

Chapter Fourteen

THE COACHING IMPACT STUDY™

A Case Study in Successful Evaluation

Derek Steinbrenner and Barry Schlosser

Introduction

The field of executive coaching has grown considerably in the last several years. By one estimate, the number of practitioners in the marketplace has risen to over 40,000 globally (Frank Bresser Consulting, 2009), and the membership rolls of the International Coach Federation (ICF), a highly recognized professional association of coaches, swelled from just under 8,000 in 2004 to nearly 16,000 in 2009 (International Coach Federation, 2010).

When the authors embarked on the Coaching Impact Study in 2004 as a joint research and practice initiative intended to explore how this burgeoning yet inadequately understood discipline could be measured and evaluated, little research had been done or was being reported beyond the anecdotal. In 2009, as we retire the study and write this chapter, that landscape is changing. There are now a growing number of professional journals publishing coaching research—including many subject to peer review—and an expanding community of academic, behavioral sciences investigators with research programs focused on this area. With SIOP now

hosting conferences that highlight coaching (for example, Society for Industrial & Organizational Psychology, 2008) and sponsoring working groups on the subject, a new era of rigor and data-driven knowledge appears to be on the horizon.

The rapid growth and maturation that have occurred in the coaching profession in the intervening years since we began the study offers us an opportunity to reflect on our research from the “early years” and share our experiences and lessons learned with other researchers and practitioners, supporting their efforts to expand our understanding of the field. In this chapter, we describe how a partnership of coaches, organizations, a consulting firm, and an academic conceived a thorough yet straightforward methodology for evaluating the effectiveness, impact, and value of executive coaching engagements as they were taking place in organizations—an approach that was successfully integrated into several organizational coaching initiatives. The chapter tells the story of our study’s origins, objectives, design, and implementation within participant organizations. Along the way, we share our process, challenges, and lessons learned (L) from this effort with the hope that researchers and practitioners alike will discover new ideas and insights in these pages that will inform, challenge, and encourage them to continue the critical work of linking coaching to outcomes, impact, and value for individuals and organizations.

Origins of the Study

The rapid growth in the popularity of executive coaching over the last decade is remarkable, and is largely due to personal experience and anecdotal evidence of its benefits to the individual being coached and, more recently, to the organization. In that time, organizations increasingly began to shift beyond the use of coaching for executives at risk of derailing and increasingly toward its use to support high-performing executives and high-potential leaders, realizing that these latter two groups, if their development as leaders could be accelerated, could return substantial additional value to their organizations.

But with no concerted, centralized plan to manage and align coaching efforts, apply consistent best-practice principles to

coaching processes, and systematically capture, evaluate, and communicate results, its impact was diminished, diffuse, and poorly documented. That was how leadership coaching was largely done—as ad hoc, one-on-one relationships whose focus and outcomes rarely emerged from behind the closed door of the confidential coaching session. It was the exception rather than the rule for the HR generalist, boss, or other key stakeholder to be aware that a coaching engagement had even occurred, let alone be clear about what it had produced.

The Organization

To counter that trend, Wachovia Corporation (which has since become part of Wells Fargo & Company) began to take a different approach to executive coaching across the enterprise. Instead of ad hoc coaching activity, it would implement a strategic coaching practice, with a practice leader tasked with ensuring that all coaching had a purpose aligned with the business's needs, was delivered by a professional coach vetted to meet strict qualification standards, was accountable for delivering key coaching milestones and reporting requirements, and was managed to a visible budget.

Wachovia was thus an early adopter of the core tenets of a “modern” strategic coaching practice, which include coordinating and managing coaching activity, prioritizing its objectives, and aligning its efforts in directions that support the organization's business and talent strategies. The *raison d'être* of a strategic coaching practice is to focus the organization's investment in coaching to achieve optimal business impact, but business impact can also be its vulnerability as visible, significant, and aggregated expenditures on anything, as “soft” as executive coaching may invite hard-nosed scrutiny. Wachovia's coaching practice leader at the time recognized this risk inherent in a strategic coaching practice. Even though the company's senior executives were committed to—and had experienced—the direct impact of executive coaching themselves, and assured her of their support of the new coaching strategy, she recognized the importance of documenting the success and impact of the practice to its long-term sustainability.

The Coaching and Researcher Team

Looking for a way to both evaluate individual coaching engagements and document the value of executives' achievements through coaching, the practice leader turned to Cambria—the consulting and coaching firm of one of this chapter's authors (Steinbrenner)—which had been working with her on the design and implementation of the bank's strategic coaching practice as well as providing and managing some of the bank's external coaches.

The firm had already begun to consider sponsoring a research program, in partnership with coaching researcher James Hunt of Babson University, to explore coaching efficacy and impact in organizations. Cambria's coaching professionals had established the firm's strategic coaching approach (Kumata, 2002) and were becoming interested in the state of research in the coaching field from the organization's perspective—and aware that there was precious little available. Similarly, Dr. Hunt had been conducting research into the value of coaching behaviors at the individual level within organizations (Hunt & Weintraub, 2002) and was beginning to shift his focus to the value of coaching to the organization as a whole.

Coincidentally, on a parallel course, this chapter's other author (Schlosser)—an executive coach and consultant with extensive experience in assessment services and methodology who happened to be coaching at Wachovia—had also been developing a research design and survey material to explore coaching outcomes and return on investment (ROI).

These contributors joined forces as a research team to collaborate on a unified measurement program that would aim to achieve each party's objectives under a single research design. For participation to be practical for Wachovia—and, we hoped, for other organizations—the study's surveys would have to not only reach our team's research and practice goals, but they would need to be concise, efficient, and simple enough to maximize the chance of their being completed by busy, over-surveyed corporate executives.

Other Organizations

As we were designing the Coaching Impact Study, two other organizations—Credit Suisse and Deloitte—agreed to participate.

Coaching in Credit Suisse's North American division was, like Wachovia's, in the process of shifting to a strategic practice model, where coaching across the division would be managed centrally and follow specific guidelines. The bank's coaching practice leader was planning a significant strategic coaching pilot initiative, providing coaching to a cohort of the bank's directors who were candidates for "election" (promotion) to managing director—an annual talent review event that would result in a challenging new role for those who would be elected that year, and disappointment for those who would not. The goals of the Credit Suisse initiative were threefold: (1) prepare directors' development leading up to the "MD Election" process, (2) support the transition of elected MDs into their new roles and accelerate their time-to-productivity, and (3) work with directors not promoted to identify and focus on their development priorities and increase their chances of success the next time around. Related to the third goal was the bank's hope that coaching support would improve its retention of directors not promoted but who were nonetheless a body of talent that was tremendously valuable to the organization and that had historically seen significant turnover following election decisions. And, beyond measuring retention for this single initiative, the practice leader needed a way to delve beneath the coaching experience to better understand the value it produced for Credit Suisse and its executives. This strategic initiative provided an opportunity to introduce such a measurement effort into the coaching process.

