

EASC Institutes Meeting Activity Report: September 2025 – September 2026

Introduction

This document serves as the official annual report summarizing the key activities, strategic discussions, and significant decisions of the European Association for Supervision and Coaching (EASC) Institutes meetings held between September 2025 and September 2026. Drawing on the minutes of the meetings of 8 December 2025, 3 March 2026, 16 June 2026, and 18 September 2026 (held during the EASC Congress in Budapest), it is intended to give association members a transparent overview of the year's progress ahead of the annual members' meeting. The period was defined above all by the practical implementation of the new examination rules and by the establishment of Organizational Development (OD) as EASC's third profession, alongside continued work on institute finances, market position, and cooperation with sister associations.

1.0 The Network in Motion: Continuity, Transitions, and International Growth

The Institutes meetings continued to serve as the primary forum in which member institutes share milestones, leadership changes, and emerging pressures within the network.

1.1 Milestones and Leadership Continuity

- Progressio marked its 20th anniversary during the reporting period. Alumni exchange events were organized, and the institute's leadership succession to Fabian Esser has been completed without loss of employees, clients, or cooperation partners.
- 4progress, under Rahel Sondheimer's leadership, continued to grow, gaining teachers with a background in transactional analysis, alongside its established annual celebration and summer alumni party.
- Wedegreieck (Hans-Günter Simon) was nearing completion of two training courses and held a themed alumni meeting over the summer.

1.2 New International Interest: A Prospective Institute in Moldova

A group of twelve professionals trained in integrative supervision in Chişinău, Moldova (training delivered by Johann Pfeiffer) is working toward establishing its own institute. Three representatives attended the Budapest Congress to build relationships with other EASC institutes. Next steps include a board meeting in Chişinău, a planned workshop on examiner training, and a fundraising programme to support the institute's establishment, with a fuller presentation expected at the General Assembly. Interested institutes, Instructors and mentoring supervisors were invited to contact Mechthild or the EASC office directly.

This continued organic evolution of the membership base ran alongside the year's most demanding body of work: the practical rollout of the new Manual's examination rules.

2.0 Completing the New Manual: The 2026 Examination Reform

2026 was deliberately treated as an experimental testing year for the new examination rules and scales introduced with the new Manual, with experience to be gathered before a final decision is taken.

2.1 Adoption Across the Network

By early 2026, institutes were split between three positions: using the new rules outright (Coaching Institut Berlin, Progressio), experimenting with them (WAEK, Wededreieck, 4progress), and retaining the old rules for the time being. ČIS kept the old rules because no Czech translation yet existed and because existing contracts remained in place; ICS ran one examination under the old rules in April and one under the new rules in November.

2.2 Scoring, Compensation, and the 10% Question

- The new percentage-based scoring scale was broadly experienced as more transparent and clearer than its predecessor, though at least one German institute chose to keep the previous form.
- The written case study and the oral examination are now scored on the same scale, replacing the two separate scales originally set out in the Manual.
- A model piloted successfully at WAEK and Wededreieck has the institute score the same rubric used by the examiners; the institute's assessment is made available to the examiners and reconciled against a maximum 10% deviation.
- Whether the oral examination and the institute's case-study assessment should be able to compensate for one another remained under discussion. Any compensation model is tied to a non-negotiable safeguard: at least two of the three examiners must still vote "pass."
- The permitted 10% deviation between written and oral results proved the most contested point. The majority view — reinforced by experience with Switzerland's federal "Höhere Fachprüfungen" (Advanced Professional Examinations)— held that written and oral performance should be assessed independently, since the two measure different competencies. Switzerland's own examination remains additionally tied to the federal "betrieblicher Mentor" (company mentor) /SBFI framework, under which the case study cannot be waived and the theory paper must relate directly to the case.

2.3 Study Book and Case Study: A Settled Question

A clear consensus emerged, across several institutes, that the study book — originally intended for grading in the Manual's draft — should not be assessed. It is now given as personal, grade-independent feedback on the participant's development process. The written case study (Written Thesis) continues to be graded.

2.4 Hybrid and Fully Online Examinations

- Wededreieck ran two CQS-approved hybrid examinations (a coaching examination on 28 February and a supervision examination on 18 April 2026), with candidates and moderation on site in Münster and examiners joining remotely via dedicated, deliberately "clean" digital sets — minimal mini-PCs stripped of stored documents to rule out unauthorized aids — with a document camera (roughly €30) replacing the flipchart. The institute reports that the equipment investment paid for itself after two examinations, and values the shared, in-person examination day for the cohort as much as the added security against manipulation.
- WAEK ran a fully remote, unsupervised examination for three candidates unable to attend in person for pregnancy-related reasons, weighting the oral examination at two-thirds and the institute's case-study assessment at one-third.
- Other institutes reported similarly positive experience with fully online examinations, including for participants who had moved abroad, provided examiners receive a comprehensive briefing beforehand and a way is found to present models and theoretical frameworks — for example, via a prepared slide or a shared whiteboard.
- The institutes reached a "both-and" consensus: hybrid and fully online formats are both accepted as consistent with EASC's understanding of trust and personal relationship, provided a comprehensive examiner briefing is in place. By comparison, ICF's more centralized examination

model was noted to face its own integrity problems (manipulated or AI-generated recordings, altered translations); the personal, relationship-based approach was seen as EASC's comparative advantage.

