



Executive Coaching Fee Survey

An analysis of 2008 fee structures used by executive coaches

Council Perspectives™

Members of The Conference Board Councils are among the most experienced and savvy executives in the world. Their private deliberations produce rich insights on the most challenging business and societal issues of our time. With their permission, we have channeled their energy and expertise into a platform to voice their views—that platform is *Council Perspectives*.

Council Perspectives is based on sessions from selected Council meetings, post-meeting interviews, and other pertinent data, and may sometimes include original content written by Council members. It is not intended to be a research report; rather, *Council Perspectives* provides a unique look into the minds of executives from leading global organizations as they assess, analyze, and develop ways to address critical issues.

Executive Coaching Fee Survey

An analysis of 2008 fee structures used by executive coaches

The first and second annual Executive Coaching Fee Surveys were fielded in 2006 and 2008 to determine the rates organizations pay for executive coaching services and how that coaching is administered. Responses indicate that the executive coaching industry as a whole remains healthy, is growing globally, and is moving toward increased standardization. The respondents represent a wide range of industry segments, and include global firms and large to very large organizations in terms of both revenues and number of employees.

This report offers an analysis of the 82 organizations—including council members, previous conference attendees, and special interest groups from the International Coach Federation—surveyed by The Conference Board Council on Executive Coaching in 2008, as well as the 31 companies surveyed in 2006. The participants who answered the questionnaires are directly involved in hiring coaches—no coaches or executives being coached participated in the survey.

It provides insight into:

- 4 [Costs of Executive Coaching](#)
- 10 [Terms of Coaching Engagement](#)
- 15 [Internal Coaching](#)

Costs of Executive Coaching

Key Findings

Survey results indicate that, generally, the use of coaching increases with the level of the executive, and the rates that organizations are willing to pay for such services vary widely.¹ Highlights of findings include:


- The hourly rates that companies pay for coaching services range from under \$200 to more than \$500 for services at all levels of an organization.
- The biggest range in rates paid can be found among organizations with small revenues.
- In general, coaches' hourly rates tend to rise as the executive being coached reaches the higher levels of an organization, and as a company's revenues increase.
- However, not everyone at a company's top level is receiving coaching. Some respondents say they don't pay to coach the CEO or other members of the C-suite, therefore leaving a number of leaders without exposure to such development.
- Executive coaching is reaching junior executive levels of some organizations, and includes leaders more than five levels below CEO.
- Large organizations are the least likely to provide coaching services to executives two to five levels below the CEO and his/her direct reports within the C-Suite, and companies with revenues of \$20 billion or more do not coach their lowest remaining leadership levels.
- Executive coaching is also being used outside the United States. Approximately 60 percent of rates around the world match those of the United States, which is used as a benchmark in this survey. When they do not match U.S. rates, they are most often lower.

Hourly Rates for Coaching of CEOs and Direct Reports

Organizations that coach their top layer of executives pay a wide range of fees—anywhere from under \$200 per hour to more than \$500 per hour—with most spending in the higher price ranges. On average in 2008, organizations report paying between \$301 and \$400 dollars for coaching services at the C-suite level, with a median rate of \$425.50. The most commonly stated fee, however, is greater than \$500 per hour.

Fees have increased since 2006. In 2008, more than one-third (37 percent) of respondents who use coaching services at the C-suite level report paying more than \$500. In 2006, only 26 percent paid more than \$500 (Chart 1).

A small portion of respondents in 2008 report paying less than \$200 to coach a company's CEO and his/her reports. And 12 percent of all respondents in both the 2006 and 2008 surveys report that they didn't provide any kind of coaching services to their top level of executives.



¹ The rates-per-hour section of the survey was revised between 2006 and 2008, with the 2008 survey providing a more specific hourly fee breakdown than the 2006 questionnaire. The 2008 price breakdowns: less than \$200, \$201 to \$300, \$301 to \$400, \$401 to \$500, greater than \$500, and not applicable. The 2006 rates were broken down as follows: below \$250, \$250 to \$400, \$400 to \$500, greater than \$500, and not applicable.

Chart 2

Average Rate Paid to Coach CEO and Direct Reports—by Industry

Non-financial services pay the widest range of rates to coach their C-suite executives.




