BusinessCentral

EMPLOYER BULLETIN

11 April 2023

A Weekly News Digest for Employers

EMPLOYER NEWS

ACC support possible for more Kiwi workers

Kiwis could get better access to ACC support for a greater number of occupational diseases, including those more likely to affect women, ACC Minister Peeni Henare announced last week.

The Government is reviewing the list of occupational diseases in Schedule 2 of the Accident Compensation Act for the first time in 15 years.

"Kiwi workers' experience will be an important part of updating the list. Workers don't have much control over work tasks or environments that over time could cause disease, illness or injury. We want to make sure access to ACC cover involves the right occupational diseases and is working for all New Zealanders," Peeni Henare said.

"Most of the occupational health research internationally and in Aotearoa New Zealand is focused on men. We can better support women if we understand what diseases they are experiencing in the workplace and highlight where we need to know more.

"By reviewing the list and asking for people's feedback and experiences, we can better understand how occupational disease claims fit into that bigger picture of women accessing ACC support.

Public submissions and the International Labour Organisation's List of Occupational Diseases will be used to draw up suggestions for an updated list of occupational diseases. These will be assessed by medical experts, who will also look at the latest occupational health research to determine what should be included going forward.

For more information and to make a submission, please visit the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment's website. Submissions will be open from 5 April to 17 May.

New Zealand Government [5 April 2023]

New Zealand's biggest data breach shows retention is the sleeping giant of data security

Over one million past and present New Zealand drivers' licences have been exposed as part of the attack on Latitude Financial, as well as people's passports. Some of the 14 million New Zealand and Australia records taken are up to 18 years old, which isn't okay.

Liz MacPherson, New Zealand's Deputy Privacy Commissioner says that data retention is emerging as a key issue in several recent domestic and global cyber-attacks including the Latitude Financial breach.

"Data retention is the sleeping giant of data security. There are consequences for holding onto data you no longer need. All businesses and organisations can learn from this: don't collect or hold onto information you don't need. The risk is simply too high for your customers and your organisation. Don't risk being a hostage to people who make it their day job to illegally extract data."

"A key finding from the NZ Institute of Directors' Director Sentiment Survey report, released late last year, was that a significant proportion of boards were not sufficiently prepared for a digital future and had an "it won't happen to us" approach. The message from the Office of the Privacy Commissioner is "wake up to yourselves". We talk to organisations almost every week who are counting the cost of a cyber data breach. Can you risk the impact to your customers and your reputation?"

Agencies should not be collecting or retaining personal information unless it is necessary for a lawful purpose connected with their function or activity. All agencies should have a personal information retention schedule that they review regularly. The simple discipline of deciding how long information will be retained as you collect it and acting on these decisions will save you and your customers a lot of pain.

Privacy needs to become a core business issue, as important as health and safety.

Office of the Privacy Comissioner [3 April 2023]

Interim Response to the Productivity Commission's Report - Immigration

The Government has released its interim response to the Productivity Commission's Report, Immigration – Fit for the Future.

The Government's interim response summarises the major reforms being undertaken to drive a more coordinated, connected and longer-term approach to workforce planning and development, as well as the further work that's needed based on the Commission's recommendations.

"A key theme of the Commission's recommendations was improving productivity and labour market outcomes by better-connecting the immigration, skills, training and education systems.

"Regional Skills Leadership Groups, Industry Transformation Plans, Workforce Development Councils and the Reform of Vocational Education all go a long way to position New Zealand's immigration, education, training and skills systems to better-respond to current and future labour market needs.

"Our reforms ensure employers have incentives to hire, train and invest in Kiwis and workers already in New Zealand and that the immigration system makes it easier to attract those with high-skills and addresses talent shortages," Grant Robertson said.

Immigration Minister Michael Wood said the Immigration Rebalance is a key part of the reforms.

"The Government's immigration rebalance has been designed to ensure we have the right mix of high-skilled migrants to grow the New Zealand economy," Michael Wood said.

"For example, the Accredited Employer Work Visa (AEWV) introduced a wage threshold, currently set at the median wage, as a mechanism to shift from low-skilled, low-waged migrant workers to high-skilled, highly paid migrant workers. It also made it easier for migrants to change employers, consistent with the Commission's recommendations.

"In addition, proposed changes to the Skilled Migrant Category align with the Commission's recommendation to provide greater certainty to skilled migrants, simplify the points system and close the gap between eligibility and available spaces.

"The Commission recommended improving the transparency and public understanding of the Government's strategic direction of the immigration system.

"Our priority is to improve how we communicate the goals for the immigration system and that we balance immigration policy objectives with broader government objectives, including how we manage demands on housing, education and health services that migration brings," Michael Wood said.

New Zealand Government [3 April 2023]

Temple Manager found guilty in immigration fraud case

Immigration New Zealand (INZ) welcomes the conviction handed down to 49-year-old Auckland man Rajvinder Singh for his part in an immigration scam.

Singh, previously a manager of the Nanaksar Thaht Isher Darbar Sikh Temple in Manurewa, pleaded guilty on 2 representative charges of providing false and misleading information. The offence carries a penalty of up to 7 years imprisonment and/or a fine of up to $100,000.

The prosecution was brought after a worker at the Temple was found to have made 6 visa applications while using a fraudulently obtained passport between 2013 and 2017.

Mr Singh, who was a friend of the applicant and had known him under his real identity when they had previously done volunteer work at the Temple, sponsored them on 6 separate visa applications knowing the applications contained false and misleading details.

