

CONFIDENTIAL

Department of Family and Community Services
Coach Development Program
Evaluation Report

Duncan Sutherland

January 2014

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Executive Summary | 3 |
| Recommendations | 3 |
| Project Scope and Background | 3 |
| Evaluation Methodology | 4 |
| Response Rate | 4 |
| Analysis of the Data | 4 |
| What coaching was done? | 4 |
| Issues addressed | 4 |
| What Worked Well | 4 |
| Difficulties Identified | 5 |
| Applications of Coaching in the Workplace | 5 |
| Analysis of Further Training Options | 6 |
| Suitability for further training | 7 |
| Survey Response Summary | 8 |
| Interview Responses | 14 |
| Quotes for Further Coach Training | 18 |

Executive Summary

Most participants found the Institute of Executive Coaching and Leadership Level 1 (IECL1) training extremely beneficial in relating to staff and supporting changes in their behaviour and performance.

All coaches indicated that coaching had benefited their coachee's workplace performance across a broad range of outcomes. They also responded that coach training and practice has improved their own performance, especially in regard to changing their professional interactions with direct reports from telling to asking, with the expectation that staff should be supported to find their own answers rather than being told what to do by their supervisor.

Those who were interviewed indicated that the GROW coaching model was easy to use and gave a clear framework for coaching interactions. Commonly, respondents said that they were very interested in further training in coaching methodology. Their confidence in taking on more coachees including peers and more senior staff was linked to their perceived level of readiness and performance, with most indicating that they would benefit from further training and support. This would include formal training programs as well as having access to supervision and guidance by a master coach.

Most of the coaches indicated a strong interest in new models and approaches to broaden their capabilities as executive coaches. For this reason the Institute of Coaching and Consulting Psychology Certificate program is recommended, despite being 4% more expensive than the Institute of Executive Coaching and Leadership Level 2 program.

Some coachees were uncertain about why they were nominated, perhaps believing that it was because of underperformance. It is necessary to give clearer information about coaching, and how it works, so that coachees understand what it means to be nominated for coaching. Some coaches and supervisors were uncertain about how coaching relates to the coachee's existing relationship with their supervisor.

Recommendations

It is recommended that:

1. FACS L&D continue with the program of training in-house coaches through the Institute of Executive Coaching and Leadership Level 1 program;
2. Selected members of the current cohort of coaches be offered further coach training with the Institute of Coaching and Consulting Psychology;
3. Trainee coaches be given access to an experienced executive coach for mentoring and guidance; and
4. Clear policy and procedures be developed for selecting and matching coaches and coachees to ensure that the coaches, coachees and supervisors understand the scope, purpose and limitations of a coaching engagement.

Project Scope and Background

In 2012, FACS L&D trained 30 managers and directors in the Institute of Executive Coaching and Leadership Level 1 (IECL1) program. Subsequently, each trainee coach was matched with one or two coachees with instructions to complete a coaching engagement of about 6 sessions over the course of 6 to 8 months. Most of the coachees were newly appointed Managers, Case Work (MCW). Some were in the same location as their coach, while several were in other centres. No coach was asked to take on a direct report as a coachee, although some did so of their own volition.

In December 2013, FACS L&D commissioned an evaluation of the progress that the 30 coaches had made, and an investigation of possible further support that could be provided to them to grow their competence as coaches. The study also produced data and information

that could be used to prioritise those participants who were most suitable for further training and development as coaches.

Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation was undertaken in 4 stages:

Stage 1: Invite all 30 coaches to participate in an on-line survey, identifying themselves if they were interested in further development opportunities;

Stage 2: Phone interviews of those who self-identified in Stage 1;

Stage 3: Invite the two leading training providers to submit quotes for further executive coach training; and

Stage 4: Analyse and report of the data and information provided in stages 1-3.

Response Rate

Of the 30 coaches in the database, 29 were available for inclusion in the evaluation. A total of 25 participants (86%) responded to the on-line survey, although only 14 identified themselves by name in their responses. Email contact was used identify those who had responded to the survey without leaving their names. It was possible by this means to identify 23 of the 25 who completed the survey. A total of 21 participants (72%) were eventually interviewed by phone.

Quotes for coach training were obtained from both the Institute of Executive Coaching and Leadership (IECL) and the Institute of Coaching and Consulting Psychology (ICCP). The specification for executive coach training was for a minimum of 15 participants.

Analysis of the Data

What coaching was done?

A total of 42 FACS staff received coaching from the 25 coaches who provided data. All but three of the coaches stated that they had completed at least 4 coaching sessions in the year (52% had completed more than 5 sessions). Several coaches stated that they were unable to complete their coaching engagements because the coachee went on leave.

Issues addressed

The most common issues addressed in the coaching sessions were:

1. managing poor staff performance;
2. having difficult conversations;
3. supervision skills (listening, questioning, feedback)
4. team development;
5. influencing skills;
6. business performance;
7. motivation;
8. work-life balance;
9. career path planning;
10. moving into a new role manager's role;
11. debriefing critical incidents; and
12. leadership and the strategic agenda.