Chart 3

Average Rate Paid to Coach Employees 2 to 5 Levels below C-suite—by Industry

Financial services firms pay at all price points to coach executives two to five levels below C-suite.





Chart 4

Average Rate Paid To Coach at Remaining Leadership Levels—by Industry

The most common hourly rate to coach remaining leadership levels is \$400 and less, regardless of industry.



■ \$200 or under ■ \$201-\$300 ■ \$301-\$400 ■ \$401-\$500 ■ > \$500

Note: Percents may not add up to 100 exactly due to rounding.

Cross-Tabulation Breakdown by Revenue Size

Chart 5

Size of Companies That Pay to Coach the CEO and CEO's Direct Reports

The smallest companies pay the widest range of fees to coach their CEOs and direct reports.




Chart 6

Size of Companies That Coach Employees 2 to 5 Levels below C-suite

The most common hourly rate to coach executives two to five levels below C-suite is between \$301 and \$400, regardless of revenue size.





Chart 7

Size of Companies That Pay to Coach Remaining Leadership Levels

The largest organizations are the least likely to coach remaining leadership.




■ \$200 or under ■ \$201-\$300 ■ \$301-\$400 ■ \$401-\$500 ■ > \$500

Note: Percents may not add up to 100 exactly due to rounding.

Between 43 and 63 percent of organizations, depending on industry, will pay more than \$400 per hour. In 2008, the industry sectors least likely to engage in executive coaching at the C-suite level are manufacturing and non-financial services²—19 percent of all respondents in both industry sectors report that they do not provide coaching services for their CEOs. When companies in the non-financial sector do provide coaching, the fees paid reach every price point (Chart 2).

When sorted by revenue size, companies with profits between \$5 and \$10 billion are least likely to coach the C-suite—18 percent of organizations in this revenue range indicate that they do not provide coaching for their top layer of executives. When companies do provide coaching, the most common rate paid to coach top execs varies by company size. For example, companies with revenues of less than \$1 billion, revenues between \$5 billion and \$10 billion, and revenues of \$20 billion or greater most commonly pay more than \$500 per hour; while a little more than one half (55 percent) of companies with revenues of \$1 billion to \$5 billion are likely to pay between \$301 and \$400 per hour.



Note: Percents may not add up to 100 exactly due to rounding.

The greatest range of fees paid belongs to companies with revenues of less than \$1 billion. Eight percent pay less than \$200 to coach their most influential executives, while no companies in any other earnings category pay at that price point (Chart 5).

Hourly Rates for Executives Two to Five Levels below the CEO

Organizations that pay to coach these levels of employees did not pay much more for such services in 2008 than they did in 2006. Note that the middle ranges (\$201 to \$300, and \$301 to \$400) in the 2008 survey are about the same as the range of \$250 to \$400 in the 2006 survey.

About two-thirds (70 percent) of respondents who do pay to coach executives two to five levels below the CEO report spending between \$201 and \$400 in 2008 per hour for these services, while 63 percent reported paying between \$250 and \$400 in 2006 (Chart 8).

When broken down by industry, for 2008, companies least likely to provide coaching services to employees at this level fall in the non-manufacturing category, with 13 percent indicating that they do not pay for coaching at this level. The most common rate paid by sectors that do provide coaching is \$301 to \$400, except for financial services, whose rates of pay are more evenly distributed among all price points (Chart 3).

In a breakdown by revenue, the largest companies (revenues of greater than \$20 billion) are the least likely to provide coaching for their mid-level executives, with 14 percent of respondents in this revenue range reporting that they do not provide coaching at this level. When these largest firms do provide coaching services, they pay fees ranging from less than \$200 to greater than \$500 per hour. But most companies of this size generally pay between \$301 and \$400 to coach their mid-level workers (Chart 6).


² Non-financial services include retail/wholesale, healthcare, business professionals, and communications services.

Hourly Rates for Remaining Leadership

Results show that fewer lower-level managers are getting coached, but for those companies who are providing coaching at such levels, hourly rates remain primarily under \$400.

In 2008, a little more than two thirds (67 percent) of respondents who do provide coaching at these levels indicate paying \$300 or less. A mere 4 percent report paying between \$401 and \$500, and only 2 percent report paying more than \$500 to coach their bottom echelon of employees (Chart 9).

