

Institutional Assessment Guide

How professional bodies and reviewers can examine the framework against competencies, ethics, and scope-of-practice boundaries.

Proprietary methodology. Ubuntu Roots Coaching™ is a proprietary methodology of **Maturity.Coach**.

This guide orients professional coaching organisations — standards bodies, credentialing organisations, review panels, educators, and program directors — to examining Ubuntu Roots Coaching™ against professional competencies, ethics, and scope-of-practice boundaries. The framework is explicitly **designed to be examined**, and studies or reviews need not be favourable to be welcome.

This is a condensed orientation. The interactive Institutional Assessment page is the authoritative source; where this summary and that page differ, the site page governs. For research-oriented study, see the Research & Evaluation Concept Note.

1. Evidence posture — read this first

Ubuntu Roots Coaching™ is a practice framework seeking rigorous assessment, critique, refinement, and evidence development. **It requires independent validation before efficacy claims can be made**, and no claim of independently verified evidence is made anywhere on the site. Reviewers should treat the framework as a set of propositions and questions to be examined — not as validated practice.

The site labels claims by their evidence status (framework proposition, illustrative practice, research question, evidence under development). A fair review assesses the *coherence and responsibility* of the proposition, not a body of outcome evidence that the framework does not claim to have.

2. What to examine

Six lenses a professional body or reviewer can apply:

Review lens	What to examine
Competency alignment	How the framework's stances and practices map to recognised coaching competencies (for example ICF, EMCC, or AC), and where it extends or diverges from them.
Ethics & scope of practice	Whether the framework keeps clear professional boundaries — client autonomy, informed consent, confidentiality — and stays within coaching rather than therapy or clinical care, with referral pathways to qualified support.
Conceptual coherence	Whether the relational premise, the Living Tree Model, and the five dimensions form an internally consistent and defensible construct.
Cultural responsiveness	Whether the use of wisdom traditions as inspiration (not ownership) holds up under scrutiny, and how the attribution protocol performs in practice.
Feasibility & implementation	Whether the framework can be delivered as intended within real engagements and institutional settings, and what supervision and fidelity conditions it requires.
Acceptability	How clients, coaches, and stakeholders experience the approach — including its boundaries and limits.

3. Ethics and scope-of-practice checkpoints

Points a reviewer can verify directly against the framework's materials:

- The framework positions itself as coaching, **not** therapy, trauma treatment, or clinical care, and directs clients needing therapeutic care to licensed professionals.
- Community involvement is voluntary and consent-based; "community" never obliges a client to disclose private information or to involve family, colleagues, or stakeholders.
- Organisational applications are presented as illustrative possibilities, never guaranteed outcomes.
- Confidentiality boundaries are explicit, including how (if at all) anything is reported to an organisational sponsor.
- Practitioners are expected to work within their existing coaching credentials and supervision — the framework is not presented as a standalone certification absent formal accreditation.

4. Cultural responsiveness

The framework draws on named wisdom traditions as inspiration, not ownership, and does not claim authority over or representation of those traditions. Reviewers examining this dimension should consult the Ethical & Cultural Stewardship Guide and the site's stewardship materials, which set out the attribution protocol, the use/avoid language policy, and the standing invitation for verification and correction by scholars and culture bearers. Where a cultural attribution is marked "in progress," treat it as provisional by design.

5. Scope: what Ubuntu Roots is — and is not

Ubuntu Roots Coaching™ is	It is not
A relational, community-centered coaching framework	Therapy or trauma treatment; not psychotherapy
A structured approach to leadership reflection and development	A religious doctrine, ceremonial practice, or spiritual direction
A model for exploring identity, relationships, stewardship, and legacy	A substitute for mental-health care, clinical care, or legal advice
A methodology designed for professional inquiry and responsible adaptation	A substitute for cultural permission or lived expertise; not cultural appropriation
A framework seeking rigorous assessment, critique, and evidence development	A mandate to involve family, community, or colleagues

6. Requesting materials and beginning a review

Institutions and professional bodies are invited to request the materials needed for a considered review through the site's partnership and contact pathway. A review can reasonably pair the lenses in Section 2 with the participant protections and study designs described in the Research & Evaluation Concept Note, and should establish up front what data — if any — the institution will see, consistent with the framework's consent and confidentiality boundaries and its Data Governance standards.

Any use of the methodology or its materials beyond examination is governed by the Intellectual Property & Licensing terms.

Related documentation

- Institutional Assessment (authoritative source)
- Research & Evaluation Concept Note
- Framework overview
- Data Governance
- Intellectual Property & Licensing

© 2026 Ubuntu Roots Coaching™ — a proprietary methodology of Maturity.Coach. This guide is a secondary orientation; the site's Institutional Assessment page is the authoritative source. It does not assert validated outcomes or constitute accreditation.