What Worked Well

Coaches noted a wide range of successes as follows:

1. Several respondents stated that the coach training was the most beneficial training that they had ever experienced. Invited to amplify, they stated that it was extremely professionally presented, made them feel very privileged to have been selected, was immediately applicable, and worked well in the field;
2. The GROW model and SMART goal setting are well understood and easy to use;
3. Most coachees very much appreciated receiving coaching interventions;

4. Most coaches stated that they were now using coaching skills with the staff that they supervise. Their relationships with these other staff have improved as a result of the use of coaching skills, especially because they are now asking instead of telling, listening instead of speaking, holding the silence, and reflecting on a situation;
5. The coaches learned new things about themselves by coaching (for example, that assisting staff members to find their own answers creates a more professional and supportive relationship than telling them what to do all the time);
6. Coaching skills have applications in many other contexts, including with peers and family members;
7. Coaches felt more satisfied and confident in their roles as a result of using coaching skills; and
8. Coaching provided a means for coaches to “give back” to the organisation.

Difficulties Identified

Coaches stated that they experienced the following difficulties:

1. Resisting the temptation to give the coachee the answer;
2. Avoiding taking over the coachee’s agenda and substituting their own;
3. Finding enough time to provide the coaching, or giving coaching a high enough priority in their work;
4. Distance and the difficulty getting to see a coachee located in a regional area;
5. The GROW model was too inflexible and regimented. A wider range of frameworks and models is needed;
6. Several coachees did not understand what coaching was about, or why they had been nominated, so they came with a confused or negative mindset. Some thought that it must be a confidential disciplinary procedure involving visitations from more senior head office staff, or that it was a replacement for existing supervision;
7. Some coaches were unsure about how coaching and supervision by the line manager should be aligned, especially when the quality of that supervision was the subject of the coaching session;
8. Several coaches stated that they would need more training and experience before they felt confident to take on coaching of peers or more senior staff; and
9. Several coaches stated that they struggled because of the lack of an instructor or more experienced coach to give them guidance when they got into difficulties.

Applications of Coaching in the Workplace

Coaches nominated a wide range of contexts in which coaching would be suitable, although there was not a consensus about suitability. Contexts in which coaching skills were seen to be applicable included:

1. supervision of staff;
2. managing poor performance;
3. disciplinary matters;
4. relationship building and networking;
5. influencing skills;
6. business performance;
7. motivation;
8. work-life balance;
9. career path planning;
10. moving into a new role;
11. debriefing critical incidents; and
12. leadership and the strategic agenda.

Coaches were also invited to nominate situations in which coaching may not be suitable. The most commonly nominated situation was the formal management of poor performance. Some also said that coaching is unsuitable for staff who are not open to change, or who have a mental illness.

There was general support for coaching being provided to all newly appointed managers, especially those in their first management role.

In the opinion of most respondents, the Department should only train those directors and managers who have the requisite attitude, willingness and availability to provide coaching services to other staff. By contrast, a minority of respondents stated that coaching should be provided to all senior staff because of its capacity to enable them to move from a directing style of leadership to a more supportive style.

Analysis of Further Training Options

More than half the respondents to the survey had undertaken other types of coach training besides the IECL1 program. A total of 21 (84%) stated that they were very interested in further formal coach training.

The IECL level 2 training was the most popular option selected through the survey. When pressed in the interview to explain what further training they wanted next, most described the contents best provided by the Institute of Coaching and Consulting Psychology (ICCP).

Theoretically-grounded, but highly practical evidenced-based models and approaches based on the principles of solution-focused behavioural change, and the supervised application of these principles in systematic coaching practice.

By contrast, the Institute of Executive Coaching and Leadership Level 2 program provides a more introspective program that some interviewees thought was less valuable.

The importance of the “state” of the coach and the coach’s ability to develop the coaching relationship.

It was also noted by two participants that they felt that the IECL1 training program presenter, Dr Armstrong, made them feel uncomfortable because of her sometimes intimidating style.

The ICCP program has higher on-costs, as the participants will be required to attend 2 sessions, each of two days at an interval of a fortnight. In addition, the ICCP quote is based on FACS L&D providing the venue as well as morning tea, lunch and afternoon tea.

Additional on-costs for the ICCP training must therefore be estimated so that the two quotes can be compared. These additional on-costs are estimated as \$7,000 based on the following assumptions:

1. There are 8 region-based participants recommended. Assume that 7 are available to attend. Each requires one additional return journey to Sydney and one additional day of subsistence allowance. These are estimated at \$5,500 (based on travel costs of \$500 pp and subsistence of \$296 pp/day); and
2. FACS L&D will be required to cater for 15 x 4 refreshments (morning tea, lunch and afternoon tea) as well as any site costs. These are estimated at a total of \$1,500.

The IECL2 quote is for \$43,500 + GST. The ICCP quote is \$38,500 + GST. Taking into account the estimated additional on-costs, the ICCP program will actually cost \$45,500 + GST, or \$2,000 (4%) more than the IECL2 quote.

