

From: ANSE Quality Expert Group
To: ANSE Board
Concerning: Quality Management Advice for the ANSE Board for the GA in October 2022
Date: 5. September 2022

1. Introduction

ANSE wants to be the European body, promoting mobility within Supervision and Coaching on a professional level. Since 2004 the idea of mutual recognition of each other's qualified and registered members has been point of interest. ANSE is developing and is involved in cross border projects that will hance a common understanding of supervision and (organisational) coaching. Guaranteeing overall quality, ethical standards, and mutual recognition within ANSE will heighten this credibility. In Springtime 2021 the present Board stated the **overall aim for quality** in ANSE is to get stronger as a profession on the European level. For this purpose, Quality talks were initiated, and an expert group with members of seven national organizations was installed. Our work provides a first overview of differences within the NO' s in acceptance of (professional) diversity.

We hope this advice will help the ANSE Board to develop an active proposal for the GA.

Members for the Quality Expert Group:

- Christoph Bär, BSO – Berufsverband für Coaching, Supervision und Organisationsberatung, Switzerland
- Elisabeth Graf, BSC – Berufsverband für Supervision, Coaching & Organisationsentwicklung / ASC – Associazione Professionale Supervisione, Coaching & Sviluppo Organizzativo, Italy
- Eva Nemes, MSZCT – Association for Hungarian Supervisors and Supervisor-Coaches, Hungary
- Gerry Aerts, LVSC – Dutch National Association for Supervision and Coaching, The Netherlands
- Gunn Brigitte Danielsen, NOSCO – Norwegian Organisation for Supervision and Co-Operation, Norway
- Patrizia Tonin, ÖVS – Austrian Association for Supervision, Austria
- Rita Škriadaitė Vrubliauske, LPSKA – Lithuanian Association of Supervisors, Lithuania

Glossary:

ANP = ANSE Network Partners
ANSE = Association of National organisations for Supervision and coaching in Europe
AMA = Associate member of ANSE
GA = General Assembly
NO = National Organisations
QEG = Quality Expert Group
SU = Summer University

2. Project Definition

ANSE Board required to make an overview and comparison of the national quality systems on the educational and lifelong learning standards to make a proposal for the GA in October 2022. Our assignment was to make recommendations to the board for minimum quality standards for developing towards mutual recognition.

Project duration: Spring 2021 – ANSE GA October 2022.

3. Working Method

For comparability we developed a comprehensive quality criteria catalogue on educational and lifelong learning standards. We contacted all of the ANSE full and associated members and the network partners for data (18 NO's, 3 AMA¹ and 4 ANP). We decided to work only with data from Supervisors education. Firstly, a lot of NO's hadn't provided data on (organisational) coaching education programs and secondly it made our work less complex. We split the group into two groups, one to analyse data on educational standards and the other on life-long learning. This way we could work more efficiently. Both groups analysed their data and evaluated similarities and differences. We shared what we found remarkable and which open questions this brought up for further reflection and quality development. We tried to find a common understanding of the results. From here we have made recommendations for compliance according to the ANSE quality standards. The results were presented by a part of the QEG members in Quality talk number five. A Poster presentation was presented at the SU in Riga. Feedback was collected by QEG members present and used in this advice.

¹ The war between Russia and the Ukraine hampered our work but when The ANSE Board sent a statement we could continue. This means data from Russia haven't been taken into consideration. At the moment number of AMA is 2.

4. Analysis and Conclusions

Each member of the expert group had 3 NO or AMA (including own NO) in a feedback loop to gather data. Of N=21 the total response was 19 (see also note number one). The participation response was excellent, even though not all questions were answered by the NO's. The following table is intended to provide an overview of the data collection.

	Becoming a member (by education)	Assure membership (by Lifelong learning)	Ending the membership
Supervisors	High data basis	Medium data basis	Medium data basis
Meta-supervisors	Medium data basis	No information available	No information available
Trainers in supervision	Medium data basis	No information available	No information available
Training institutions	High data basis	Not in scope of evaluation	Not in scope of evaluation
National Organisations	Not in scope of evaluation	Not in scope of evaluation	Not in scope of evaluation

Color legend				
high data basis	medium data basis	weak data basis	no information available	Not in scope of evaluation

The following is a summary overview of our results according to our analysis criteria.

a) Lifelong Learning

11 NO's have a defined quality standard procedure for members; 4 NO's do not have expressed quality standard procedure for members; 2 intend to introduce it.

b) Quality Assurance Procedure

Most of the NO's make the procedure mandatory. The review frequency is between 2 and 3 years (with 3 exceptions at 5 years). 2 NO's have dialogue in addition to documents and self-declaration. 1 NO has 2 different procedures for membership and senior membership.

c) Process Quality

NO's have process quality elements in their quality standards.

d) Professional experience

3 NO's do not specify a minimum, the others between 10 and 40 hours per year, one NO does not specify hours but 2 processes.

e) Meta supervision

The NO's have between 5 and 25 hours per year. Some differentiate according to length of membership and between intervision and meta-supervision. 1 NO's specifies 2 supervisions and 4 intervisions and 1 NO does not have any requirements.

f) Continuing education

3 NO's do not set any requirements, the others prescribe between 6 and 20 hours per year. 1 NO provides for an annual self-assessment interview. Some NO's have a broad concept of continuing education, including e.g. participation in the national organisation, publication and research work.

g) Quality system for trainers and meta supervisors

4 NO's have a quality system for the trainers. 7 NO's have a quality system for the meta-supervisors.

h) Other

- 6 NO's have established an ombudsperson position, 2 without information, the others have not.
- 7 NO's have a form of passive membership.
- For 5 NO's the failure to meet the quality standards leads to end the membership.