Deloitte's strategic coaching practice was several years older and more established than those of Wachovia and Credit Suisse at the time we developed the Coaching Impact Study. According to Syd Snyder, talent director of Deloitte's Partner Services organization, his firm became involved in the Coaching Impact Study for two reasons:

At Deloitte, we have known for some time that executive coaching can be effective. We knew this by collecting feedback from the leader who worked with a coach and his/her leader. On a case by case, engagement by engagement basis, we knew the costs of executive coaching were completely justified. What we DIDN'T know is how Deloitte as an organization was impacted or not impacted by executive coaching. The Impact Study provided

us a picture of the organizational shifts as a result of numerous executive coaching engagements with our senior leaders. The good news is the shifts were all in the direction Deloitte as an organization wanted to see.

Secondly, and of equal importance, the Impact Study provided us the opportunity to codify the goals of executive coaching in order for us to learn where we might consider other developmental interventions to supplement, if you will, the one-on-one coaching. By understanding what our leaders as a group believed that they were lacking in leadership capability, we were able to significantly better leverage our development dollars with other development programs. (S. Snyder, personal communication, October 11, 2009)

Ultimately, these first three participating companies, and those that would follow, each had real business needs driving their interest in being involved in the Coaching Impact Study. They did not sign up for the study—with its rigorous surveys of their senior-most leaders (and their managers!) probing for details about a potentially sensitive subject—purely out of an altruistic motivation to contribute research and knowledge to the profession of coaching (though that was part of it). Though needs and interests varied across the group, among them were:

- To develop a foundation of quantitative and qualitative evidence establishing the impact and value of their organization's strategic coaching practice
- To gather data on organizational trends, such as key areas of coaching focus across coaching engagements
- To identify common pitfalls or obstacles to coaching success
- To raise “red flags” that might indicate priorities for the coaching practice, including internal messaging needs (for example, raising awareness of coaching with a key stakeholder group) or coaching process elements (for example, incorporating a check-in with the manager at the end of the coaching process)
- To better align and blend executive coaching with other talent development efforts of the organization
- For a couple of participant organizations, to evaluate the effectiveness and fit of the coaches doing the coaching work

These business needs shaped our study's objectives, and each had an impact on its design and implementation. The study's objectives, design, and implementation are the subjects of the next three segments of this chapter.

Objectives

In large measure, we pursued the Coaching Impact Study to apply quantitative and qualitative research methodology to understanding the focus, process, impact, and value of what is accomplished through executive coaching. At its outset, there was a paucity of studies of actual coaching engagements, and so we took it upon ourselves to research and map out what a contemporary and practical study of executive coaching might consist of at the individual and organizational levels.

Though we agreed that powerful lessons can be drawn from anecdotes and stories, our general sense was that the executive coaching field would benefit from a more empirical, quantitative examination. We were thus determined to design a study that would extend beyond the qualitative to also allow for robust statistical analyses.

We settled on the following key objectives integral to the study's success:

- 1. Develop a practical design.** Achieving sufficient response rates was a major concern as we embarked on our study. We were highly aware that the surveys were in some respects an imposition upon the respondents—busy professionals, many of whom have little time or inclination for being surveyed and may already be over-surveyed. Thus, the practicality of our design became a study objective of its own. We labored to strike a balance among comprehensiveness of content, item design, and survey length. We used a straightforward design for the Web-based surveys. We wanted each survey to fit within one scrolling Web page of reasonable length—rather than a series of pages—so that respondents could quickly see the full length of the survey they were being asked to respond to and would therefore be more likely to complete the entire survey.

2. Examine coaching from multiple perspectives. There are three primary stakeholders in most coaching engagements: the executive or “coachee,” the coach, and the coachee’s manager. We refer to these stakeholders collectively as the “coaching triad.” Our participant organizations each expected some level of involvement in the coaching process from the coachee’s manager (or, in those more matrixed organizations, a more senior “sponsor” for the coaching effort). Though in some cases the manager’s role was primarily to approve funding, most managers were expected to provide input into coaching priorities, confirm action plans, track progress, and provide ongoing feedback. We and our participant organizations were interested in comparing the perspectives of these “managers/sponsors” to those of the other members of the coaching triad.

3. Compare expectations to outcomes. Whereas traditional program evaluation efforts typically focus on measuring reactions, perceptions, and effects following the completion of the program, we were also curious to find out how assessments of impact and value from coaching after the fact compared to expectations going into the engagement. Would overly high expectations at the outset tend to produce disappointment in the end? Would initial skepticism tend to be disabused or confirmed? Or perhaps more important, would levels of initial skepticism persist in influencing perceptions regardless of actual accomplishments? These and similar questions led us to build into our study’s design a Time 1—Time 2 methodology.

4. Identify the focus of coaching engagements. The overarching objectives of most developmental coaching are essentially behavioral and attitudinal changes in a particular direction—not increased knowledge of a subject or improvement of a technical skill, which might be better addressed by training or other educational means. Thus, an important aspect of understanding the value that coaching produces for the individual and, by extension, for the organization is to understand the specific kinds of capabilities and behaviors targeted for improvement within a coaching engagement. In formulating our study, we needed to identify a method to help survey respondents zero in on these capabilities and behaviors before appraising their value. This

would also allow us to identify trends or themes in areas that receive the most attention in coaching and to compare what was envisioned for improvement at the start of coaching to what actually was addressed.

5. Identify the impact of coaching engagements. To arrive at a reasonable estimate of the value produced by a coaching effort, it is critical to determine what organizational or business-oriented outcomes are achieved. Such insights could provide valuable support for an organization's investment in coaching.

6. Measure perceptions of the value of coaching engagements and factors important to them. Coaching may be perceived to add value to an organization in many ways. Coachees may become more effective by improving their capabilities; a manager/sponsor may have a more connected team member; the organization may find value because desired business metrics have been achieved. These perceptions of value are tied to changes in behavior or capability that lead to business-relevant outcomes that hold merit for the organization. Our objective was not to treat these perceptions as equivalent to econometric notions of ROI, nor were we particularly interested in pursuing the notion of a financial return on the coaching expense as other investigators had (for example, Anderson, 2003). The financial estimates of value we intended to measure would serve more as a proxy for stakeholder *perceptions* of the value that a coaching effort produced for the organization.

7. Produce useful reports for organizations. For our participant organizations, a main goal was to gain access to organizational-level survey data that would allow them to influence the use and direction of coaching at their own organization, as well as to share information with their own leaders. A major benefit to these organizations was the opportunity to compare data from their own surveys to benchmark data from other participants.