The interviews revealed that the participants have come to coaching practice with a deal of confidence, tacit knowledge and easy comfort with the coaching process. They understand the importance of relationship building to the effectiveness of a coaching engagement. Many stated that they found the GROW model somewhat restrictive, and welcomed the opportunity to acquire a wider range of models and approaches. For this reason, although the investment in ICCP program is estimated to be higher by \$2,000, the ICCP program is recommended ahead of the IECL2 program.

Suitability for further training

The phone interview process produced information that can be used to assess the suitability of each respondent for further coaching. Key concerns were the coach's apparent willingness or ability to make themselves available, their empathy for coachees, and their capacity to allow the coachee to develop their own agenda. Of 21 coaches interviewed, 18 were considered suitable and recommended for further training. The other 3 were not recommended for reasons of availability or suitability.

Those recommended for further training are listed below.

| Recommended | Location |
|--------------------|-----------------|
| Jutta Bradley | Regional |
| Lisa Campbell | Regional |
| Simone Czech | Metropolitan |
| Mary Evans | Regional |
| Gargi Ganguly | Regional |
| Catherine Harris | Regional |
| Cora Ingram | Metropolitan |
| Ilona Kernick | Metropolitan |
| Emily Lalor | Metropolitan |
| Mary Maher | Metropolitan |
| Kim McMullen | Regional |
| Deborah O'Reilly | Regional |
| James Price | Metropolitan |
| Richard Prunty | Metropolitan |
| Anne Radburn | Regional |
| Alison Soutter | Metropolitan |
| Eleonora Spresian | Metropolitan |
| Tracey Stokoe | Metropolitan |
| N=18 | |

Survey Response Summary

Q1

| What coaching training or development have you done? (Choose as many as applicable) | | |
|---|------------------|----------------|
| Answer Options | Response Percent | Response Count |
| Institute of Executive Coaching and Leadership (Level 1) | 100.0% | 25 |
| Skills applicable to coaching (listening, questioning, feedback, difficult conversations) | 36.0% | 9 |
| Reading coaching textbooks | 24.0% | 6 |
| Mentoring by an experienced coach | 12.0% | 3 |
| Coaching Supervision | 12.0% | 3 |
| Coaching by an experienced coach | 8.0% | 2 |
| Graduate Diploma in Coaching Psychology (Syd) or similar | 0.0% | 0 |
| Masters in Coaching Psychology (Syd) or similar | 0.0% | 0 |
| Other coaching training (please specify) | | 4 |
| answered question | | 25 |
| skipped question | | 0 |

Other coaching training (please specify)

1. I have also been trained as a mentor/coach for both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal staff.
2. Studies in Organisation behaviour at Harvard university and a Masters in Education which both included units on coaching as part of a suite of development applications.
3. A background in psychological medicine and counselling has assisted me to understand the nuances of coaching as a different approach.
4. Advanced Motivational Interviewing by Dr Joel Porter 2013

Q2

| How well has your training and development prepared you to coach staff? | | |
|---|------------------|----------------|
| Answer Options | Response Percent | Response Count |
| Extremely well | 28.0% | 7 |
| Quite well | 52.0% | 13 |
| Moderately well | 20.0% | 5 |
| Slightly well | 0.0% | 0 |
| Not at all well | 0.0% | 0 |
| answered question | | 25 |
| skipped question | | 0 |

In what ways specifically?

1. Ideas on how to approach the coaching for different people, situations and learning styles, although the specific Level 1 coaching, while having great content, the presenter/trainer was not so great, and did not facilitate everyone's learning in the group.
2. Structure to the coaching session - initially setting it up, GROW framework and tools to look at the context and relationship with the coachee and their environment/world view
3. Good framework. The GROW model. Good hints and tips. I found the methodology translates well to real coaching experiences. The course was very transferable to the work I did with coachees.
4. To listen more - and have the staff member come up with own action
5. It provided me with a framework to use during coaching sessions

6. The GROW model was the focus of training with the IECL and there were opportunities prior to training and following training ie materials, website, blogs, co coaching circles etc which augmented this training
7. The training through the IEC has been very useful. It is rigid and clunky to start with but starts to fit more comfortably with use.
8. provided a framework and principles to work under. I need to seek out the opportunities for revision and supervision. Time constraints
9. The training provided a number of strategies and a framework to assist the coachee in our organisation.
10. I have been able to weave coaching in to supervision and group supervision with my team members.
11. The questions handout was especially helpful and I look at it before each session
12. I have a framework and I am guided by evidence-based principles in my coaching.
13. The important transition from a mentor to a coach where instead of given 'example answers' you are giving exploring questions and getting the coachee to do the thinking about the issue. My role is to guide the thinking process and put some structure around it, probe for difficulties and prompt for alternative responses.
14. The training was excellent but as with all training it is the application from which I learn best.