Nearly one third of all survey respondents (31 percent) indicate not paying for any type of coaching at this level, up from 25 percent in 2006.



Note: Percents may not add up to 100 exactly due to rounding.

The industries that do not engage in coaching employees at this level are financial services (40 percent) and non-financial services (38 percent) (Chart 4).

In a breakdown by company size, organizations with revenues greater than \$20 billion are least likely to provide coaching services for lower levels of employees, at 41 percent. Firms with revenues greater than \$10 billion that provide coaching to their lowest-level of executives pay the widest variety of price points of any other-sized firm. Close to one-tenth (8 percent) of companies with revenues of \$20 billion or greater pay more than \$500 to coach their junior-level executives (Chart 7).

Rates outside the United States

Coaching is now prevalent in the following regions: Europe, 48 percent; Asia, 39 percent; South America, 27 percent; Australia, 27 percent; and Africa, 20 percent. Companies that use coaches outside the United States generally pay at or below U.S. rates, except for Europe. The median pay rate for both the United States and Europe is \$425.50, which, in 2008, is also the average pay rate in Europe.

The most commonly stated fee for coaching a company's top tier of executives in Europe, however, is greater than \$500 per hour, same as in the United States. More than three quarters (83 percent) report matching the United States at this rate of pay. An additional 17 percent report paying a quarter more than the U.S. benchmark (Table 1).

Table 1

Europe: Average Hourly Rate for CEO and Direct Reports

	\$200 or under		\$201 to \$300		\$301 to \$400		\$401 to \$500		Over \$500	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
-99%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
-75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
-50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
-25	0	0	1	50	0	0	1	9	0	0
Same as U.S.	0	0	0	0	4	57	6	60	10	83
25	0	0	1	50	2	29	2	21	2	17
50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
100%	0	0	0	0	1	14	1	6	0	0

Sixty percent of all respondents who employ coaches in Europe report paying in the \$401 to \$500 range, which matches the most commonly paid rate in the United States. A little under one-tenth (9 percent) pay a quarter less than U.S. rates, slightly more than one-fifth (21 percent) pay a quarter more than U.S. rates, and another 6 percent pay twice what they would pay in United States.

No European companies report paying \$200 or less to coach their top layer of executives, while half of the respondents who pay in the \$201 to \$300 price range say they pay 25 percent less than the U.S. benchmark. The other half of respondents who pay in this price range pay one quarter more than the U.S. benchmark to coach the top executive level. More than half (57 percent) of companies who coach the C-suite at the \$301 to \$400 pay range match U.S. rates, while 29 percent pay a quarter more than the United States and 14 percent pay 100 percent more.

The 2008 survey results also indicate more variability among rates in Europe and Asia than in other regions, and greater participation overall—particularly in South America and Africa. Results also point to coaching's continuous growth overseas (Table 2).

There are indications that coaching is growing on a more global scale. In written survey responses, one company indicated that it is in the incipient stages of “rolling out” its global coaching strategy.

Table 2

International Difference in Fees Paid for Executive Coaching

	2006								
	-99%	-75%	-50%	-25%	Same as U.S.	25%	50%	75%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	0%	10%	40%	40%	10%	0%	0%
Asia	0	0	0	20	40	20	20	0	0
South America	0	0	0	0	75	25	0	0	0
Australia and New Zealand	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0
Africa	0	0	0	50	50	0	0	0	0
	2008								
	-99%	-75%	-50%	-25%	Same as U.S.	25%	50%	75%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	0%	9%	65%	21%	0%	0%	6%
Asia	0	0	4	21	63	13	0	0	0
South America	0	0	11	21	68	0	0	0	0
Australia and New Zealand	0	0	21	79	0	0	0	0	0
Africa	0	7	7	29	57	0	0	0	0

Note: Percents may not add up to 100 exactly due to rounding.

Terms of Coaching Engagement

Results indicate that the standardization of terms may be increasing, and that business units and corporate centers primarily fund the executive coaching services for a company. Rates have become more stable over time, and variability in fees is based on a coach's experience and the level of the coachee.

Coaches are selected using a combination of factors, such as experience and level of executive being coached. Engagements most often last nine months or less, and in general, coaches spend between one and six hours per month working directly with the executive being coached. Most companies employ coaches for one to five engagements per client per year. Invoicing is done mainly on a monthly basis, but billing as services are rendered is also somewhat common.