2.5 Artificial Intelligence and the Integrity of Case Work

The use of AI in written case studies raised growing concern. Case work is meant to support participants' personal development, and AI use can work against that purpose; institutes agreed that AI use should be disclosed where it occurs. A further complication was raised: AI can be trained to match an individual's own writing style, which makes disclosure-based assessment considerably harder in practice.

2.6 Looking Ahead: Centralization and a Dedicated Examination Manual

- A pilot project for 2027 is under consideration: centralized, cross-institute examination dates two to three times a year (for example in northern and southern Germany), conducted by independent examiners in a model likened to a driving test, as an alternative to institute-run examinations, with a joint evaluation planned after the pilot phase.
- A separate, standalone examination manual (covering scales and procedures) is being drafted in all EASC languages, targeted for completion by the November members' meeting.
- A systematic evaluation of the year's experimental examination formats is planned for the end of 2026.

Examination reform was not the only structural change under way. In parallel, the network took decisive steps toward establishing Organizational Development as a profession in its own right.

3.0 Building the Third Profession: Organizational Development (OD)

As of December 2025, OD training was recognized within the network as an increasingly important area of coaching and supervision practice — but no one was yet qualified to lead it. Over the following nine months, the institutes moved steadily from that starting point toward a concrete certification pathway.

3.1 From Concept to Manual

By June 2026, OD had been formally anchored in the updated Manual as EASC's third profession, alongside coaching and supervision, following preparatory work by a small OD working group of EASC members active as OD practitioners. The intent is not a separate OD association, but a deliberate connection of OD to coaching and supervision, open to supervisors, coaches, and, potentially, qualified career-changers.

OD is understood to build on an existing coaching or supervision qualification rather than admitting entrants "from zero." It was noted, however, that the current Manual architecture could in theory also be read as permitting entry via organizational consulting alone, without prior EASC qualification — a point flagged as still needing clarification, since the Manual's diagrams were deliberately left unchanged even as the accompanying text was revised.

3.2 Defining "Stunde Null"(point zero): The Berlin Working Meeting

An original plan for immediate trainer certification was withdrawn after the CQS advised that the timeline was too tight. Instead, a first working meeting on 17–18 July in Berlin (held in hybrid format) was set to mark the beginning of "Stunde Null," (starting point/point zero) tasked with defining the criteria for OD trainers. Institutes and trainers unable to attend may still submit their evidence later; no one is meant to be disadvantaged by the scheduling. The Berlin group's mandate was to produce an actionable, start-ready "point zero" pilot draft without additional review loops, with further iteration explicitly expected and welcomed.

3.3 A Guiding Principle, and an Open Debate on Access and Identity

A holistic, human-centered understanding spanning the economy, society, and ecology as a shared "survival unit" was adopted as a binding core of EASC's approach to OD — explicitly to guard against the field opening toward a purely economics-driven form of organizational consulting (headcount reduction, EBIT optimization, AI-driven redesign) that would sit in tension with EASC's existing ethos.

A broader debate ran through the year without being resolved: whether coaching, supervision, and OD should be integrated more closely as EASC's practice areas develop, or further differentiated into three distinct professions. The latter position was defended on the grounds that OD assignments need clear mandate and role boundaries to avoid ethically problematic overlap with coaching or supervision work. By September, development of the OD track remained visibly German-centric, and the institutes were still gathering country-specific input on requirements and practice elsewhere in Europe. Scrum Masters and other agile coaches were identified as a possible new target group for a future OD add-on qualification. A longer-term idea, not yet a decision, is a shared international coaching/supervision/OD curriculum to which several institutes would jointly contribute.

3.4 Formal Requirements and Current Uptake

By the Budapest meeting, the CQS's requirements for OD trainer certification had been set out in detail: existing recognition as a trainer for coaching or supervision; a five-year OD practice record (logbook, hours, projects); a written OD concept in line with the Manual; and documentation of three completed OD processes from different practice fields (at least three months each, four to five pages, covering the assignment, process, methods, one's own role, and critical reflection), submitted to the CQS. OD training itself may only be offered through an institute, with a minimum of two trainers per programme (the Master Coach training being the sole exception).

As of September 2026, two people had already been recognized by the CQS as "Organisationsentwickler:in und Trainer:in" (organizational developer and trainer for organizational development) , " and roughly eight to twelve further participants signaled interest in the certification during the Budapest plenary discussion.