Q3

| How many staff have you coached in the last 12 months? | | |
|--|------------------|----------------|
| Answer Options | Response Percent | Response Count |
| More than 5 | 8.0% | 2 |
| 4-5 | 4.0% | 1 |
| 2-3 | 32.0% | 8 |
| 1 | 52.0% | 13 |
| None | 4.0% | 1 |
| answered question | | 25 |
| skipped question | | 0 |

What factor most determined the number of staff you coached?

1. Only informally in the first round. I was not linked to a staff, and in the subsequent round, the staff member had to go off on maternity leave.
2. Time, new job role, children etc
3. Availability/time
4. When allocated a third person to coach she was about to go on an extended holiday. We have pencilled in a plan for next year. My second coachee was outside of the L&D managed program
5. Capacity within workload
6. My willingness to help others as a coach. I have coached a number of people who approached me outside the process because a colleague recommended me.
7. Staff member was allocated to me through L&D. However, I am using coaching techniques with my own direct reports - which totals 10 staff members.
8. At this stage I have only had one referred.
9. I would only be able to coach 1 person at a time given my work commitments. Otherwise I would run the risk of providing a less adequate coaching experience for the coachee.
10. This person was allocated to me.
11. I was only referred one candidate through L&D following the training and certification as a coach.
12. 3 months personal leave and 5 months in other positions as operational manager of staff has interfered with my ability to undertake coaching. The MCW allocated to me for coaching has also taken leave at a time when I was available.
13. Initially it was difficult to connect with my coachee due to her availability and job changes. We have maintained several sessions now and her job role is such that she continues to go in and out of the MCW role and this has an impact on goal development, options and action. I have also found it difficult with the time constraints of work.
14. I have only been provided with on coachee from L&D.
15. I have formally coached 1 person and I am mentoring two others (those sessions are run similar to the coaching sessions).

16. The number allocated to me.
17. Two of the referrals were from L&D as part of the IECL Program. Directors made the other three referrals based on their knowledge of my coaching skill set.
18. Officially the number of staff allocated for coaching. Unofficially, I have used my skills with my managers whilst they have had the opportunity to relieve in my substantive position and I have been a support to them, from the sidelines.
19. I was allocated 1 staff member to coach. After that I was away for approx. 3 months and have not been offered another coachee.
20. I was linked to another person to coach and there were never suitable dates available. I suspect that they did not want to be coached by me because they seemed to avoid it.

Q4

| How often, on average, have you met with your coachees in the last year? | | |
|--|------------------|----------------|
| Answer Options | Response Percent | Response Count |
| More than 5 times | 52.0% | 13 |
| 4-5 times | 32.0% | 8 |
| 2-3 times | 8.0% | 2 |
| Once only | 4.0% | 1 |
| Not yet met any | 4.0% | 1 |
| answered question | | 25 |
| skipped question | | 0 |

Q5

| What benefits does coaching bring to your role? (Choose as many as applicable) | | |
|--|------------------|----------------|
| Answer Options | Response Percent | Response Count |
| It allows me to help coachees to find their own answers | 96.0% | 24 |
| Coaching makes my role more satisfying/enjoyable | 72.0% | 18 |
| Coaching helps me to build trusting relationships with staff | 64.0% | 16 |
| Coaching has improved staff performance or business outcomes | 56.0% | 14 |
| I can manage under-performers better with coaching | 20.0% | 5 |
| Staff prefer coaching to regular supervision | 4.0% | 1 |
| Other (please specify) | | 10 |
| answered question | | 25 |
| skipped question | | 0 |

Other (please specify)

1. At an informal level it has helped me to support staff and family members.
2. It has been a good add-on to supervision, stretching the staff I supervised more. I supervise 7 staff in my substantive role, and have used this with all of them regularly in the last 12 months.
3. I have not applied coaching methodology (formally) within my own team. I have however used some aspects of the questioning and focussing techniques.
4. Coaching has helped me re-shape my management style so I am now always thinking how can I get those I am managing to solve their own questions. It has made me less inclined to always have an answer or solution when someone approaches me as a manager.
5. Coaching is probably useful for addressing performance issues. However, we generally are not coaches for our own staff. Having said that, some coaching techniques are applicable to other aspects of a supervising staff.

6. It allows me to give something back to the organisation and to use the skills and experience I have gained with another manager to help them develop.
7. I have supported my MCW to use coaching techniques when managing under-performers
8. Coaching is helping people who are good at their work to become even better.
9. Coaching reinforces the value of CS' Professional Supervision because I coach staff to make optimal use of their supervisory relationships.
10. Staff see coaching as complementary to supervision, not replacing it. For example I can coach a person through an issue but they need their supervisor as the delegated authority to approve their action plan. This happens in supervision.