8. Share our findings with coaching researchers and practitioners. From the outset of the Coaching Impact Study, we intended to explore unanswered questions in the coaching field and to convey our insights and findings to the broader coaching community—and to encourage dialogue, questioning, and further study. Throughout the life of the study, therefore, various

combinations of our investigator team and participant organizations have endeavored to broadcast the aim of the study and our findings to a variety of audiences, including professional associations, research groups, practitioner groups, and stakeholder communities internal to our participant organizations.

Design

The preceding eight objectives drove the ultimate design of the Coaching Impact Study, which we detail here along with several key findings and lessons learned along the way.

Study Methodology

The Coaching Impact Study methodology consisted of identical online surveys sent to multiple stakeholders of a coaching engagement at two points in the coaching process: near the outset and at the conclusion. These fundamental design elements—Identical Surveys Across Stakeholders and Time 1—Time 2 Surveys—have been described previously (Schlosser, Steinbrenner, Kumata, & Hunt, 2006), but bear further discussion here before we examine the details of survey construction.

Identical Surveys Across Stakeholders

Because we wanted to be able to compare responses on survey items not just within but across stakeholder groups, we created a standardized survey whose primary focus of evaluation was the engagement itself, with each item identical across the coaching triad. This gave us the opportunity, for example, to collect what was essentially a self-assessment rating of the commitment of the manager/sponsor to the coaching engagement.

We ultimately found that the stakeholder group with the highest response rate was the coach group. In our view, this was largely because coaching program managers hold the purse strings and therefore have significant influence over their coaches. The second highest responders were the coachees: most of our participant organizations asked their coaches to encourage their coachees to respond to the surveys. Lowest of the response rates was that of managers/sponsors, and the organizations most

successful in getting their responses were those who explicitly defined a role for that individual in the coaching process itself and clearly communicated that surveys were an important element of the process. [¶]*With all groups, personal follow-up on uncompleted surveys by coaching practice staff produced the highest success rate in obtaining responses to the surveys.*

Time 1—Time 2 Surveys

To meet our objective of comparing expectations to outcomes, we created two versions of the survey: the first—Time 1 (T1)—to be distributed near the outset of the coaching engagement, and the second—Time 2 (T2)—to be distributed at or soon after the conclusion of the coaching engagement. The T1 and T2 surveys were nearly identical, with most items differing only in verb tense (that is, forward-looking at T1 and primarily backward-looking at T2). Our initial intent was to use the T1 survey to establish a baseline of initial expectations of what would be achieved by the coaching engagement and then to compare those expectations to T2 evaluations after coaching had occurred.

What actually happened was that most of our participant organizations began by administering the T2 survey for coaching engagements that had recently ended (without having administered the T1 survey for those engagements) and then proceeded with both T1 and T2 surveys as new coaching engagements began and ended over time. We therefore collected considerably more T2 data over the life of the study than T1 data. Furthermore, due both to inconsistent response rates from individual stakeholders at both T1 and T2, and to occasional changes in manager/sponsor over the course of an engagement, we ultimately had relatively few responses to both surveys from the same individual manager/sponsor. [¶]*Although we were able to pool a very modest amount of data **across** organizations to link some individual responses from T1 to T2 and begin to explore differences in those responses, organizations were unable to link their own results across the two points in time for reliable insights into such differences.*

However, the T1—T2 design proved quite valuable in other ways. As our participant organizations began to administer the T1 surveys in new coaching engagements, an interesting phenomenon emerged. The surveys, by their very introduction into

the coaching process, began to influence the behavior of those involved. Coaches, after being briefed on the surveys by the coaching program manager, began discussing them with their coachees at the outset of the engagement. The language of the T1 survey, such as its lists of behaviors and outcomes, and the survey items probing organizational impact and value, began to filter into initial coaching discussions themselves (the actual survey items are shown later in this chapter). Coaches and coachees, and even managers, began to link the coaching objectives they were including in their action plans to business results and impact. And they were quantifying them—what will the value be to the organization if we achieve this objective? *ℒ**We discovered that a survey we had introduced to **measure** a dynamic system had **influenced** that system—not in every case, surely, but enough to cause lively discussion of the phenomenon among the coaches and program managers of most of our participant organizations. This result seems to us a highly desirable by-product of a coaching evaluation process. Encouraging the explicit linking of coaching outcomes to business impact and value in the context of a coaching engagement must increase the likelihood that the stakeholders of the coaching engagement will recognize and acknowledge the business value when there is coaching success. For a coaching program manager attempting to build visibility and recognition for the value coaching delivers to the organization, facilitating that recognition is a worthwhile goal.*

*ℒ**Another way in which the T1—T2 design proved valuable was in looking at different group aggregates. For coaching cohort groups (coaching engagements starting at the same time and proceeding together as part of a common initiative), the aggregate data provided (at T1) insight into the group's initial expectations of what coaching would achieve, as well as (at T2) an overall picture of what the program ultimately achieved. At the organizational level, aggregate data revealed trends across the organization's executive population, such as the most common areas of development, as well as both statistics and qualitative anecdotes describing the impact and value that coaching was delivering to the organization (including, as we will discuss, enough information to calculate a type of ROI).*

Survey Construction

Construction of effective yet practical surveys was no small challenge. For the remainder of this segment of the chapter, we provide a brief walk-through of the surveys themselves, section by section, showing the T2 (Follow-Up Survey) version while describing the differences in phrasing of the T1 (Initial Survey). A reproduction of the study's Follow-Up Survey is provided for reference in Figure 14.1, at the end of the chapter.

Section 1: Capabilities/Behaviors

The survey began by focusing on what we called “Capabilities/Behaviors,” which comprised a pick-list of competencies and behaviors that we compiled through an iterative design-and-feedback process involving the study's authors, our initial participant organizations, and a handful of executive coaches. The first item asked respondents to select all Capabilities/Behaviors from the list that applied to this coaching engagement (see Figure 14.1 Section 1¹).

Our objective with this list was to provide the respondents with an opportunity to expand their thinking about what could be (T1), or had been (T2), accomplished through coaching. The list was not intended to be orthogonal—indeed many of the options overlap conceptually—nor did our need for a practical design allow us to define each term in detail. Rather, we wanted to present as complete a list as possible to maximize the likelihood that the accomplishments of most any coaching engagement could be identified. Subsequent analyses would allow us to connect and group related items to identify patterns of coaching focus and achievement. To provide additional flexibility, we included options for “None (no change in any area)” and “Other”—the latter of which included a text box to allow a brief description of the meaning of that response.

Item 1 of the survey included a second component, where we asked respondents to select up to three of the Capabilities/Behaviors they had chosen from the full list and describe them in greater detail by responding to three additional questions for each Capability/Behavior they selected. The rating scale and scale anchors for these survey fields are shown in Table 14.1.