Funding Sources

Business units maintained their position as the primary source of funding in 2008. More than three quarters of respondents in both surveys report that the funding source resides in the business unit (Table 3).

Corporate centers show the most significant increase as the provider of coaching funds since 2006. The percentage of respondents who report corporate center control of money paid to coaches jumped 14 percentage points, from 32 percent in 2006 to 46 percent in 2008.

Table 3

Source of Coaching Funding

	2006 N=31	2008 N=82
Business Unit	77%	79%
Corporate Center	32	46
Other	6	5

Note: Multiple selections allowed.

Coach Selection

Companies appear to be more interested in hiring coaches with a combination of experiences, rather than specialization in a particular area or topic. And while a third of respondents say a coach's qualifications are a factor when choosing a coach, they did not address "certification" specifically.


A coach's experience played a much larger role in 2008 than in 2006, rising in importance from 29 percent to 40 percent (Chart 10). In 2008, respondents also placed greater emphasis on a coach's qualifications and the level of executive being coached than they did in 2006: only 29 percent indicated the level of the executive being coached as important in 2006, while 38 percent felt it was important in 2008. The importance of a coach's qualifications jumped from 23 percent in 2006 to 33 percent in 2008—a 10 point increase.

The importance of specialty areas of expertise edged downward slightly, from 13 percent in 2006 to 11 percent in 2008, while the importance of a combination of skills rose from 52 percent to 57 percent.

Among written survey responses, one company said it is "holding coaching accountable to given qualitative and quantitative results" and asks its coaches to "have a solid business background rather than a softer background."

Chart 10

Coach Selection Criteria




Note: Multiple selections allowed.

Average Length of Time per Engagement

Respondents to the 2008 survey indicate that three quarters of all engagements last nine months or less, up from less than two-thirds in 2006 (Chart 11).


The implementation of six-month engagements is becoming increasingly popular, jumping 24 percentage points from 27 percent in 2006 to 51 percent in 2008. Therefore, the percentage of engagements for other durations all fell. In 2006, 28 percent of respondents indicated using 12-month engagements, while in 2008 only 20 percent indicate year-long engagements. Nine-month engagements plummeted from 28 percent in 2006 to 15 percent in 2008; 3-month engagements edged down from 10 percent in 2006 to 9 percent in 2008; and engagements lasting over a year edged downward from 7 percent to 6 percent.



Note: Percents may not add up to 100 exactly due to rounding.

Coaching Time per Month


Just about half (49 percent) of the 2008 survey respondents indicate that coaching time per month lasts between 1 and 4 hours, while 71 percent overall indicate using 6 hours or less of coaching time per month (Chart 12). It is unclear whether this includes front-end work on data gathering, and it may be the perceived time per month rather than the actual time, since survey respondents include only those directly involved in hiring executive coaches, not the executives or coaches themselves.



Note: Percents may not add up to 100 exactly due to rounding.

Number of Engagements Initiated per Coach per Year

Most coaches have just a handful of engagements per year per organization, according to the survey responses. In 2008, 51 percent of respondents report hiring coaches for one to five engagements per year, down from 57 percent in 2006. The percentage of coaches performing a number of engagements in the middle range—6 to 15—rose to 24 percent in 2008 from 18 percent in 2006 (Chart 13).



There is a significant increase in coaches having at least 16 (or more) engagements per year. The percentage of coaches hired for between 16 and 25 engagements per year jumped to 11 percent in 2008, from zero in 2006.

However, the number of coaches holding 25 or more engagements rose only slightly to 12 percent in 2008, from 11 percent in 2006.


Rate Structure

Standardization among rates is increasing. In 2008, 54 percent of respondents say they pay a standard fixed rate per engagement, and 43 percent say they pay a standard fixed rate by the hour or day, up from 48 percent and 32 percent, respectively, in 2006 (Chart 14).

However, the actual amount that companies will pay per engagement varies. A few organizations said in written responses that they base their rates more on the coach's experience and level of coachee and less on time or location.

In 2008, 38 percent of respondents indicate using variable rates based on experience of the coach, and 35 percent determine what they'll pay based on the level of the coachee.

In some cases, companies have a set of standard fees per engagement rather than hourly rates, although setting "engagement rates" often involves estimating the number of coaching days or hours per week.