Q6

| What are the main impediments to you using coaching? (Choose as many as applicable) | | |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Answer Options | Response Percent | Response Count |
| I don't have enough time | 62.5% | 10 |
| I have difficulty getting together with my coachee | 56.3% | 9 |
| Coachees don't have enough time | 37.5% | 6 |
| I am not confident about my level of skill as a coach | 12.5% | 2 |
| Staff would prefer me just to tell them what to do | 12.5% | 2 |
| I feel it takes too long to get results or action | 0.0% | 0 |
| I worry that I could make things worse | 0.0% | 0 |
| I think coaching doesn't work for me as a management tool | 0.0% | 0 |
| Other (please specify) | | 16 |
| answered question | | 16 |
| skipped question | | 9 |

Other (please specify)

1. Nil- coaching is great and a fantastic initiative that should have greater FACS investment eg should be mandatory for all new MCWs. I also wonder about the future of professional supervision in the context of group supervision with practice first and our poor compliance previously with supervision.
2. Two coachees have had extended periods of leave - and one of these has been impacted also by family illness
3. I don't see any of the above applying to my situation. Time limitations are always there but not necessarily a problem.
4. Sometimes difficult to apply this with my direct reports due to time/nature of work.
5. The distance between where we live and work, I live on the Central Coast and work in Ashfield and the coachee lives in Yass and works in Goulburn
6. I can't see any impediments if the coach and coachee are committed to the process.
7. Regional areas make travel difficult and so a mix of face to face and telelinks is required
8. I enjoy the coaching approach in supervision of staff in my team however there is need to mix this with the appropriate management style for the situation
9. I work hard on not simply providing answers and at times in the formal coaching relationship I have felt that my use of the model was 'clunky' and disjointed. The coachee has always acknowledged that I have been helpful in my time with her
10. I use coaching to deepen conversations with my staff to meet results.
11. I have been allocated coachees at least 3 hours drive away.
12. Coaching is valued and I am being effective in my coaching role.
13. Coaching requires practice. With only one person at a time, I feel I am not making the most use of the skills and training we have had. I feel I have the capacity to have more coachees.
14. While I do not feel particularly confident in my coaching skills yet this has not been an impediment to me. I am not able to take on another coachee as I intend to retire from the agency, going on extended leave from 28/2/14.

Q7

| How best can FACS L&D help you to improve your coaching effectiveness? (Rank the choices) | |
|--|---------|
| Answer Options | Ranking |
| Further training with the Institute of Executive Coaching and Leadership (Level 2) (3-day) | 1 |
| Coaching training with the Institute of Coaching and Consulting Psychology Certificate Sydney University (2 x 2-day) | 2 |
| FACS coaching skills workshop with an executive coach (1 day) | 3 |
| Mentoring with an experienced Executive Coach (sessional as requested) | 4 |
| Coaching by an experienced Executive Coach (5-7 sessions) | 5 |
| Coaching supervision (sessional as requested) | 6 |
| Recommended readings | 7 |
| Webinars with a selection of executive coaches | 8 |
| Train me in some coaching tools such as TLCP, LSI, DISC, MBTI | 9 |

Q8

| How confident are you to coach a peer or someone at a level higher than the people you have been coaching? | | |
|--|------------------|----------------|
| Answer Options | Response Percent | Response Count |
| Extremely confident | 4.0% | 1 |
| Very confident | 24.0% | 6 |
| Moderately confident | 52.0% | 13 |
| Slightly confident | 20.0% | 5 |
| Not at all confident | 0.0% | 0 |
| answered question | | 25 |
| skipped question | | 0 |

Comment

1. I am currently (and have been for 6 months) in a Director role, and so would be relatively comfortable coaching someone in the field at a MCS level.
2. Peer ok, not so sure about higher level.
3. One of my coachees was a less experienced peer - coming to grips with organisational culture.
4. Have only coached one person and thus still building confidence in coaching.
5. My experience to date has included a staff member at a lower grade.
6. With more training, support and opportunity to utilise the skills.
7. Coaching is about moving the coachee forward to meet potential at work.
8. I have been coaching new or underperforming MCWs and a new MCS. I would be confident to coach experienced MCS's and new Directors Community Services/Directors Practice Standards.
9. I would feel more confident if I had the opportunity to complete Level 2 - the old saying applies - you don't know what you don't know. Level 1 is good for what I am doing. I can see how it would work for someone in a higher position than me and recognise the benefits in terms of my credibility for coaching a higher grade, if I had completed more than the entry level coaching.

Q9

| How interested are you in further developing your coaching skills? | | |
|--|------------------|----------------|
| Answer Options | Response Percent | Response Count |
| Extremely interested | 45.8% | 11 |
| Very interested | 41.7% | 10 |
| Moderately interested | 8.3% | 2 |
| Slightly interested | 0.0% | 0 |
| Not at all interested | 4.2% | 1 |
| If you are interested, please give your name | | 14 |
| answered question | | 24 |
| skipped question | | 1 |

Q10

| Do you have any other comments, questions, or concerns? | |
|---|----------------|
| Answer Options | Response Count |
| | 11 |
| answered question | 11 |
| skipped question | 14 |

