

From: Heidi Kramer [<mailto:sol001.hk@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, May 29, 2017 11:32 AM
To: Rep Buehler <Rep.KnuteBuehler@oregonlegislature.gov>
Cc: Droppers Oliver <Oliver.Droppers@oregonlegislature.gov>
Subject: Comments on HB 2303

Representative Knute Buehler,

I urge you and other House Representatives to remove “life coaching”, “health and wellness coaching” and “parenting coaching” from the proposed amendment to HB 2303. I completely understand the desire to regulate the practice of coaching, but the way this particular proposal is written will fail to provide adequate consumer protection and will contribute to a loss of both individual and state revenue.

I recommend that you reject this amendment and work with certifying coaching agencies such as the International Coaching Federation <https://coachfederation.org/> and the Center for Credentialing and Education <http://www.cce-global.org/Credentialing/BCC> to come up with better regulations that would both protect consumers and retain the livelihoods of coaches who are contributing excellent services to Oregon citizens.

Two significant reasons for rejecting the proposed amendment to HB 2303:

1. The proposed amendment to HB 2303 is inadequate because coaching and counseling are fundamentally different. Therapists are trained to help people who have pathological psychological problems. Certified coaches work with people who are psychologically well and simply want help figuring out how to achieve their next goal. As part of their certification process the International Coaching Federation teaches coaches to understand the difference between these two modalities as well as how to refer a client to a licensed therapist when needed. In fact, during a course I took from the International Coaching Federation, some students who were licensed therapists testified to the necessity of seeking out coach training (which was absent from their counseling educations), so that they could have the option of effectively using either psychotherapy or coaching with their clients. If it is true that most therapists lack training in coaching practices, does it make sense to require coaches to be under their supervision? Might it be wiser to regulate coaching as a separate practice and require coaches to work within the limits of their training just like any other certified professional?
2. The proposed amendment to HB 2303 may have a destructive impact on the coaching economy in Oregon. Unlike therapy, coaching can be done virtually, so coaches often have self-employed home based businesses. This is a financially productive model for both clients and coaches, since coaching is excluded from medical insurance coverage. Shifting coaches to employee status with agencies and therapists will increase costs for everyone involved as well as fail to guarantee adequate coaching supervision. If this amendment passes, our most qualified coaches may leave the state to practice elsewhere where they can be more effective, leaving Oregon with lost tax revenue and a much poorer pool of coaching services. On the other hand, proper regulation might increase awareness of the value of coaching and attract more of the most highly qualified, successful coaches to our state.

Please reject the proposed amendment to HB 2303 and work with agencies like the International Coaching Federation and the Center for Credentialing and Education to enact progressive legislation that better meets the needs of Oregon citizens, certified coaches and licensed therapists.

Sincerely,
Heidi Kramer
1880 NE Jackson Ave
Bend, Oregon 97701
sol001.hk@gmail.com
541-705-5040