Some respondents report fees ranging from a low of \$13,000 to a high of \$30,000 for a six-month engagement. For example, one company says that for a six-month engagement it pays between \$15,000 and \$25,000 for C-suite coaching and from \$10,000 to \$15,000 for coaching at the next levels. Another company says it pays \$25,000 for CEO coaching, \$15,000 to coach its upper management, and between \$7,000 and \$10,000 to coach middle management.

One company adds that “executive coaching contracts are usually a flat fee including assessments, interviews, face-to-face, and telephonic coaching meetings.” However, 55 percent of respondents indicate that assessment instruments and materials are an added cost in 2008, versus 39 percent in 2006.

Unlike 2006, 32 percent of the 2008 respondents compensate coaches for travel time. Likewise, 2008 is also the first time that companies indicate using coaches who have set rates based on the results achieved—5 percent of respondents indicated this. One respondent noted that “we have ‘results guarantee programs’ where the coaches do not get paid if the leader does not achieve the agreed-upon results.”

Fee Changes—How Often Coaches Raise Fees

Respondents don’t expect coaches to raise fees very often. Only 5 percent indicate that their organization was willing to consider an annual change in rates in 2008, compared to 67 percent in 2006, while no respondents in 2008 and only 4 percent of organizations in 2006 considered more than one rate change per annum (Chart 15).

Actual changes in fees occurred less than once a year, with no automatic or expected increases. Only 2 percent of 2008 respondents indicated coaches actually raising their fees annually, and none raised them more than once a year, compared to 42 percent of respondents who indicated coaches raising fees once and 4 percent who indicated raising them more than once in 2006 (Chart 16).

Chart 15
How Often Is a Raise in Rates Considered?





Chart 16
How Often Do Coaches Raise Rates?



Invoice Processing

Most invoicing is done monthly or as services are rendered. “Varies by engagement” as a payment option jumped to 28 percent in 2008 from 16 percent in 2006. And paying as services are rendered gained in popularity in 2008, with 27 percent billing this way, compared to 19 percent in 2006 (Chart 17).


Paying monthly remained one of the most the common ways for invoicing. A little more than a third (35 percent) indicate their coaches bill each month in 2008, compared with 38 percent in 2006.

The way in which invoices are processed also serves as an indicator of increased standardization. No respondents chose “other” as a form of invoicing for 2008, versus 16 percent choosing unspecified forms of payment in 2006.

Split payment forms saw mixed results. The percentage of coaches invoicing for half payment at the beginning and the other half at the end of the term of service jumped from 10 percent in 2006 to 20 percent in 2008, according to respondents. Conversely, the percentage of coaches billing in installments of a third of payment each at the beginning, middle, and end of services rendered fell from 13 percent in 2006 to 9 percent in 2008.

According to respondents, the percentage of coaches wanting full payment up front decreased from 10 percent in 2006 to 6 percent in 2008, and the percentage billing in full only at the end of the engagement slipped from 7 percent in 2006 to 6 percent in 2008. Those invoicing based on a specified deliverable became even less common, dropping from 3 percent in 2006 to a mere 1 percent in 2008.

Chart 17
How Invoices Are Processed



Internal Coaching

Internal coaching exists in many organizations. In 2008, 75 percent of respondents who answered this question report that they use internal coaches.

Internal Coaches' Roles Split Among Other Functions


The majority of individuals who perform internal coaching devote very little time to it. Only a handful of respondents whose companies have internal coaches indicate that these coaches spend more than half of their time in that role. Executive coaching is most of the job for only 17 percent of internal coaches, and their duties are hazy (Chart 18).

A little over one-third (35 percent) engage in individual executive coaching, 20 percent do 360 debriefs, 6 percent engage in career coaching, and 11 percent in team coaching, but what team coaching entails is not defined. Another 29 percent responded that they perform "other" types of coaching, but exactly what type is not delineated (Chart 19).

One respondent says that most of the company's internal coaches have been trained in-house by its senior vice president of human resources, and all its internal coaches are part of the human resources department. The majority of this organization's internal coaches also have had extensive experience with 360 processes and feedback, and all have excellent consulting skills.

Chart 18


Internal Coaching: Percentage of Time Devoted To Coaching (2008)



Note: Percents may not add up to 100 exactly due to rounding.