Response Text

1. I believe that coaching helps create an environment in the industry where the organisation works to people's strengths. It also helps to make the organisation one that everyone aspires to belong to.
2. I have found the experience very valuable, the training was of a high standard and the peer group learning and subsequent co-coaching circle was integral to this being a positive experience.
3. The operational needs of the rural Districts I cover and the distances required to travel can make access difficult. This does not diminish the usefulness of the coaching program. I have seen good results from sustained periods of coaching by other coaches.
4. I have expressed my interest in the Aboriginal Mentoring program recently announces for 2014 within FACS
5. The coaching program is fantastic and should be offered to all MCW not just those new to the role.
6. the coaching training was inspirational, it is the best training I have attended.
7. thank you
8. I think that whilst I feel confident in my coaching, it is essential that I continue to engage in ongoing professional development to ensure that I am the best I can be and that the Agency can have confidence that I am providing top quality coaching.
9. Thankyou
10. The first level training was informative and very helpful. I have received good feedback from my coachees. I have attended other events put on by IECL on my own time and have found them informative. I have shared my notes from those sessions with other coaches and they also found it helpful.

Interview Responses

| Invited | Location | Survey | Interview | Coachees x Sessions | Pref | Comments | R |
|-----------------|----------|-----------|-----------|---------------------|-------------------|---|---|
| Jutta Bradley | Reg | Completed | 27 min | 1 x 4 | Exp Coach | Coaching skills are transferable to the supervisor's role, being very effective for staff performance, and for client work. I experimented with a 3-way with the coachee and another coach who was also the coachee's supervisor. I need more training and experience, and would prefer learning from a more experienced coach for modelling. I would be able to manage one coaching assignment every semester. Not everyone is suitable to be a coach, lacking the interest or pre-requisite skills. You are no longer the person with the answers. | Y |
| Lisa Campbell | Reg | Completed | 33 min | 2 x 4 | IECL2 | We already use coaching as part of our service delivery model. I use rapport building to address the seniority difference with my coachees. Although coaching skills are suitable for supervision, coaching is different from supervision because there are no other agendas. My coachees were uncertain about why they had been nominated for the program. Coaching may not work with unwilling coachees. I'm seeking further training in higher level tangible coaching skills so IECL may be a bit basic. Only provide training to staff who are suitable and willing to coach others. | Y |
| Simone Czech | Metro | Completed | 29 min | 2 x 5 | IECL2 | Coach training is the best training I have ever done. The first coachee was really unsuitable as she really required performance managing. My other coachee was very successful, as she has now been promoted. I'd like to keep the engagement going with her for the next 12 months. All MCWs should be given coaching, although those trained as coaches need the right disposition: open to asking rather than telling. Coaching is less suitable for formal performance management. Coaching is very exhausting! | Y |
| Clare Donnellan | Metro | Completed | 20 min | 3 x 5 | IECL2 | Coaching has had no benefits for my role. It's important not to blur coaching and supervision. More senior staff are easier to coach as they are more open to change. Coaching must be more structured and task focussed than mentoring. I use coaching skills in my personal life. Coaching is unsuitable for formal performance issues, moderately hostile staff, for workplace issues, and for staff who don't want to be coached. I'm moderately interested in further training as a coach. We were not well matched with our coachees. Only train those directors and managers who are committed to use the process. | N |
| David Elliot | | Completed | | 2 x 4 | IECL2 | Not interviewed | |
| Mary Evans | Reg | Completed | 22 min | 4 x 5 | IECL2 | Very successful coaching experience. Adapted coaching skills to regular supervision. Very confident and interested in more L&D incl ICCP. Difficult resisting giving advice. Coaching unsuitable for quick technical information and guidance (eg. new staff). L&D needs to have confidence in coaches, but don't leave us to our own devices. All Directors and Managers need the coaching skills and principles. | Y |
| Wayne Flett | | ? | | | | Not interviewed | |
| Briony Foster | | Completed | | 2 x 2 | Coach supervision | Not interviewed | |

