation? — *A real, accessible channel.*

Evidence: Feedback channel

3. Is there a documented instance of a flagged recommendation leading to genuine review? — *A real, concrete example.*

Evidence: Issue response record

- A review happened at launch but hasn’t been repeated as the tool updates.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

When	What
Week 1-2	Review tool outputs and introduce a member feedback channel.

HOW THE MONITOR VERIFIES THIS

Method	What	Detail
DOCUMENT	Review record check	Reviews the documented appropriateness review.

SUPERVISOR TIPS

- Ask a qualified trainer whether they’ve personally reviewed the tool’s outputs.

EVIDENCE BASE

American College of Sports Medicine. ACSM's Guidelines for Exercise Testing and Prescription. 11th ed. Philadelphia: Wolters Kluwer; 2021.

[ASF training courses on GMJ Academy →](#)

Foundation courses A-00 to A-03 are live. Criterion-specific modules are being developed and will link here when published.

11.5

Accountability for AI-Assisted Recommendations Is Explicitly Defined

STANDARD

The facility has genuinely considered and documented who is responsible when an AI-driven fitness or nutrition recommendation causes harm or proves inappropriate — not leaving this as an unexamined question until it actually matters.

In plain terms: Everyone knows, in advance, who’s actually responsible if an AI-generated fitness plan turns out to be wrong for someone.

Facility category	Crisis	Transition	Small	Standard
Applicability	Adapted	Full	Full	Full

WHY THIS MATTERS

Without clear accountability, a member injured following an AI-generated recommendation faces a genuinely confusing situation about who is actually responsible — the facility, the software vendor, or themselves for following an automated suggestion without professional review.

WHAT GOOD LOOKS LIKE

- Accountability is explicitly documented.
- Staff genuinely understand their own role.
- A defined process exists for reviewing an incident.

COMMON FAILURE MODES

- Accountability has never been explicitly addressed.

WORKED EXAMPLE

IN PRACTICE	
A gym offering an AI nutrition recommendation tool.	
BEFORE	Staff were unclear whether responsibility for an inappropriate recommendation sat with the facility, the vendor, or the member for following it unreviewed.
ACTION	A clear policy was documented: recommendations are suggestions only, reviewed by staff before being presented as personalized advice, with staff accountable for that review step.
AFTER	The Monitor interviewed a staff member who could clearly describe this accountability. Verified.

IF YOU ARE STARTING FROM ZERO — DO THIS FIRST

1. Explicitly document accountability for each AI-driven tool offered to members.

The most common mistake: Leaving accountability genuinely ambiguous until an actual incident forces clarity.

SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Is accountability explicitly documented? — *A real, clear answer.*

Evidence: Documented accountability policy

2. Do staff genuinely understand their own role in reviewing recommendations? — *Real, demonstrated understanding.*

Evidence: Staff interview

3. Is there a defined process for reviewing accountability if harm occurs? — *A real, usable process.*

Evidence: Incident review protocol

COMMON REASONS FOR A PARTIAL ANSWER

- **A policy exists but hasn't been communicated to frontline staff.**

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

When	What
Week 1	Document accountability for each AI tool offered.

HOW THE MONITOR VERIFIES THIS

Method	What	Detail
ASK	Staff interview	Asks a staff member to describe their accountability.

SUPERVISOR TIPS

- **Ask a staff member directly: if a recommendation causes injury, who is responsible?**

EVIDENCE BASE

European Commission. Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy Artificial Intelligence. Brussels: European Commission; 2019.

[ASF training courses on GMJ Academy →](#)

Foundation courses A-00 to A-03 are live. Criterion-specific modules are being developed and will link here when published.

11.6

Members Are Genuinely Informed
When a Recommendation Involves AI

STANDARD

A member whose fitness recommendation involves AI-driven input is genuinely informed of this — not left to assume every recommendation came from a human instructor alone, with disclosure treated as optional rather than a genuine, standard part of informed membership.

In plain terms: If an AI tool actually helped shape a workout or wellness recommendation, the member genuinely knows this — not left to assume a human instructor made it alone.

Facility category	Crisis	Transition	Small	Standard
Applicability	Adapted	Full	Full	Full

WHY THIS MATTERS

A member’s genuine right to understand their own fitness and wellness recommendations includes knowing, in plain terms, when an AI-driven tool actually shaped a suggestion rather than a human instructor’s judgement alone. This matters especially where an app-generated recommendation reaches a member with no genuine human review — the member deserves to know the real source.