4.0 Fee Structures for New Curricula and Teaching Trainers

At the June 2026 meeting, the institutes worked through a board mandate to review the fee schedule (Gebührenordnung) governing new curricula and trainers without their own institute.

- The Master Coach module fee was clarified at 20% of the curriculum fee per module (capped at €200 in Germany for the full 250-hour curriculum) — implemented directly by the office, without requiring a change to the fee schedule itself.
- New curricula from existing institutes must be certified by the CQS but remain fee-free, on the reasoning that this avoids a double burden alongside the institute's own five-year recertification.
- Curricula developed by Teaching Trainers without their own institute are certifiable but fee-bearing, with fees staggered by EU category (for example, €200 in Germany, €350 in Switzerland).

The meeting settled two points in principle: all curricula — including additional curricula developed later by existing institutes — must pass through the CQS for quality assurance; and Teaching Trainers may only offer or deliver certified curricula in cooperation with an institute, so as not to undercut the institutes themselves. A model proposed by Christoph Schalk preserves a "Lehrtrainer:in's" (instructor/ trainer) authorship of, and intellectual property in, a curriculum even when it is delivered only under an institute's umbrella.

Both points require an amendment to the fee schedule, which is being prepared for the November members' meeting. The underlying fee question — whether, and on what basis, institutes should pay per curriculum going forward — was left for the institutes to develop a position on before that meeting.

Longstanding "grey zone" curricula that were developed but never formally submitted to the CQS are to be surfaced and addressed during institutes' first five-year recertification cycle.

5.0 Market Position, Competition, and External Cooperation

5.1 Competitive Pressure

In Germany, EASC institutes face growing competition from short, Employment-Agency-funded formats — AZAV-certified, often delivered online over four to six months, with funding of up to €10,000 for participants. AZAV certification itself costs roughly €2,700 and takes about four months to obtain; no German EASC institute currently holds it, largely because it is economically unattractive at the course volumes involved, and longer programmes of a year or more do not qualify for this funding at all. A related concern raised at the end of 2025 — very short, often subsidized programmes such as a five-day "certified business/systemic coach" course through the Würzburg Chamber of Industry and Commerce, which emphasize knowledge transfer over practical experience and personal development — was seen as a competitive pressure that, depending on how EASC training is positioned and marketed, could also sharpen the case for the duration, scope, and depth of EASC programmes.

In Hungary, EASC institutes compete with an established, non-academic international certification system; there, EASC training is positioned on the strength of its genuine, professionally qualifying credential.

European identity and network, high quality standards, and a professionally qualifying outcome were identified as EASC's core competitive and marketing arguments. A new EASC website is planned from November 2026, alongside a communication strategy built around European identity and community.

5.2 Cooperation with Other Associations

In Switzerland, there is interest in cooperating with the BSO, since BSO membership is a precondition for certain tenders and assignments from which EASC members are sometimes excluded. This is held back by the effort a renewed recognition process would require, despite EASC's already higher requirement level. The board named a broader structural obstacle: limited interest in cooperation from national associations, particularly in the German-speaking (DACH) region, where EASC tends to be seen as a competitor rather than a partner.

The Budapest Congress brought EASC into direct contact with ANSE's president, opening the door to further conversations. Separately, a Hungarian coach-supervisor association already in contact with ANSE now recognizes EASC, providing a first, indirect link between EASC and ANSE. A separate, still-inconclusive conversation is under way about possible cooperation with an association for Supported Communication (Unterstützte Kommunikation).

6.0 Recurring and Deferred Topics

Two substantial items remained open across multiple meetings during the year. The use of artificial intelligence in coaching, supervision, and EASC's own training programmes was tabled for lack of time at both the March and June 2026 meetings and has not yet been substantively addressed at the institute level. The qualification pathway from Supervisor to Master Coach made comparatively little progress: an informal vote in December 2025 showed majority support for developing a formal proposal, with the CQS expected to take it up in January; by March 2026, however, only the Manual's diagram marking the transition points was available, with no agreed method for weighing the individual components against one another; by June 2026 the topic remained with Volker Tepp and was again postponed for lack of new information.

7.0 Conclusion: Toward the November Members' Meeting

The 2025–2026 period was defined by the practical translation of the new Manual into working examination practice, and by the deliberate, carefully-paced build-out of Organizational Development as EASC's third profession. Alongside this, the network continued to navigate rising competitive pressure in several countries, uneven cooperation with sister associations, and open questions about how new curricula and independent trainers should be resourced and governed. Several of the year's central threads — the OD trainer criteria, the dedicated examination manual, and the amendment to the fee schedule — are due to converge at the November members' meeting. The institutes' next regular exchange is scheduled for 7 December 2026.

Christoph Schalk
(Institutes' Speaker)