Table 14.1. Rating Scale and Scale Anchors for Drop-Down Response Fields

| Scale | Scale Anchors | | |
|-------|--------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| | Dollar Value | Importance | Confidence |
| 1 | \$0 | Very Little | Very Little |
| 2 | \$1 to \$5,000 | | |
| 3 | \$5,001 to \$10,000 | | |
| 4 | \$10,001 to \$25,000 | | |
| 5 | \$25,001 to \$50,000 | | |
| 6 | \$50,001 to \$100,000 | | |
| 7 | \$100,001 to \$250,000 | | |
| 8 | \$250,001 to \$500,000 | | |
| 9 | \$500,001 to \$1,000,000 | | |
| 10 | over \$1,000,000 | Very Much | Very Much |

Our biggest concern with this item, and the whole survey itself, was whether respondents would ultimately be willing to provide an estimate of the financial value of what was attained in a coaching engagement. We worried that stakeholders would not be able to quantify coaching's impact in any meaningful way, and thus not respond. [Ⓛ]*We ultimately found that this particular design—starting with a broad pick-list of possible behavior changes, then asking respondents to select a few of the most important ones, describe them in their own words, and assess their importance to the organization, before asking for a financial value of that impact—provided a sufficiently robust **chain of logic** for the respondents, and that most did actually think through the process, follow it to its end, and provide a response to the financial value question.* This being the first of several questions asking for financial value ratings, it also brought respondents further down the pathway toward the ultimate goal: an estimated overall financial value rating for the coaching engagement as a whole.

This item (“Capabilities/Behaviors”) ultimately produced some important results for our participant organizations. [Ⓛ]*The item revealed the areas coachees were focusing on for development, which showed their organizations how coaching was being used by executives across the enterprise and revealed trends in the development needs of the organization’s leaders.* Findings such as respondents’ most frequent selections, which have been reported elsewhere (Schlosser, Steinbrenner, Kumata, & Hunt, 2006, 17), helped coaching practice leaders better market their practices to organizational leaders based on the needs they served and highlighted potential development priorities for their executive and high-potential populations as a whole. The item provided quantitative and qualitative documentation of the kinds of behavioral changes being focused on and achieved through coaching as well as the perceived value of those changes to the stakeholder groups surveyed.

Section 2: Outcomes/Metrics

The next section of our survey, numbered as Item 2, exactly mirrored the format of the first section, but focused on the business-related by-products of behavioral change, which we called “Outcomes/Metrics” (see Figure 14.1 Section 2²). Again, we employed the same process as for our list of “Capabilities/Behaviors” to develop a master list for this item. Our rationale for this item was twofold: (1) to build a greater understanding of the concrete ways coaching was being seen as producing real impact and value for organizations, and (2) to lead our respondents *further down the chain of logic* to arrive at an assessment of the financial value of that coaching engagement overall.

This item also produced valuable findings for our participant organizations. Their practice leaders were able to draw from its responses and develop a body of quantitative and qualitative data demonstrating how the organization’s coaching investment was producing outcomes of real business value.

Section 3: Impact Narrative

We followed the first two narrowly defined, largely quantitative survey items with a qualitative item asking respondents for a

description, in their own words, of what the coaching would or did produce (see Figure 14.1 Section 3³). This narrative response item allowed respondents to describe their experiences, observations, and expectations regarding the impact and success of the coaching engagement outside of the structure of a selection box or rating scale. *↳ Narrative responses gave our participant organizations access to a wealth of insights into the experiences of those involved in their coaching engagements and valuable anecdotes they could use in reports and presentations on their coaching programs.*

Section 4: Scale Response Items

The next ten survey items (items numbered 4 to 13; see Figure 14.1 Section 4⁴) were designed for responding using a simple 10-point scale. These items captured a variety of assessments of the value of the coaching, as well as evaluations of several factors that we and our initial participant organizations believed might mediate respondent perceptions of that value. Challenges with this section included keeping items sufficiently brief and uncomplicated.

We deliberately chose to exclude evaluations of coach methods and styles because doing so would have exceeded the practical limits we placed on our survey design. Coaching methodologies and their efficacy were beyond our study's focus and, thankfully, have become the subject of increasing examination (for example, McKenna & Davis, 2009; Stober & Grant, 2006;). For the purposes of our study, it was enough to know that a coaching engagement was roughly defined as a six-to-twelve-month one-to-one development process facilitated by a vetted professional executive coach, and that executive coaching engagements were implemented and managed with some consistency within a given participant organization.

This section provided a wealth of insight into stakeholder perceptions of the value of coaching engagements and their assessments of factors affecting that value. For example, we found that ratings provided by managers/sponsors were significantly lower than those of coachees and coaches, which were similar to each other. These lower ratings from managers/sponsors sparked a fair amount of concerned speculation among the study's research team and our participant organizations and prompted extensive

discussion and some further writing (Steinbrenner, Kumata, & Schlosser, 2007). ¹*The key imperative we took away from this finding was this: get the manager more involved from the outset and throughout the coaching process.* This makes managers more aware of the focus of the coaching engagement and better positioned to observe and appropriately value the changes that occur. We return to this discussion again in the next segment of this chapter.

It is interesting to note that manager/sponsor ratings weren't lower across the board; one item bucked the trend. The item with the highest average rating from managers/sponsors, consistently higher than the ratings it received from the other respondent groups, was Item 6, which assessed their own commitment to the coaching process.

Section 5: Overall Impact Assessments

Items 14 and 15 of the Follow-Up Survey (see Figure 14.1 Section 5⁵—the Initial Survey did not include an item corresponding to 15) were designed to gather summative assessments of the overall impact and value of the coaching engagement.

A Surprising Finding

The result that most captured our—and our participant organizations'—attention were data plots, by respondent group, of the financial values estimated for the coachee's change in overall effectiveness. Data from the Initial Survey showed strong agreement across rater groups, with most ratings of expected financial value from coaching on the high end of the scale (over 90 percent of respondents in each group expecting the value to be above \$50,000, and 39 to 49 percent expecting the value to be above \$1,000,000). Data from the Follow-Up Survey revealed a striking difference: whereas the coach and coachee data followed a similar pattern (albeit a bit more spread out), the manager/sponsor group was dramatically split. Although most managers/sponsors continued to perceive significant value from the coaching, over 15 percent of them estimated the financial value of the impact of the coaching engagement at \$0!