| Invited | Location | Survey | Interview | Coachees x Sessions | Pref | Comments | R |
|------------------|----------|-----------|-----------|---------------------|-------|---|---|
| Gargi Ganguly | Reg | Completed | 17 min | Nil | IECL2 | Was not able to complete any coaching due to the coachee taking leave. Has used coaching with staff and family. Very much recommends the process and training for all new managers, as well as for senior staff. Very keen to do more training and formal coaching assignments with FACS managers. I'm seeking coaching support for my own role. | Y |
| Lana Hall | | ? | | | | Not interviewed | |
| Catherine Harris | Reg | Completed | 25 min | 1 x 1 | IECL2 | A background in psychological medicine and counselling has helped me to understand the nuances of coaching. Due to leave I've only met the coachee once. I enjoy the coaching approach in supervision of staff in my team however there is need to mix this with the appropriate management style for the situation. Also interested in ICCP. Distance is an issue for me. Only train those directors and managers who are interested to use the process. | Y |
| Cora Ingram | Metro | Completed | 43 min | 1 x 6 | ICCP | I very much appreciated being selected for this training. Coaching really works, and I found I'm quite good at it. It's also improved my skills in asking, not telling. The coachee gained so much benefit from the program that our relationship remains ongoing as mentoring. My other coachee has been reluctant to engage, perhaps in the belief that she is perceived as remedial. The GROW coaching model is suitable for a wide range of situations including critical incident debriefing. I found the IECL trainer Dr Armstrong a bit intimidating, perhaps because I was more junior. I now seek a wider range of models and skills. Only train those who are willing to make the provision of coaching a priority. | Y |
| Kathy Karatasas | Metro | Completed | 21 min | 3 x 5 | IECL2 | I set a tight agenda for the coachee, including task allocation. There is a need to clarify the relationship of the coach and coachee with the coachee's supervisor. Also, there needs to be a "contract" with longer term goals for an engagement – the expectation has been discreet sessions using GROW. Coaching has helped me to reflect, refresh my approach, and transfer skills to others. Coaching is unsuitable for formal performance issues if progress has been unsuccessful. The coach needs to be independent of the coachee, allowing some objectivity. Coach training should be available for all as an option to enable self-reflection. | N |
| Gerald Keating | Metro | ? | | | | Not interviewed | |
| Ilona Kernick | Metro | Completed | 60 min | 1 x 5 | ICCP | I also use an experienced coach. I used f2f and phone coaching. Phone is much more difficult because it feels much more formal. I found GROW too restrictive. I've improved my talk/listen balance. I find it hard to avoid telling, especially with gruesome topics. I also struggled to find time for coaching. I need a go-to person for monitoring and support, especially immediately after completing the training. Coaching is unsuitable for resistant coachees and those with mental issues. I felt uncomfortable with Hilary Armstrong's style (IECL). Only those directors and managers who are receptive to the training and keen to implement it should be trained. | Y |
| Emily Lalor | Metro | Completed | 39 min | 1 x 6 | IECL2 | This is the best training ever provided and should be for all managers and directors. I struggled with how to manage the situation where my coachee's supervisor was performing poorly. I used higher level skills including challenging the coachee and managing him out of dramatising his situation. Coaching is widely applicable including managing poor | Y |

| Invited | Location | Survey | Interview | Coachees x Sessions | Pref | Comments | R |
|-------------------|----------|-----------|-----------|---------------------|-----------|--|---|
| | | | | | | performance. The Department has a general problem of poor supervision because managers and directors cannot get away from telling staff what to do. | |
| Mary Maher | Metro | Completed | 23 min | 1 x 6 | Tools | The best approach for me was 3 rd party perspective and reality-based discussions. I found it hard to manage the tension and how to shut it off. I need a framework for a coaching engagement that goes beyond individual sessions. I also need more tools. The ICCP sounds ideal. Coaching has made me a better manager because I'm more reflective. I now have more options to re-think the past and the future. I'm also less of a micromanager. Coaching is unsuitable for formal performance processes, where a more direct approach is needed. Coaches need to be reflective and open to new ways of thinking. Some of our directors and managers seem stuck in one management style. Only train those who are interested in delivering coaching. | Y |
| Kim McMullen | Reg | Completed | 29 min | 5 x 5 | IECL2 | Coaching allows staff to find their own answers. I had difficulty getting access due to time and location pressures. Phone is OK, but need at least 1-2 f2f sessions. Harder to read body language on the phone. Hard to get the coachee to commit to SMART goals. Adapted coaching skills to regular supervision. Coaching unsuitable for formal performance issues where more direct style is needed. I want supervision by a more experienced coach. All managers should be coached. Only train those who are interested in delivering coaching. Don't coach staff you supervise. | Y |
| Catherine Mullane | Metro | Completed | | 1 x 3 | IECL2 | Not interviewed | |
| Deborah O'Reilly | Reg | Completed | 25 min | 1 x 5 | | This is the best training I've ever done. It was inspirational. It includes immediately useful tools and skills. I used a very structured approach, including the supervisor. I found it hard to accept that it is the coachee's goals that are important, not mine. The process worked very well, especially the talk/listen balance. Coaching is suitable for all aspects of development, including personal goals. Those who are trained must have commitment to ensure that they implement the process. | Y |
| Sean O'Toole | Metro | ? | | | | Not interviewed | |
| James Price | Metro | Completed | 30 min | 3 x 5 | IECL2 | I coached and supported my managers while they relieved in my role. Coaching makes my role more enjoyable but I need more practice with the skills. There was some frustration that sessions were only twice monthly. I also struggle with not answering for the coachee. The process saw a big improvement in the coachee's performance. Coaching is complementary to supervision, not replacing it. Coaching unsuitable for formal performance issues where more direct style is needed, and for personal issues (because of boundaries). Also interested in ICCP. Don't coach staff at the same or higher levels as it reduced the "impact". Only train staff who are suitable and willing to implement the process. I have the capacity to coach more staff. | Y |
| Richard Prunty | Metro | Completed | 20 min | 1 x 5 | Exp Coach | I had difficulty with access to the coachee due to time constraints. Coaching allows me to use the skills and experience I have gained to give back to the organisation. I'm not confident in my coaching skills. I work hard on not simply providing answers and I felt that my use of the model was 'clunky' and disjointed, although the coachee found it helpful in her transition to the MCW role. In my management role I now hold back from giving advice | Y |