WHAT GOOD LOOKS LIKE

- Members are genuinely informed when AI contributed to a recommendation.
- Disclosure is genuinely understandable, in plain language.
- A member can genuinely confirm they were told.

COMMON FAILURE MODES

- AI involvement is buried in app terms and conditions, technically present but never genuinely read or understood.

WORKED EXAMPLE

IN PRACTICE

A facility using an AI-generated workout plan feature in its member app.	
BEFORE	AI's role was mentioned only in the app's general terms and conditions, which members accepted without genuine awareness that their specific plan had actually been AI-generated.
ACTION	A brief label was added directly on the plan itself: "This plan was generated with AI assistance and reviewed by a certified instructor."
AFTER	The Monitor interviewed a member who could genuinely confirm they understood AI had been involved. Verified.

IF YOU ARE STARTING FROM ZERO — DO THIS FIRST

1. Add a brief, plain-language label directly on any AI-generated recommendation a member receives.

The most common mistake: Treating a line buried in app terms and conditions as genuine disclosure, when the member never actually registers it.

SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Is a member genuinely informed when AI contributed to a recommendation? — *Real, standard disclosure.*
Evidence: Disclosure labelling
2. Is this disclosure genuinely understandable, not buried in app terms? — *A real, plain-language explanation.*
Evidence: Labelling sample
3. Can a member asked directly confirm they were genuinely told? — *A real, concrete confirmation.*
Evidence: Member interview

COMMON REASONS FOR A PARTIAL ANSWER

- Disclosure exists in app terms but members genuinely cannot recall or explain it when asked directly.

When	What
Week 1-2	Add a plain-language AI-disclosure label to any AI-generated recommendation.

HOW THE MONITOR VERIFIES THIS

Method	What	Detail
ASK	Member interview	Asks a member whether they were genuinely told AI was involved in their recommendation.

SUPERVISOR TIPS

- Ask a member directly rather than relying on the app terms’ existence alone.

EVIDENCE BASE

World Health Organization. Ethics and Governance of Artificial Intelligence for Health: Guidance on Large Multi-Modal Models. Geneva: WHO; 2024.

[ASF training courses on GMJ Academy →](#)

Foundation courses A-00 to A-03 are live. Criterion-specific modules are being developed and will link here when published.

← **Fitness & Wellness Standards — all standards**

Self-assess against these criteria →

← **Standard 10 — Sustainable Care**

Standard 12 — Supporting the Care Workforce →

ASF STANDARDS · FITNESS & WELLNESS · STANDARD 12

Standard 12 — Supporting the Care Workforce

6 criteria · 2 core · 4 standard-level · Version 1.0 · Aligned to ISQua EEA
Principle 8, 6th Edition

CRITERIA IN THIS STANDARD

- 12.1 — Every Member of Staff Is Genuinely Credentialed for Their Actual Role
- 12.2 — Ongoing Competency Is Genuinely, Regularly Evaluated
- 12.3 — Staff Have Genuine Access to Ongoing Education and Skill Development
- 12.4 — Workforce Health and Safety Is Genuinely Protected
- 12.5 — Workplace Issues Raised by Staff Are Genuinely Investigated and Resolved
- 12.6 — Workforce Feedback Is Genuinely Gathered and Acted On
- 12.7 — Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Across the Workforce Are Genuinely Monitored

12.1

Every Member of Staff Is Genuinely Credentialed for Their Actual Role

CORE

Every staff member delivering a service with real physical risk — personal trainers, group fitness instructors, massage or spa therapists — has genuine assurance of the certification their role requires, including contracted or

In plain terms: Everyone leading a class or working one-on-one with members — including freelance trainers — has had their real certification genuinely checked.

Facility category	Crisis	Transition	Small	Standard
Applicability	Adapted	Full	Full	Full

WHY THIS MATTERS

Fitness facilities routinely rely on freelance or contracted instructors — a visiting yoga teacher, a guest personal trainer — and members cannot distinguish between employed and contracted staff when assessing whether the person leading their session is genuinely qualified. This is marked Core because incorrect technique or inappropriate programming from an uncertified instructor carries real, direct injury risk.

WHAT GOOD LOOKS LIKE

- Genuine certification assurance extends to contracted instructors.
- Certification is genuinely verified, not assumed from a resume.
- A real corrective process exists for a gap.

COMMON FAILURE MODES

- Freelance instructors are trusted based on their resume alone, never independently verified.

WORKED EXAMPLE

IN PRACTICE

A gym hiring freelance group fitness instructors.