This result generated numerous questions among the study's authors and our participant organizations. What were these managers thinking about the coaching investment that they and

their company were making in their direct report? Were they not noticing any behavior change and, if not, was there really no impact, or were they just not connected enough to the coachee or his or her development to fully recognize and appreciate change? Or were they actually noticing change, but not seeing it as valuable to the organization? We were not able to go back to individual respondents to probe further into these responses, but we did arrive at two important conclusions and related suggestions from this finding—both rather intuitive, yet subtle:

- *Get the manager more involved.* Involve the coachee's manager early in the coaching engagement to foster insight into the coachee's development priorities and buy-in on the coaching action plan. Then, continue to keep the manager in the loop as the coaching engagement unfolds. Check in with the manager at milestone points during the engagement to gather feedback on the coachee's progress (and facilitate recognition of that progress). The less input managers have into the coaching plan, and the less they are primed and encouraged to observe change and development, the less likely they are ultimately to recognize achievements made through coaching.
- *Link coaching and development plans to business outcomes and anticipated organizational value.* Creating an action-oriented coaching plan with specific, clear objectives for the coaching engagement, usually with documented success metrics, has been a long-standing hallmark of good coaching practice. But the results articulated for such well-conceived goals are often limited to descriptions of the behavior change being targeted. Rarely do they include successful business outcomes resulting from that change. Even more rarely do they put an estimated financial value on successful achievement of the goal—it's hard to do. Yet, for the coach, coachee, and manager to agree at the end of the coaching engagement that the investment of time and money in coaching was worthwhile, it seems to us that those bridges must somehow be crossed. Encourage that discussion by incorporating it into formal coaching processes, development plan templates, and other elements of the coaching program's architecture.

In the next segment of this chapter we will come back to some of these findings and conclusions and discuss how they influenced, and were influenced by, the implementation of the Coaching Impact Study within our participant organizations.

A Note to Empirical Survey Designers

We realize our surveys were not without flaw. We relied on single items to measure some phenomena, used a variety of response scales, and included no reverse-scored items. Our lists of behaviors and outcomes were derived from a committee process and are not orthogonal (that is, they are not all independent of one another). And while we led respondents through a conceptual chain of logic, encouraging them to work from high-level concepts down to concrete metrics, we left it to them to take some logical leaps, such as asking them to derive financial value figures from descriptions of their coaching progress.

Implementation

Once our study methodology and surveys were in place, the next steps were to implement them within the established, active coaching practices of participant organizations, accumulate survey responses, and analyze and report on the results.

Start-Up

Although the formal design of the study included both the Initial and Follow-Up Surveys for each coaching engagement, our implementation was flexible enough to allow individual respondents and participant organizations to participate in either or both surveys independently. The data for each survey could easily stand alone, and in fact most of our survey reporting and analyses examined the T1 and T2 surveys separately. We incorporated that flexibility by choice. We realized early on that we could not expect high survey completion rates within any stakeholder group at both points in time, from frequently over-surveyed individuals, given the separation of many months from T1 to T2 and under circumstances where job roles may shift during the process.

Ⓙ *A major benefit of this flexible approach was that it allowed an organization to launch the study in one major introduction.* In addition to “rolling into” the study by administering the Initial Survey as new coaching engagements began, organizations were also able to send the Follow-Up Survey to large batches of coaching engagements that had recently completed. These engagements may have closed anytime in the prior few months and would not have previously received the Initial Survey. By starting participation in this way, organizations were quickly able to obtain meaningful results from a large number of coaching engagements.

Change Management

Our participant organizations all realized that embarking on the study was an exercise in change management within their coaching programs. This change management effort required planning ways to communicate about the study and its relevance to coaching stakeholders and to encourage responses to the surveys.

The communication effort was twofold: first, organizations had to embed the study into their formal coaching programs, introducing it to the coaching triad (as stakeholders) from the beginning of new coaching engagements, explaining the rationale for it and its importance, and informing stakeholders that they would receive the study’s two surveys over the course of the coaching program. Second, they had to present the study to the stakeholders of coaching engagements that were already in progress, or that had recently ended, where the surveys would not have been initially expected by the stakeholders.

For most organizations, this communication process began with their communities of coaches. These were primarily professional executive coaches hired by the organization to provide coaching services to executives. Among each organization’s first objectives were educating its coach community about the study, ensuring that all coaches understood the process and highlighting the importance to the organization of their participation. Coaches were then encouraged to reinforce that message with coachees and their coachees’ managers/sponsors.

Most, but not all, coaches reacted positively to this message.

Ⓙ *Coaches who reacted with initial opposition to the study fell into two*

categories: those who believed the surveys to be an intrusion into the confidentiality of their coaching relationship, and those who believed that the business-related impact of coaching, and the financial value of that impact, was either inappropriate or impossible to measure in this way.

Most of the resistant coaches perceived the surveys to be an intrusion into the sanctity of their confidential relationship with their coachee. In their opinion, any request for information of the kind in our study, such as the behavioral changes and business outcomes pursued through coaching, compromised that confidentiality. These objections primarily surfaced among coaches in organizations whose coaching programs were less structured and were managed with a lighter touch. Coaches in such programs tended to have a higher degree of latitude in how they delivered coaching and relatively little accountability to the program manager for following a defined coaching process. They had not been asked by their program managers to report much, if anything, about what they were doing in their coaching engagements, and in that context the surveys were a startling change in procedure. Organizations whose programs were more structured and included other process and reporting expectations, such as shared action plans and progress reports, did not encounter much of this kind of resistance.

Program managers who did encounter this resistance successfully dealt with it through open dialogue, both one-on-one with resistant coaches and in group settings with their coach community. These program managers explained to their coaches that the information provided by the surveys was highly important to the coaching practice and to the organization, that no confidential details from coaching sessions would be collected, and that survey data would only be reported in aggregate.

The second reason for resistance among coaches was a refutation of the notion that the outcomes of coaching could be measured or quantified in any meaningful way through the use of a survey. In their view, the only valid approach to understanding the value of coaching was through the same anecdotal evidence that represented the bulk of research into coaching efficacy at the time we designed our study. Coaches in this group believed that although the individual coachee gains

personal value from an executive coaching engagement, the organization does not, or more accurately should not, expect to realize any meaningful, quantifiable value from it. In their minds, it was not appropriate for the organization to measure the business impact of coaching.

This view is, of course, antithetical to ours and to that of our participant organizations. Companies that pay for executive coaching do so not out of pure altruism, or simply as an element of an executive's compensation package. They do so largely because they believe it will provide enough value to the organization to justify its expense; in other words, they expect some form of ROI. They may not expect to be able to attribute a direct financial return on a coaching investment, but their decision to pay for coaches is certainly based on a business case for coaching that includes not just individual benefit but positive organizational outcomes as well.

We were surprised at first that our study met this kind of resistance and skepticism from some professional executive coaches. Perhaps, when we launched the study in 2004, the field was still young enough, in some corners of the practitioner population, to react defensively against inquiry into its inner workings, to fear exposure of its (or a given coach's) processes to scientific scrutiny. It could be that these coaches simply disagreed with the specific design of our study, but our interactions with these coaches led us to believe that most or all of them would have objected to any study having the general intent of our own. Happily, this kind of resistance among the coach community appears to be on the decline. Increasingly, coaches realize that their work does, and should, produce discernible value for organizations. Perhaps the coaching community is also becoming more confident in the soundness of its processes and approaches. Certainly evidence is mounting to support that confidence.