| Invited | Location | Survey | Interview | Coachees x Sessions | Pref | Comments | R |
|-------------------|----------|-----------|-----------|---------------------|-------|---|---|
| | | | | | | and answers. Coaching is unsuitable for child protection triage and crisis management, and where inexperienced staff need direction. All directors and managers should do coaching as it reduces the directed nature of their work. I have expressed interest in the Aboriginal Mentoring program. | |
| Anne Radburn | Regional | Completed | 20 min | 1 x 5 | IECL2 | This was the best training ever! I had 2 x f2f and 3 x phone. I struggled to avoid giving the answers. Coaching skills are very transferable to supervision. I joined 3 other FACS coaches in a community of practice. Coaching is unsuitable for remedial, conduct, and performance issues. Avoid coaching staff that you supervise. Only train those who are interested in delivering coaching. The training was of a high standard and the peer group learning and subsequent co-coaching circle was integral to this being a positive experience. | Y |
| Rose Samuels | Metro | ? | | | | Not interviewed | |
| Liz Small | Regional | Completed | 12 min | 1 x 5 | IECL2 | I'm retiring in February. Coaching has helped my relationships with my boss and my staff. I use coaching techniques in supervision. Coaching is less suitable for new staff who need more direction. Also unsuitable for performance management and discipline. Coaching should be a service provided to all MCWs. Only train those who are interested in delivering coaching. | N |
| Alison Soutter | Metro | Completed | 16 min | 1 x 5 | IECL2 | Coaching is an excellent initiative. All managers should be given access to it. It is a logical extension of my psychology skills and practice. My coachee, located in a region, found my visits a bit difficult to explain to colleagues. Coachees need better briefing on what coaching is and how it works. I found coaching very helpful to keep me grounded in frontline practice. Coaching works very well for all situations, but I'd struggle with unconsciously incompetent coachees. All executives from grade 11/12 upwards should be trained as coaches. | Y |
| Eleonora Spresian | Metro | Completed | 18 min | 1 x 5 | IECL2 | I was very well matched to my coachee and we had a very successful engagement. Now I want to grow in confidence through more coaching, and getting the talk/listen balance right. I now use coaching skills with my staff, getting them to come to decisions rather than telling them. Coaching is suitable for all situations except the formal stages of performance management. More of a framework is needed, relating to timings and inclusion of the coachee's supervisor. Coaching has also taught me many things about myself. Coach training should be provided for all directors, as many of them lack the skills to provide quality supervision. | Y |
| Tracey Stokoe | Metro | Completed | 25 min | 3 x 5 | IECL2 | Coaching allows me to help coachees to find their own answers. I'm comfortable with GROW and SMART goals, and now I want the next thing. Finding time is my main constraint. Coaching is not suitable for the formal stages of performance management. I want more training before I'm confident enough to coach peers and those more senior. Only train those who are interested in delivering coaching, and who have the appropriate personality match. | Y |
| N=29 | | N=23 | N=21 | | | | |

Quotes for Further Coach Training

| | Quote 1 | Quote 2 |
|---------------------|--|--|
| Provider | Institute of Executive Coaching and Leadership Level 2 (IECL2) | The Institute of Consulting and Coaching Psychology (ICCP) |
| Program | NSW Department of Family and Community Services In-house | Institute of Consulting and Coaching Psychology Certificate |
| Focus | The importance of the “state” of the coach and the coach’s ability to develop the coaching relationship. | Theoretically-grounded, but highly practical evidenced-based models and approaches based on the principles of solution-focused behavioural change, and the supervised application of these principles in systematic coaching practice. |
| Format | 3 day face-to-face workshop | 2 x 2-day face-to-face workshops two weeks apart (total of 4 days) |
| Dates | 3 consecutive days in 2014 TBA | Days 1-2: 10/11 April Days 3-4: 15/16 May Or Days 1-2: 22/23 May Days 3-4: 29/30 May |
| Time | 9.00am-5.00pm | 9.00am-5.00pm |
| Location | IECL Training Room, Barrack House | Training rooms provided by FACS |
| Minimum | 15 | 15 |
| Maximum | Not stated | 21 |
| Facilitators | Dr Hilary Armstrong and Irene Booth | Dr Tony Grant and Dr Mike Cavanagh |
| Cost for 15 | \$43,500 + GST | \$38,500 + GST |
| Additional | \$2,900 + GST | \$2,500 + GST |
| Inclusions | Participant workbooks and materials Morning tea, lunch and afternoon tea on each face to face day | Participant workbooks and materials * |
| On-costs | Regional staff will require travel plus 3 days of subsistence | Regional staff will require 2 x travel plus 4 days of subsistence* |
| Contact | Dani Matthews Client Relationship Manager 8270 0632 danim@iecl.com | Ingrid Studholme Business Manager 0422 418704 ingrid.studholme@telstra.com |

* These additional on-costs for travel, subsistence and meals and estimated at \$7,000.