Chart 19

Internal Coaching: Type of Coaching Performed (2008)



Note: Percents may not add up to 100 exactly due to rounding.

Conclusion

Overall, the executive coaching industry is showing steady growth, and its popularity is leading to increased standardization, as well as a growing global presence.

While a company's revenue size and the status of the executive being coached help drive rates, a broad range of rates are being used across all categories of executives, and organizations are beginning to see a standardized way of invoicing in the United States. The most common duration of an engagement is nine months, but may be dropping, and coaches spend four hours or less per month working directly with their coachees.

Internal coaches are also making a solid showing. While a handful devote the majority of their time to coaching, the bulk of the internal coaches only provide such services for a portion of day, performing such tasks as 360 reviews.

Rates vary internationally and most are below those of the United States, with the exception of Europe.

Appendix

About the Survey Participants


Industries Surveyed

Both surveys cover a wide cross-section of industries, with the 2008 survey providing a more detailed industry breakdown than the 2006 questionnaire. In 2006, 51 percent of survey respondents came from the manufacturing sector, 14 percent from financial services, and 35 percent from an undefined “other” category (Chart 20).

The original survey was revised before it was distributed again in 2008 to include the new “non-manufacturing,” “non-financial,” and “government/public administration/non-profit” categories. A little more than one quarter (26 percent) of respondents in 2008 came from the new “non-financial services” category, which includes retail/wholesale, healthcare, business professionals, and communications services.


Two categories from the original survey garnered over a third of the responses in 2008, with 22 percent coming from manufacturing and 21 percent from financial services. Another 12 percent came from the new “government/public administration/non-profit sector;” 10 percent from the new “non-manufacturing” category, which covers the energy, utilities, construction, and transportation industries; and 9 percent of participants from an undefined “other” category.

Chart 20
Survey Participants by Industry



2008:

A more detailed segmentation



Size of Companies Surveyed

Mostly large organizations participated in the survey—66 percent have at least \$5 billion in revenues and 32 percent have at least \$20 billion in revenues (Chart 21); 61 percent have 10,000 or more employees and 32 percent have 50,000 or more employees (Chart 22); and 27 percent of respondents do business in 50 or more countries (Chart 23).

Chart 21
Survey Participants by Revenue






Chart 22
Number of Full-time Employees



Note: Percents may not add up to 100 exactly due to rounding.

Companies That Operate in the Number of Countries Surveyed

The companies surveyed indicate a growing global presence over the past few years.



The Functional Responsibility of Respondents

Survey respondents in 2008 are the individuals directly responsible for purchasing coaching services for their organizations. They report having a functional responsibility in at least one of the following areas (multiple answers were allowed): leadership development (72 percent), coaching (67 percent), and talent development (51 percent). Succession planning (45 percent) and human resources (33 percent) made a healthy showing as well (Chart 24).

In addition, one fifth of survey respondents indicate that they have other functional responsibilities, including executive development, organizational development, people development, performance management, learning, mentoring, new learning integration, and career development.



- how coaches are paid;
- whether coaching fees increase with the size or wealth of an organization;
- how organizations invoice their coaches;
- the cost of coaching outside the United States;
- the length of a coaching engagement; and
- how much time a coach spends with a coachee.

Both surveys polled council members, previous conference attendees, and special interest groups from the International Coach Federation (a worldwide resource for business and personal coaches). The 2006 survey had 31 participants, while the 2008 survey saw 80 different organizations respond. The 2006 questionnaire was revised to provide a more detailed breakdown in certain areas, including industry sectors and hourly rate breakdowns, when it was administered the following year.

About This Report

This report is based on two surveys, one administered in 2006 and one in 2008, with the goal of increasing knowledge about the executive coaching market. The idea for the first survey stemmed from a 2004 meeting of the Council on Executive Coaching, during which members raised questions regarding the following aspects of executive coaching:

- how coaches are paid;
- whether coaching fees increase with the size or wealth of an organization;
- how organizations invoice their coaches;
- the cost of coaching outside the United States;
- the length of a coaching engagement; and
- how much time a coach spends with a coachee.