BEFORE	Freelance instructors' certifications were listed on their resumes but never independently verified with the certifying body.
ACTION	A direct verification step was added before any instructor's first class, confirmed against the certifying body's registry.

IF YOU ARE STARTING FROM ZERO — DO THIS FIRST

1. Add direct certification verification to your instructor onboarding process.

The most common mistake: Trusting a resume’s listed certifications without independently verifying them.

SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Does genuine certification assurance extend to contracted instructors? — *Real, consistent coverage.*
Evidence: Certification verification records

2. Is each instructor’s certification genuinely verified? — *A specific, documented check.*
Evidence: Verification record

3. Is there a real process if someone teaches outside their certification? — *A genuine corrective process.*
Evidence: Correction procedure

COMMON REASONS FOR A PARTIAL ANSWER

- **Employed staff are verified but freelance instructors are not.**

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

When	What
Week 1	Add verification to instructor onboarding.

HOW THE MONITOR VERIFIES THIS

Method	What	Detail
DOCUMENT	Credential review	Reviews verification records across employed and contracted instructors.

SUPERVISOR TIPS

- **Ask about the most recently engaged freelance instructor.**

American College of Sports Medicine. ACSM's Guidelines for Exercise Testing and Prescription. 11th ed. Philadelphia: Wolters Kluwer; 2021.

[ASF training courses on GMJ Academy →](#)

Foundation courses A-00 to A-03 are live. Criterion-specific modules are being developed and will link here when published.

12.2 Ongoing Competency Is Genuinely, Regularly Evaluated STANDARD

The continued competency of instructional staff is genuinely, regularly evaluated — including observed class or session quality, not assumed to remain adequate indefinitely once initial certification is complete.

In plain terms: Instructor quality keeps getting genuinely checked, with real observed classes — not just a certification card checked once at hiring.

Facility category	Crisis	Transition	Small	Standard
Applicability	Adapted	Full	Full	Full

WHY THIS MATTERS

A valid certification confirms someone was qualified at a point in time, but instructional quality, safety cueing, and class management can genuinely drift without any ongoing observation — a real, periodic class observation is what catches this before it becomes a member safety issue.

WHAT GOOD LOOKS LIKE

- Competency is genuinely evaluated, including real observation.
- Evaluation covers actual current class offerings.
- A genuine gap triggers a real response.

COMMON FAILURE MODES

- Certification is checked once at hire and never revisited through observation.

IN PRACTICE

A gym with no class observation process.

BEFORE

Instructor quality had never been directly observed since hiring, several years prior for some staff.

ACTION

An annual, direct class observation was introduced, with a simple feedback form.

AFTER

The Monitor reviewed a recent observation record. Verified.

IF YOU ARE STARTING FROM ZERO — DO THIS FIRST

1. Introduce an annual, direct class observation for each instructor.

The most common mistake: Treating an initial certification check as sufficient for the duration of someone's employment.

SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Is competency genuinely evaluated, including real observation?

— *A real, periodic evaluation.*

Evidence: Evaluation records

2. Does evaluation genuinely cover current class offerings? — *A*

specific, role-relevant check.

Evidence: Role-specific criteria

3. Does a genuine gap trigger a real response? — *A genuine*

corrective process.

Evidence: Correction record

COMMON REASONS FOR A PARTIAL ANSWER

- **Observation happens but no feedback is ever given to the instructor.**

When	What
Week 1-2	Introduce annual class observation.

HOW THE MONITOR VERIFIES THIS

Method	What	Detail
DOCUMENT	Evaluation review	Reviews evaluation for genuine, observed substance.

SUPERVISOR TIPS

- Ask to see an evaluation involving real, observed class attendance.

EVIDENCE BASE

Institute of Medicine. Health Professions Education: A Bridge to Quality.
Washington DC: National Academies Press; 2003.

[ASF training courses on GMJ Academy →](#)

Foundation courses A-00 to A-03 are live. Criterion-specific modules are being developed and will link here when published.

12.3 Staff Have Genuine Access to Ongoing Education and Skill Development STANDARD

Every staff member has genuine access to ongoing education — including CPR/first-aid recertification and genuine opportunities to develop new instructional skills — not education treated as a one-time induction event.

In plain terms: Staff can actually keep learning and recertifying — especially CPR and first aid, genuinely essential in this setting.