5. Discussion

These Questions on Lifelong Learning are still open. We have to consider that the data are missing for some NO's, which means that the database is incomplete. Some of the data is also not clear.

We also have to contemplate that all standards are only for the full members. If the AMA wants to apply as full member, they have to meet up to the standards.

During the SU we had all positive feedback. Some were very inspired about our presentation and had some ideas they would like to share with their NO. There was one question: What if NO has minimum standards or under: What will be the consequences?

- Would it be necessary to make the data collection more accessible and understandable?
- Does ANSE have criteria or guidelines for the quality assurance procedure for members in the sense of Lifelong Learning?
- Where does the NO want to go? What is lifelong learning for them? Do we have a common understanding of what is needed as a lifelong learning for supervisors?
- Could it be helpful to have a comparable editorially description form for the quality assurance in the NO's?

6. Recommendations for Proposal GA

Based on our findings, we recommend to ANSE Board the following guidelines. We have left space for individual differences, (e.g., any NO can explain, why they do it different and that cross check). In this way these guidelines leave options for member organisations to adapt this to their individual needs and national legislation on education.

6.1. Recommendations for Educational Standards

- 1. In all educational programs it should be obligatory to put in theory about: Supervision and coaching; sociology of work and workspace plus theory of organisations.**
- 2. A quality system for trainers is recommended.**
- 3. Educational program requirements should be stated for the different professions, Supervision, Coaching and Organisational Coaching.**
- 4. Recognition and registration of Educational Programs by the NO' s**

Substantiation for 1 and 2

- it will contribute to the quality of the educational programs,
- it makes comparison easier and gives space to diversity, and
- in this way the ANSE standard will be a minimal required standard to be a professional supervisor, coach, or organisational coach.

- 5. Introduce ECTS as a standard for Education and lifelong learning or Permanent Education**

Substantiation

- Most Bachelor and Master programs count in European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS). ECTS credits represent learning based on defined learning outcomes and their associated workload. ECTS is applied to support student mobility between higher education.
- ANSE guidelines will be specified in the same unit: 1h = 60 min; 1 ECTS = 25-30² Hrs.
- It makes comparison easier and gives space to diversity.

- 6. Equalize Educational Standards Admission requirements**

- a. Bachelor EQF6 or Master Educational EQF7 level or equivalent. Preferably Social or Human Science. Exceptions or further requirements can be defined by the NO.
- b. Some countries select above a minimal age of 27 or 30, others don't. Refer to professional experience of minimal 4 years according to the ANSE standard.
- c. Half the countries have an assessment procedure. We would like to keep it open. NO could decide if this is necessary as a part of the whole certification procedure.
- d. Make self/group experience part of continuing education.

Substantiation: That would contribute to more flexibility in professional development and deeper understanding of the self of the supervisor.

² Some countries refer to ECTS between 25 - 28 hrs. NO can follow the national ECTS standard of their country.

- e. Proven supervisee experience must be upgraded to the ANSE Standard of 30 hrs. for all countries. (1 hr. = 60 minutes, in line with ECTS)
- f. Preferably the duration of the Supervision program should be brought up to ANSE standards of 2 years. ANSE standard for contact hours is 375 hrs. of 45 minutes or 300 hrs. of 60 minutes.
- g. Practice of supervision brought up to ANSE standards of 45 hours. NO could make an extra standard e.g., to a minimal of individual, group, or team supervision. Some countries already have.
- h. Meta-supervision brought up to the minimal ANSE standard of 35 hours for all NO's.
- i. Add a presentation of a thesis or Portfolio as a final assessment of the educational programs.
Substantiation: It is important that supervisors contribute to further development of the body of knowledge of supervision and are able to start the professional dialogue about it.
- j. According to ANSE standards final examination or colloquium should be part of all the educational programs.

6.2. Recommendations for Lifelong Learning

1. **Each NO must have a written description of its own mandatory quality system for lifelong learning for their members. Including practice of supervision, meta supervision and education.**
2. **Invite the members to share their thoughts about their standards on lifelong learning and discuss their experiences to further develop comparable quality standards.**
3. **Create space for the NO in the quality talks to integrate the standards on lifelong learning.**
4. **Quality talk s should also include how the membership will end in the NO.**
5. **Share the different process quality in the NO`s to develop a common understanding of what is meant by process quality.**

7. Resources

- Data provided by the NO's (2021-2022)
- Quality talk 1 (2021) Ppt by ANSE
- Quality talk 5 (2022) Ppt by QEG
- ANSE Board (2014) *Mutual recognition* – the original motion, sent to ANSE presidents on March 21st, 2014 – *reminder for the President meeting*