Both surveys polled council members, previous conference attendees, and special interest groups from the International Coach Federation (a worldwide resource for business and personal coaches). The 2006 survey had 31 participants, while the 2008 survey saw 80 different organizations respond. The 2006 questionnaire was revised to provide a more detailed breakdown in certain areas, including industry sectors and hourly rate breakdowns, when it was administered the following year..

This report was originally published in August 2008 by The Conference Board as Research Report Number R-1430-08-RR *The 2008 Executive Coaching Fee Survey*

About the Authors

Lee WanVeer is vice president of learning at Prudential Financial, responsible for the executive coaching practice and leadership development of the global company. WanVeer is also chair of The Conference Board Council for Executive Coaching. He brings over 20 years of leadership development, training, and organizational development experience to his current roles.

Sheri Rothman is an associate editor at The Conference Board. She is also an award-winning journalist who has written for *The Washington Post*, *Credit Union* magazine, *Bank Investment Marketing* magazine, and numerous business websites and newsletters.



About The Conference Board Council Program

Membership in one of our Councils affords entrée into a select community of 2,500 executives from a broad array of industries, functions, and regions who know the value of this rich source of insights and new approaches.

Enduring relationships are the cornerstone of the Councils experience. Enhanced by our global, enterprise-wide reach, these relationships span the world and extend value across your organization. Confidential peer dialogue combines broader perspective, specific knowledge, and shared experience to save you precious time and public missteps.

Features of the council experience include: **Collective problem solving** that makes your issue *the* agenda item in our peer assist process. **A unified voice** raised via The Conference Board statements and publications. **Benchmarking** through regular surveys of members of related Councils. **Multi-function insights** and an added wealth of perspective when Councils members work together across functions and geographies in more than 100 Councils worldwide, covering more than 50 functions **Virtual communities** that extend the learning 24/7 with a variety of online forums and other resources.

To learn more, contact Katie Plotkin, Councils Membership Manager, +1 212 339 0449 or katie.plotkin@conference-board.org. Council participation is by invitation only and is an exclusive benefit for The Conference Board member organizations.





About The Conference Board

The Conference Board is a global, independent business membership and research association working in the public interest. Our mission is unique: to provide the world's leading organizations with the practical knowledge they need to improve their performance *and* better serve society.

The Conference Board creates and disseminates knowledge about management and the marketplace, conducts research, convenes conferences, makes forecasts, assesses trends, publishes information and analysis, and brings executives together to learn from one another. The Conference Board is a not-for-profit organization holding 501 (c) (3) tax-exempt status in the United States.

Publications team

Charles Mitchell Publishing Director

Sheri Rothman, Lee WanVeer Authors

Henry Silvert Research

Megan Manni Editor

Peter Drubin Design

Andrew Ashwell Production

To download this publication free of charge, visit www.conference-board.org

Public relations contact:

Frank Tortorici, +1 212 339 0231 or frank.tortorici@conference-board.org

To become a member or inquire about membership with The Conference Board, call:

Americas +1 212 339 0345

Europe, Middle-East, and Africa + 32 2 675 5405

Asia-Pacific + 852 2804 1000

South Asia + 91 9987548045



The Conference Board, Inc.

845 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022-6600
United States
Tel + 1 212 759 0900
Fax + 1 212 980 7014

The Conference Board Asia-Pacific

22/F, Shun Ho Tower
24-30 Ice House Street, Central
Hong Kong, SAR
Tel + 852 2804 1000
Fax + 852 2869 1403

The Conference Board China

Beijing Representative Office
7-2-72 Qijiyuan,
9 Jianwai Street
Beijing 100600 P.R. China
Tel + 86 10 8532 4688
Fax + 86 10 8532 5332
www.conference-board.cn (Chinese)

The Conference Board Europe

Chaussée de La Hulpe
130, box 11
B-1000 Brussels Belgium
Tel + 32 2 675 5405
Fax + 32 2 675 0395

Conference Board India

701 Mahalaxmi Heights, A Wing
Keshav Rao Khadye Marg
Mahalaxmi, Mumbai 400 011
India
Tel + 91 9987548045
Tel + 91 9820300749
Fax + 91 2267464001
www.conference-board.org/worldwide/india.cfm

The Conference Board of Canada

255 Smyth Road
Ottawa, Ontario K1H 8M7
Canada
Tel + 1 613 526 3280
Fax + 1 613 526 4857
www.conferenceboard.ca

www.conference-board.org