Facility category	Crisis	Transition	Small	Standard
Applicability	Adapted	Full	Full	Full

WHY THIS MATTERS

CPR and first-aid certification genuinely expire and require real recertification, and a lapsed certification in a setting where cardiac events and injuries genuinely occur during exercise is a direct, serious

WHAT GOOD LOOKS LIKE

- Genuine, ongoing access to education, including CPR/first-aid.
- Real development opportunities beyond minimums.
- Staff can describe a real opportunity taken.

COMMON FAILURE MODES

- CPR/first-aid certification is allowed to lapse with no tracking.

WORKED EXAMPLE

IN PRACTICE

A gym with no tracking of CPR certification expiry.

BEFORE	CPR certifications were not centrally tracked, and two staff members' certifications had lapsed without anyone noticing.
ACTION	A tracking system with automatic renewal reminders was introduced, and lapsed certifications were immediately renewed.
AFTER	The Monitor confirmed all current staff held valid, current CPR certification. Verified.

IF YOU ARE STARTING FROM ZERO — DO THIS FIRST

1. Audit current CPR/first-aid certification status for all staff and set up tracking.

The most common mistake: CPR/first-aid certification expiry not centrally tracked, allowing it to silently lapse.

SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Does every staff member have genuine, ongoing access to education, including CPR/first-aid? — *Real, continuing access.*

Evidence: Certification tracking record

minimums? — *Real opportunities.*

Evidence: Training calendar

3. Can staff describe a real opportunity taken in the past year? — A

real, specific example.

Evidence: Staff interview

COMMON REASONS FOR A PARTIAL ANSWER

- **CPR tracking exists but broader skill development opportunities are rare.**

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

When	What
Week 1	Audit and set up certification expiry tracking.

HOW THE MONITOR VERIFIES THIS

Method	What	Detail
DOCUMENT	Certification tracking review	Reviews current CPR/first-aid certification status for all staff.

SUPERVISOR TIPS

- **Ask to see the current CPR certification expiry dates for all instructional staff.**

EVIDENCE BASE

World Health Organization. Global Strategy on Human Resources for Health: Workforce 2030. Geneva: WHO; 2016.

[ASF training courses on GMJ Academy →](#)

Foundation courses A-00 to A-03 are live. Criterion-specific modules are being developed and will link here when published.

12.4

Workforce Health and Safety Is Genuinely Protected

CORE

The facility genuinely protects the health and safety of instructional staff, who face real, physically demanding occupational risk — repetitive strain, injury from demonstrating movements, overuse injuries from a high

In plain terms: The instructors working here are genuinely kept physically safe too — real limits on class load, real attention to overuse injury — not just member safety considered.

Facility category	Crisis	Transition	Small	Standard
Applicability	Adapted	Full	Full	Full

WHY THIS MATTERS

Instructors who teach multiple classes daily, repeatedly demonstrating full-intensity movements, face genuine, cumulative physical risk that is often overlooked precisely because the facility's stated safety focus centers on members. This is marked Core because this risk is real, serious, and directly tied to the facility's own scheduling and class-load decisions.

WHAT GOOD LOOKS LIKE

- Genuine, specific measures prevent instructor overuse injury.
- Instructor injury is genuinely tracked.
- An instructor can describe a real instance where a measure worked.

COMMON FAILURE MODES

- Instructors are scheduled for a high class load with no limit or rotation.

WORKED EXAMPLE

IN PRACTICE

A gym where popular instructors taught back-to-back classes daily.

BEFORE	A popular instructor taught up to six high-intensity classes daily with no scheduled rest, and had developed a genuine, recurring shoulder strain injury.
ACTION	A daily class load limit was introduced, and instructors were rotated across lower and higher

AFTER

The Monitor reviewed the class load policy and confirmed real, current adherence. Verified.

IF YOU ARE STARTING FROM ZERO — DO THIS FIRST

1. Set a real, specific daily class load limit for instructional staff.

The most common mistake: No class load limit, allowing popular instructors to accumulate genuine, repetitive strain risk.

SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Are genuine, specific measures in place to prevent overuse injury? — *Real, specific measures.*

Evidence: Class load policy

2. Is instructor injury genuinely tracked? — *Real, systematic tracking.*

Evidence: Injury log

3. Can an instructor describe a real instance where a measure worked? — *A real, concrete example.*

Evidence: Staff interview

COMMON REASONS FOR A PARTIAL ANSWER

- A policy exists but isn't genuinely enforced for the most popular instructors.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

When	What
Week 1-2	Set and enforce a class load limit.

HOW THE MONITOR VERIFIES THIS

Method	What	Detail
DOCUMENT	Schedule review	Reviews instructor schedules against the stated class load policy.