Organizational Reports

In return for their participation in our study, organizations received comprehensive aggregate reports of the data collected from each survey. For many of the survey items (the quantitative items in

particular), these reports showed the organization's results alongside the aggregated results of the other participant organizations (rolled into one). *⌞This benchmarking capability was a key benefit of a standardized survey design implemented across multiple organizations.*

⌞Most organizations chose to publicize some of the findings from their surveys to their coaching communities in some way, revealing highlights and surprising findings to their coaches as a way of demonstrating the value of the survey effort, and also to spawn discussion and reflection on the meaning of certain results. In a few cases, the organization invited us to present the findings from the organization's surveys to scheduled gatherings of their coaches. These interactive presentations and ensuing discussions were well received by the coaches who attended. Many of these coaches developed a better appreciation for the purpose and value of the measurement effort, and discussions among coaches and program managers often produced insights about how to increase response rates and improve perceptions of the value of coaching.

In fact, it was from one of these participant-sponsored coach meetings where a discussion first surfaced about the effect the survey process was having on the coaching process itself. A coach attending the meeting mentioned that, anticipating the Initial Survey shortly after the start of a coaching engagement, he had begun to incorporate into initial conversations with his coachees some discussions of the business outcomes that they might expect from coaching success, and even the value of those outcomes to the organization. One of this chapter's authors (Schlosser) had already observed a similar change in his own coaching process.

Further, the common finding that the manager/sponsor group had both the lowest response rate and the greatest proportion of respondents attributing little impact and value to coaching prompted extensive dialogue among the coaching communities of several participant organizations. In response, coaches and program managers began to discuss ways to better engage managers in the coaching process, to make them more aware of the focus and goals of the coaching, and to get their buy-in into its efficacy. Again, a number of coaches described making changes to their own coaching processes that they found increased involvement and responses from the managers/sponsors of their coachees.

⌞ *Clearly, the act of measurement was, itself, having an effect on the phenomenon being measured.*

Publication

Although providing timely and valuable reporting on survey results to our participant organizations was critical to guaranteeing and growing our participant base, another important objective was to communicate our study design, experience, and findings to the broader coaching community through presentation and publication opportunities. Throughout the years of our study, this included presentations to multiple industry and academic audiences (for example, Kumata, Schlosser, Hunt, Gentry, & Steinbrenner, 2005; Steinbrenner, Schlosser, & Snyder, 2008; Steinbrenner & Schlosser, 2008; Steinbrenner & Schlosser, 2009)—some that included representatives of our participant organizations—and articles in a few industry and research publications (for example, Kumata, 2007; Schlosser, Steinbrenner, Kumata, & Hunt, 2006; Steinbrenner, Kumata, & Schlosser, 2007). For each, we examined and reported on different aspects of our study's data and, since data collection was a continuous process that occurred over several years, we updated findings with new data at later dates. And as our dataset grew, we were able to expand our analyses into new areas and identify new findings.

Moving Forward

The Lifespan of the Study

Work on the Coaching Impact Study began in mid-2004, and in the intervening years we worked with six formal participant organizations—Wachovia, Deloitte, Credit Suisse, Booz Allen Hamilton, Citi, and Assurant—gathering and feeding back data on over three hundred coaching engagements. By mid-2009, after five years in total, we announced the study's retirement and began to wind down data collection with remaining participant organizations. We closed the study feeling that we had accomplished our primary mission of examining some of the workings of the coaching process from start to finish and making a useful

contribution to the field of coaching and the growing foundation of research underlying it.

⌚ *One key learning was just how challenging it is to run a complex longitudinal study staffed by volunteers who were not full-time researchers (for whom such an effort is a familiar drill).* Perhaps our biggest unanticipated challenge was the sheer number of hours the project would consume to bring it to life and sustain it—seeking participants, developing and delivering reports for participant organizations, running analyses of the data collected, organizing our findings, and publishing and presenting our work to various audiences. We often relied on the generosity and kindness of colleagues who helped with such tasks as survey and report programming, graphic design, statistical analysis, and general editorial support. Participant organizations contributed modest funding to help defray expenses, which was of great help in offsetting some of the programming and travel costs. The majority of funding, however, came from the principle investigators ourselves.

All told, the study was worth the effort. We are grateful to have found the enthusiasm and commitment of several world-class coaching practices to help launch the study and it was gratifying to see the data begin to accumulate in sufficient quantities to permit meaningful analyses. And, ultimately, it was rewarding to find such receptive, encouraging audiences for our findings.

It is conceivable that we could launch a “Round 2” of the study. Should the Coaching Impact Study continue in a future iteration, we envision engagement-level reports that would be used by the coaching triad to see, for instance, how aligned the parties are at the beginning and conclusion of coaching. Such a report from the Initial Survey, for example, might prompt conversations among the coaching triad regarding focus and priorities that could help to put the coaching engagement on a more refined path to success from all perspectives.

Adaptations of the Study

Many organizations do not wish to, or may not be able to, gear up for a full-scale assessment of their coaching initiatives. Common reasons include not having a dedicated coaching staff or strategically oriented coaching program, lack of time, insufficient

funding, or having an approach to coaching based mostly on responding to the occasional “one-off” coaching need. Even though our study was engineered to be readily adopted, it did require a certain scale and scope of coaching program. It was also standardized, and not equipped to include items customized to evaluate specific aspects of a particular coaching initiative. For smaller programs and those with unique evaluation needs, we have also explored with success a modified impact study approach using short forms or portions of the surveys supplemented by custom items. This is another avenue by which we hope the Coaching Impact Study might live on in some form, contributing to future coaching evaluation and research efforts.

ⒿA key takeaway from our experience is that “simpler is better” and, even then, it is likely to be mainly the coach and coachee who will be the most willing survey respondents.

Recommendations for Coaching Practice Leaders

Whether you are responsible for a handful of coaching engagements or a substantial practice, it is valuable to have a window into understanding what is specifically being addressed in your organization’s coaching engagements in order to build strategic alignment between business needs and individuals’ behavior changes. As a practice leader, part of your responsibility is to help ensure that the organization meets its aims by providing employee development resources, such as executive coaching, so that leaders, managers, and teams can function at their best. Your understanding of the metrics of impact helps you align your efforts and optimally invest your limited resources, and having a way to assess the value of this impact to the organization provides you with a tool to differentiate among such investments and a unique window into the perceptions of key stakeholders of your practice.

Other recommendations for coaching practice leaders, based on our experiences throughout the study, include:

1. Using data as a foundation, convey the success stories of your coaching engagements to others in your organization to help

build up your coaching culture. Encourage leaders to share their own coaching success stories. This will increase the overall credibility of the coaching initiatives.

