

I oppose to HB 2493.

I am a Portland-based career and executive coach and hold a “Professional Certified Coach” credential from the [International Coaching Federation](#) (ICF). I also serve as the Board Secretary of the Oregon Charter Chapter of the ICF. While I appreciate the consumer protection intention behind the legislation, I object to the bill’s inclusion of “life coaches” in its definition of “alternative practitioners” for the following reasons:

1. Coaching is a mainstream discipline that is recognized and relied upon by major corporations;
2. Coaches already meet rigorous training and credentialing standards through the ICF;
3. The ICF provides an Ethical Conduct Review Process; and
4. This bill places an unfair financial burden on coaches, many of whom operate as small business owners in Oregon.

1. Coaching is a mainstream discipline that is recognized and relied upon by major corporations.

The coaching profession has existed for several decades and has been relied upon by Fortune 500 companies, elite law firms, government agencies and non-profit institutions as a key resource in the professional development of its workforce. These organizations routinely offer coaching services to enhance their leaders’ effectiveness. Many of Oregon’s premier employers, such as Nike, Intel, Adidas, OHSU, Columbia Sportswear, and Providence, invest considerable resources in offering coaching services to their employees.

2. Coaches already meet rigorous training and credentialing standards through the ICF.

Coaches who are credentialed by the ICF must meet rigorous training standards that are focused on developing and delivering [core competencies](#) and on upholding the ICF’s [Code of Ethics](#). The well-being of our clients is paramount, and we are well-trained to understand what coaching is (and is not). Coach training programs, some of which are offered at the nation’s leading university such as Georgetown University, Columbia University, University of Texas, and New York University, teach coaches to respect the boundaries of coaching and to make referrals to appropriate professionals (such as mental health practitioners) when a client’s needs extend beyond our discipline.

To maintain a coaching credential, the ICF requires coaches to complete a significant amount of ongoing education emphasizing core competencies and ethics, and to submit evidence of this training every three years as part of the renewal process.

3. The ICF Provides an Ethical Conduct Review Process.

The ICF is committed to the integrity of the coaching profession and to the safety of our clients. The ICF maintains an Ethical Conduct Review Process to address complaints about the behavior of coaches. This process provides for review, investigation and response to alleged unethical practices or behavior deviating from the established ICF Code.

4. This bill places an unfair financial burden on coaches, many of whom operate as small business owners in Oregon.

HB 2493's provisions to register and pay an annual registration fee provide an unnecessary burden on coaches, many of whom are self-employed business owners in Oregon. Coaches already invest a significant amount of time and money in their education programs, credentialing process and continuing education. The requirements of this bill place an unfair burden on coaches, especially since many of the protections it aims to offer are already available through the ICF. This financial burden will ultimately be passed on to members of the public to the extent that coaches will need to raise their fees in order to meet the bill's obligations.

Respectfully submitted,

Susanne Aronowitz, JD PCC
Portland, Oregon
May 9, 2021