SUPERVISOR TIPS

- Check actual schedules for the most popular instructors, not just the policy.

World Health Organization. Health Worker Safety Charter. Geneva: WHO; 2020.

[ASF training courses on GMJ Academy →](#)

Foundation courses A-00 to A-03 are live. Criterion-specific modules are being developed and will link here when published.

12.5 **Workplace Issues Raised by Staff Are Genuinely Investigated and Resolved** STANDARD

A genuine process exists for investigating and resolving workplace issues raised by staff, with real protection from adverse treatment, not a grievance process that exists on paper with no real follow-through.

In plain terms: When staff raise a concern, it actually gets looked into, and they're genuinely protected.

Facility category	Crisis	Transition	Small	Standard
Applicability	Adapted	Full	Full	Full

WHY THIS MATTERS

A genuine, trusted reporting channel is particularly important for freelance and contracted instructors, who may feel genuinely more vulnerable than employed staff when raising a concern, given their less secure working relationship with the facility.

WHAT GOOD LOOKS LIKE

- A genuine, accessible process exists.
- Real evidence of genuine resolution.
- Genuine protection from adverse treatment.

COMMON FAILURE MODES

- Freelance instructors feel they cannot raise a concern without risking their contract.

WORKED EXAMPLE

IN PRACTICE

A facility where freelance instructors rarely raised concerns.

BEFORE

Freelance instructors privately expressed reluctance to raise scheduling or safety concerns, fearing it would affect their contract renewal.

ACTION

A written non-retaliation commitment specific to contracted staff was introduced, along with a clear, accessible reporting channel.

AFTER

The Monitor interviewed a freelance instructor who described genuine confidence in the process. Verified.

IF YOU ARE STARTING FROM ZERO — DO THIS FIRST

1. Ask freelance instructors privately whether they'd feel safe raising a concern.

The most common mistake: Assuming freelance instructors have the same genuine confidence in the reporting process as employed staff, without ever actually checking.

SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Is there a genuine, accessible process for raising issues? — *A real, known process.*

Evidence: Process documentation

2. Is there real evidence of genuine resolution? — *Genuine follow-through.*

Evidence: Resolution log

3. Are staff genuinely protected from adverse treatment? — *Real, demonstrated protection.*

Evidence: Staff interview

COMMON REASONS FOR A PARTIAL ANSWER

- A process exists for employed staff but freelance instructors aren't explicitly covered.

When	What
Week 1-2	Extend the reporting process and non-retaliation commitment to contracted staff.

HOW THE MONITOR VERIFIES THIS

Method	What	Detail
ASK	Staff interview	Asks a freelance instructor whether they'd feel safe raising a concern.

SUPERVISOR TIPS

- **Specifically interview a freelance or contracted instructor, not only employed staff.**

EVIDENCE BASE

International Labour Organization. Violence and Harassment Convention, 2019 (No. 190). Geneva: ILO; 2019.

[ASF training courses on GMJ Academy →](#)

Foundation courses A-00 to A-03 are live. Criterion-specific modules are being developed and will link here when published.

12.6 Workforce Feedback Is Genuinely Gathered and Acted On

STANDARD

The facility has a genuine, systematic approach to gathering staff feedback, including from part-time and freelance instructors whose limited on-site time can easily leave them disconnected from feedback processes, with real analysis and a genuine, implemented response.

In plain terms: Staff, including part-time and freelance instructors, get genuinely asked how working here actually is, and real changes happen as a result.

Facility category	Crisis	Transition	Small	Standard
Applicability	Adapted	Full	Full	Full

Freelance and part-time instructors, who may only be on-site for their own classes, are genuinely likely to miss staff meetings and informal feedback moments that employed, full-time staff naturally participate in — a feedback process that doesn’t deliberately reach them misses a real, substantial part of the instructional workforce.

WHAT GOOD LOOKS LIKE

- Feedback genuinely reaches part-time and freelance staff.
- Feedback is genuinely analysed.
- A documented instance shows a genuine, implemented change.

COMMON FAILURE MODES

- Feedback sessions happen during staff meetings freelance instructors never attend.

WORKED EXAMPLE

IN PRACTICE	
A gym whose feedback survey rarely reached freelance instructors.	
BEFORE	Feedback was gathered during monthly staff meetings freelance instructors, who weren’t paid to attend, rarely joined.
ACTION	A brief digital survey with a genuine deadline was introduced, reaching all instructors regardless of meeting attendance.
AFTER	The Monitor reviewed response data showing genuine participation from freelance staff. Verified.