2. Share what you learn about patterns of impact and value, in the aggregate, with your coaches. Include the main themes about what is being worked on, what the business and other desirable outcomes are, and how these are valued. If you find that coaching efforts are directed toward pursuits that are off-course from the organization's strategic priorities, use what outcome and valuation data you may have as a resource for redirection.
3. Consider banding together with other like-minded organizations and coaches to form a coalition in which you can disseminate best practices about coaching evaluation approaches. Survey items used in common with other organizations can also provide useful benchmarks for comparison.
4. Once enough data are available to begin reporting in the aggregate, do so. Build interest among key organizational communities in the accomplishments and trends of coaching in your organization.

Recommendations for Coaching Researchers and Evaluation Consultants

With hindsight from our experience with the study, we also offer a few suggestions to fellow researchers and consultants embarking on the evaluation of coaching initiatives:

1. Keep the survey material brief and digestible.
2. Ensure that the language used in the surveys is not laden with professional coaching or research jargon, but instead is couched in language meaningful to business executives.
3. If possible, use a pre-post design and link expectations to outcomes.
4. Include the "coaching triad" (that is, coachee, coach, and manager/sponsor). The views of each stakeholder group are different, and each is valuable. Develop a practical strategy to maximize participation of managers/sponsors. Institutionalize

- clear accountability from the outset and encourage personal follow-up from program managers, coaches, and coachees.
5. Don't reinvent the wheel unless your road has very unique requirements. Leverage existing survey items, such as those from our study, and compare your results from them to other findings where available.
 6. Plan periodic data-sharing events with your participant organizations and interested stakeholder groups, such as coach communities.

Challenge to Coaches

Coaching professionals know that an interview-based 360 process can serve not only to gather critical contextual information for a coaching engagement, but also as a communications medium to the coachee's broader workplace social environment. Broadcasting in this medium sends a message that the coachee is pursuing desirable change toward one or more end states. Likewise, a formal assessment of impact and value among the coaching triad before and after coaching provides a similar benefit.

Our challenge for coaches is to *energetically* communicate to their coaching engagement stakeholders important aspects of what will be addressed in coaching at the front end of each engagement, and what was specifically accomplished, and its value, at the conclusion. This can be done through persistent and collaborative follow-up with those in key relationships with the coachee, and it can be sought by both the coach and coachee (and, for that matter, anyone else positioned to broadcast the message of success). A conceptual framework for describing what will be and has been addressed through coaching and its impact on the organization, such as that provided by our study, can help meet this challenge.

Figure 14.1. Coaching Impact Follow-Up Survey

Survey Sections

CAMBRIA
CONSULTING

Coaching Impact: Follow-up Survey

Thank you for providing feedback regarding the ABC Corporation coaching engagement identified below. Your feedback is being sought in an ongoing effort to measure the effectiveness and value of this organization's coaching initiative, and to identify opportunities for improvement. This survey will take approximately 30 minutes of your time.

If you have any questions, please contact: Donna Star (dstar@abc.com) or Betty Henderson (bhenderson@abc.com).

ⓘ Please respond to this survey in reference to the following coaching engagement:

Person Being Coached: Jack Connolly, ABC Corporation
 Your relationship to him/her: Executive Sponsor

Is the above information correct? Yes No
 If not, please explain:

1. From the list below, select the **capabilities/behaviors** that you think Jack Connolly has improved as a result of this coaching engagement:

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Big-picture/Detail Balance | <input type="checkbox"/> Diversity Considerations/Sensitivity | <input type="checkbox"/> Meeting Facilitation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Building Enthusiasm | <input type="checkbox"/> Executive Presence | <input type="checkbox"/> Negotiation Skills |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Building Relationships | <input type="checkbox"/> External Visibility/Image | <input type="checkbox"/> Partnering across Boundaries/Silos |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Building Team Morale | <input type="checkbox"/> Field Presence/Field Experience | <input type="checkbox"/> Personal Energy/Optimism |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Business Acumen/Knowledge | <input type="checkbox"/> Following Others | <input type="checkbox"/> Productivity/Time Management |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Business Results/Execution | <input type="checkbox"/> Fostering Innovation | <input type="checkbox"/> Project Management |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Career Advancement | <input type="checkbox"/> Global/International Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Quality of Work Product |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Communication Skills | <input type="checkbox"/> Goal Setting | <input type="checkbox"/> Self-Awareness/Self-Reflection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Collaboration/Teamwork | <input type="checkbox"/> Influence | <input type="checkbox"/> Self-Confidence |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Conflict Management/Resolution | <input type="checkbox"/> Internal Visibility/Image | <input type="checkbox"/> Sense of Urgency/Responsiveness |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Client Focus/Service | <input type="checkbox"/> Interpersonal Skills | <input type="checkbox"/> Setting Direction and Vision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Decision Making and Judgment | <input type="checkbox"/> Job Satisfaction and Enjoyment | <input type="checkbox"/> Strategic Thinking |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Delegation/Empowering Others | <input type="checkbox"/> Leading/Driving Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Stress Management |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Developing/Coaching Employees | <input type="checkbox"/> Listening Skills | <input type="checkbox"/> Technical Skills Mastery |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Developing Self | <input type="checkbox"/> Managing Performance Issues | <input type="checkbox"/> Work/Life Balance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> None (no change in any area) | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (If other, enter here.) <input style="width: 100%;" type="text"/> | | |

Based on your selection(s) above, select and describe up to 3 of the most important **capabilities/behaviors** that you think Jack Connolly has improved as a result of this coaching engagement:

| Capabilities/Behaviors | Describe what progress in this area has looked like | Importance to the results of the business | Estimated dollar value* of coaching success in this area |
|--|---|---|--|
| <input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/> | <input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/> | <input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/> | <input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/> |
| <input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/> | <input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/> | <input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/> | <input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/> |
| <input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/> | <input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/> | <input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/> | <input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/> |

Please give your best guess - we're just looking for your general perceptions.*

(continued on p.398)

Figure 14.1. (Continued)

2. From the list below, select the **outcomes/metrics** that you think Jack Connolly has improved as a result of this coaching engagement:

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Alignment with Business Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Employee/Team Retention | <input type="checkbox"/> Product/Service Launch |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Avoidance of Termination/Separation | <input type="checkbox"/> External Client Sat./Relationships | <input type="checkbox"/> Productivity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Base of Committed Followers | <input type="checkbox"/> Increased Sales/Revenue | <input type="checkbox"/> Profitability |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Client Retention/Growth | <input type="checkbox"/> Internal Client Sat./Relationships | <input type="checkbox"/> Promotability/Career Progression |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Efficiency/Cost Reduction | <input type="checkbox"/> Intention to Remain with Organization | <input type="checkbox"/> Quality Management |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Employee Alignment | <input type="checkbox"/> Merger Integration | <input type="checkbox"/> Reduce Loss/Business Decline |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Employee Engagement | <input type="checkbox"/> Process Improvement | <input type="checkbox"/> Risk/Liability Reduction |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Employee Satisfaction | <input type="checkbox"/> Product/Service Development | <input type="checkbox"/> Turnaround/Business Recovery |
| <input type="checkbox"/> None (no change in any area) | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (If other, enter here.) <input type="text"/> | | |

Based on your selection(s) above, select and describe up to 3 of the most important **outcomes/metrics** that indicate the success level of this coaching engagement:

| Outcomes/Metrics | Describe what progress in this area has looked like | Importance to the results of the business | Estimated dollar value* of coaching success in this area |
|-------------------|---|---|--|
| Please select - > | <input type="text"/> | Please select - > | Please select - > |
| Please select - > | <input type="text"/> | Please select - > | Please select - > |
| Please select - > | <input type="text"/> | Please select - > | Please select - > |

Please give your best guess - we're just looking for your general perceptions.*

3. In concrete terms, what has the coaching experience produced for Jack Connolly and ABC Corporation in the last six (6) months?

For questions 4-13 please select "?" if you have no basis for making an assessment.

Please select a response to each question.

| | | Very Little | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | Very Much | 10 | ? |
|-----|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 4. | To what extent has coaching positively impacted Jack Connolly's overall effectiveness in his/her role? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 5. | To what extent was the coaching worth Jack Connolly's investment of time? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 6. | To what extent was the coaching worth ABC Corporation's dollar investment? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 7. | How important was coaching success, in this instance, to the part(s) of ABC Corporation for which Jack Connolly works? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 8. | To what extent was Jack Connolly personally committed to the coaching process? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 9. | To what extent was Jack Connolly's manager(s) personally committed to the coaching process? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 10. | To what extent did ABC Corporation set clear expectations about coaching deliverables? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 11. | To what degree was coaching useful in facilitating understanding of ABC Corporation strategic goals? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 12. | At present, how satisfied are you with the value of coaching for Jack Connolly? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 13. | At present, how satisfied are you with the value of coaching initiatives across ABC Corporation? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

14. Recognizing that there are numerous factors involved, please estimate the dollar value to ABC Corporation of Jack Connolly's change in overall effectiveness **over the next 18 months** as a direct result of coaching:

- How much confidence do you have in your dollar value estimate above?

15. How much has Jack Connolly's performance improved since starting his/her coaching engagement?

- What percentage of this improvement do you attribute directly to coaching? %

Footnotes

1. The corresponding item in the Initial Survey varied as follows (varying text underlined): “From the list below, select the **capabilities/behaviors** that you think Jack Connolly must improve in order for the coaching engagement to be a success”; “Based on your selection(s) above, select and describe up to 3 of the most important **capabilities/behaviors** to focus on in this coaching engagement.”; and “Describe what progress in this area would look like”
2. The corresponding item in the Initial Survey varied as follows (varying text underlined): “From the list below, select the **outcomes/metrics** that you think Jack Connolly must improve in order for the coaching engagement to be a success”; “Based on your selection(s) above, select and describe up to 3 of the most important **outcomes/metrics** that would indicate the success level of this coaching engagement.” and “Describe what progress in this area would look like”
3. The corresponding item in the Initial Survey varied as follows (varying text underlined): “In concrete terms, what **outcomes** would a successful coaching experience produce for Jack Connolly and ABC Corporation in six (6) months?”
4. The corresponding items in the Initial Survey varied as follows (varying text underlined): “To what extent will coaching positively impact Jack Connolly’s overall effectiveness in his/her role?”; “To what extent will the outcomes of coaching be worth Jack Connolly’s investment of time?”; “To what extent will the outcomes of coaching be worth ABC Corporation’s dollar investment?”; “How important is coaching success, in this instance, to the part(s) of ABC Corporation for which Jack Connolly works?”; “To what extent is Jack Connolly personally committed to the coaching process?”; “To what extent is Jack Connolly’s manager personally committed to the coaching process?”; “To what extent has ABC Corporation set clear expectations about coaching deliverables?”; and “To what degree will coaching be useful in facilitating understanding of ABC Corporation strategic goals?”
5. The corresponding item in the Initial Survey varied as follows (varying text underlined): “Recognizing that there are numerous factors involved, please estimate the dollar value to ABC Corporation of Jack Connolly’s change in overall effectiveness over the next 24 months as a direct result of coaching.”

References

- Anderson, M. (2003). *Bottom-line organizational development: Implementing and evaluating strategic change for lasting value*. Burlington, MA: Elsevier.

- Frank Bresser Consulting. (2009). *The state of coaching across the globe: The results of the Global Coaching Survey 2008/2009*. www.frank-bresser-consulting.com/globalconsultingsurvey.html.
- Hunt, J., & Weintraub, J. (2002). *The coaching manager: Developing top talent in business*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- International Coach Federation. (2010). *Background information & membership facts—February 2010*. <http://coachfederation.org>.
- Kumata, E. (2002). Aligning executive coaching with strategic business goals. *Performance Improvement*, 41(9), 16–19.
- Kumata, E. (2007). Establishing the value of executive coaching: ROI insights for coaches and their stakeholders. *CoachLeader Update*, 1(3), 2–4.
- Kumata, E., Schlosser, B., Hunt, J., Gentry, C., & Steinbrenner, D. (2005). Coaching impact: Identifying individual and organizational outcomes of coaching. Presented to the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology's 20th Annual Conference, Los Angeles.
- McKenna, D., & Davis, S. (2009). Hidden in plain sight: The active ingredients of executive coaching. *Industrial & Organizational Psychology*, 2(3), 244–260.
- Schlosser, B., Steinbrenner, D., Kumata, E., & Hunt, J. (2006). The Coaching impact study: Measuring the value of executive coaching. *The International Journal of Coaching in Organizations*, 4(3), 8–26.
- Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. (2008). *Executive coaching for effective performance: Leading edge practice and research*. 4th Annual SIOP Fall Consortium 2008, October 17–18, Cincinnati, OH.
- Steinbrenner, D., Kumata, E., & Schlosser, B. (2007). Commentary on the coaching impact study: Measuring the value of executive coaching. *The International Journal of Coaching in Organizations*, 5(1), 158–161.
- Steinbrenner, D., & Schlosser, B. (2008). *The coaching impact study: Understanding the value of executive coaching*. 4th Annual SIOP Fall Consortium 2008: Executive Coaching for Effective Performance: Leading Edge Practice and Research, October 17–18, Cincinnati, OH.
- Steinbrenner, D., Schlosser, B., & Snyder, S. (2008). *Measuring the impact and value of executive coaching*. 23rd Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial & Organizational Psychology, April 9, San Francisco, CA.
- Steinbrenner, D., & Schlosser, B. (2009). The coaching relationship: How clients view coaches and their impact. In L. Boyce, & G. Hernez-Broome (Eds.), *The client-coach relationship: Examining a critical component of successful coaching*. 24th Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial & Organizational Psychology, April 2, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Stober, D., & Grant, A. (2006). *Evidence-based coaching handbook*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.