IF YOU ARE STARTING FROM ZERO — DO THIS FIRST

1. Check whether freelance instructors genuinely participate in current feedback processes.

The most common mistake: Feedback tied to unpaid meeting attendance, which freelance instructors have no genuine incentive to join.

1. Does feedback genuinely reach part-time and freelance staff? —

Real, ongoing collection.

Evidence: Response data

2. Is feedback genuinely analysed? — *A real, documented analysis.*

Evidence: Analysis notes

3. Is there a documented instance of feedback genuinely leading to a change? — *A real, concrete example.*

Evidence: Change record

COMMON REASONS FOR A PARTIAL ANSWER

- **Feedback is gathered but freelance response rate remains genuinely low.**

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

When	What
Week 1-2	Introduce a feedback channel independent of meeting attendance.

HOW THE MONITOR VERIFIES THIS

Method	What	Detail
DOCUMENT	Response rate review	Reviews feedback response data by employment type.

SUPERVISOR TIPS

- **Specifically check freelance instructor response rates.**

EVIDENCE BASE

NHS England. NHS Staff Survey National Results. Leeds: NHS England; 2023.

[ASF training courses on GMJ Academy](#) →

Foundation courses A-00 to A-03 are live. Criterion-specific modules are being developed and will link here when published.

Equality, Diversity and Inclusion

12.7 Across the Workforce Are Genuinely Monitored

STANDARD

The organisation genuinely monitors and responds to real patterns of equity across recruitment, work allocation, scheduling, and promotion — including among freelance and contracted instructors — not an assumption that fair treatment exists simply because no formal complaint has been raised.

In plain terms: The facility actually looks at real patterns — who gets hired, which classes people get, who gets promoted — not just assuming things are fair because nobody has formally complained.

Facility category	Crisis	Transition	Small	Standard
Applicability	Adapted	Full	Full	Full

WHY THIS MATTERS

Inequity in recruitment, class assignment, or promotion can genuinely persist for years without a single formal complaint — people often don't report a pattern they can't fully see themselves, or don't trust reporting to change anything. This genuinely matters for freelance instructors too, who may have even less visibility into organisational patterns than salaried staff. Genuine, proactive monitoring of real workforce data is what actually surfaces a pattern that individual complaints alone would likely never reveal.

WHAT GOOD LOOKS LIKE

- Workforce data is genuinely monitored for patterns.
- A genuine pattern triggers a real response.
- A real instance shows monitoring informing a change.

COMMON FAILURE MODES

- No formal complaint has been raised, so the organisation genuinely assumes no issue exists, with no actual data ever reviewed.

IN PRACTICE

A facility that had never reviewed its own class-assignment data across instructors.

BEFORE

Popular, well-paid class slots were assigned informally with no genuine review of whether certain instructors consistently received less favourable assignments.

ACTION

A quarterly equity review was introduced, which identified and corrected a genuine, unintentional pattern.

AFTER

The Monitor reviewed the review documentation and the resulting correction. Verified.

IF YOU ARE STARTING FROM ZERO — DO THIS FIRST

1. Introduce a regular review of recruitment, class assignment, and promotion data, including freelance instructors.

The most common mistake: Assuming fairness exists because no one has formally complained, with no actual data ever reviewed.

SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Is workforce data genuinely monitored for patterns of inequity? —

A real, documented monitoring process.

Evidence: Monitoring protocol

2. Where a genuine pattern is identified, is there a real, defined response? — *A genuine corrective process.*

Evidence: Response record

3. Is there a real, documented instance of this genuinely informing a change? — *A concrete, real example.*

Evidence: Change record

- **Data exists but has genuinely never been reviewed specifically for equity patterns among freelance instructors.**

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

When	What
Week 1-2	Introduce a quarterly equity review covering recruitment, class assignment, and promotion.

HOW THE MONITOR VERIFIES THIS

Method	What	Detail
DOCUMENT	Equity review record	Reviews the monitoring data and any resulting corrective action.

SUPERVISOR TIPS

- **Ask to see the actual data behind the last equity review, including freelance instructors specifically.**

EVIDENCE BASE

World Health Organization. Gender Equity and Human Rights in the Health Workforce. Geneva: WHO; 2019.

[ASF training courses on GMJ Academy →](#)

Foundation courses A-00 to A-03 are live. Criterion-specific modules are being developed and will link here when published.

← **Fitness & Wellness Standards — all standards**

Self-assess against these criteria →

← **Standard 11 — Digital Care & AI**