Cases can be reported to the MBIE Service Centre on 0800 20 90 20. Offending can also be reported to the New Zealand Police on 105 or 111 (in an emergency) or anonymously to Crime Stoppers on 0800 555 111.

Immigration New Zealand [3 April 2023]

Government delivers massive boost to working holiday workforce

Businesses could soon have access to thousands of additional working holiday makers as the Government boosts the number of working holiday places for Spain and extends the period for working holiday makers currently in New Zealand, Immigration Minister Michael Wood announced.

"So far over 52,000 working holiday visas have been approved, with nearly 36,500 working holiday makers entering the country since borders reopened. But we know demand is ongoing, so we want to make travelling and staying on here as attractive as possible.

"From today, working holiday makers currently in New Zealand with visas due to expire between now and 30 September will have their visa extended by six months. They will also have open work rights, meaning they can work for the same employer for longer than three months, where maximum work durations currently apply.

"This change will help address casual workforce shortages in tourism and hospitality industries, two sectors that have traditionally employed working holiday makers.

"The extension will affect around 7,500 working holiday makers, who can extend their stay and continue to work in their current casual jobs, or travel around our beautiful country and find other work.

New Zealand Government [4 April 2023]

EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS AUTHORITY: FOUR CASES

Unsuccessful personal grievance claims

Ms Kent was employed by Central Otago Living Options Limited (COLO) as a support tutor, assisting in providing support services to some of the people that COLO supported in the community. Ms Kent had various complaints about events that she claimed occurred during her employment and the way in which she said she was treated. She raised personal grievances for unjustifiable dismissal and unjustified actions causing disadvantage to her employment.

The Employment Relations Authority (the Authority) granted non-publication orders prohibiting the publication of the name and identity of any of the people COLO provides support services to who were referred to in the evidence.

The first point considered about Ms Kent's unjustifiable dismissal claim was that Ms Kent resigned. She said her resignation was an unjustifiable dismissal because she resigned in response to a breach of duty by COLO, and it was therefore a constructive dismissal. There was, however, an additional element that impacted on Ms Kent's personal grievance, which was the status of her employment. COLO said Ms Kent was a casual employee and Ms Kent said she was a permanent part-time employee. Ms Kent was employed by COLO from July 2020 on a casual employment agreement.

The Authority assessed the real nature of the employment relationship and found that, while there was some regularity in Ms Kent's work, it was not sufficiently regular to create a pattern of work that was permanent. The evidence showed she worked varying rosters with different shifts and differing hours each week and she could refuse to accept any rostered shift.

Reflecting on the various factors and assessing overall how the employment relationship operated, the Authority concluded there was no obligation on COLO to offer work to Ms Kent and there was no requirement imposed on Ms Kent to accept work. The employment relationship was a casual one and the circumstances in which her employment stopped could not give rise to an unjustified dismissal grievance.

The Authority then assessed Ms Kent's unjustified action claims. The first claim was about travel expenses for use of her own car to travel to work locations. Ms Kent never claimed petrol expenses in the course of her work with COLO, and as a result, was never paid any petrol expenses. The Authority assessed the evidence and concluded there was no breach by COLO in terms of Ms Kent's rights to claim travel expenses, and therefore, there was no basis for an unjustified action causing disadvantage in connection with the claim.

Ms Kent's second claim was that Ms Wildey, the chief executive officer of COLO, disclosed information about her that was personal and confidential to one of the people COLO supported in the community, with whom she worked. The Authority referred to the individual as XJP. Ms Kent said the breach of her privacy was a breach of duty by COLO. Ms Wildey denied telling XJP the personal information about Ms Kent. Ms Wildey said she did not know the detail of the personal information that she was alleged to have disclosed, so could not have done so.

The Authority also heard evidence from an individual who supports XJP in a private capacity and she explained her close relationship with XJP. One of the points she made was that when she discussed Ms Kent's claim with XJP, he told her that Ms Wildey had not told him the personal information about Ms Kent as was alleged and he had not told Ms Kent that Ms Wildey had done so. Based on the evidence, the Authority was not persuaded that Ms Wildey did disclose Ms Kent's personal information to XJP and concluded there was no breach of duty by COLO.

Ms Kent also claimed that after she raised her personal grievance in relation to her personal information, COLO reduced the hours she worked each week. The Authority reviewed the evidence regarding the hours worked by Ms Kent, including the time sheets and contemporaneous correspondence about her work. In early March 2021, Ms Kent told COLO she was no longer able to do sleepovers and she later advised she no longer wished to be involved in the care provided to XJP.

The Authority found that any reduction in shifts, and therefore hours of work, offered to Ms Kent by COLO reflected the two instructions from Ms Kent. The Authority therefore concluded there was a reduction in hours of work given to Ms Kent after she raised her personal grievance in February, however it was in response to Ms Kent's instructions about the shifts she wanted to work and not a reaction by COLO to her personal grievance. COLO's actions were justified.

The Authority determined there was no basis for Ms Kent's personal grievances for unjustifiable action causing disadvantage. Ms Kent's claims for personal grievances did not succeed.

Kent v Central Otago Living Options Limited [[2022] NZERA 586; 10/11/2022; P van Keulen]

Employer's disciplinary process held to be fair and reasonable despite disadvantage claim succeeding

Mr Maddock was employed as a truck driver by The Pallet Company Limited (Pallet) from 29 June 2018 to 17 June 2021, when he was summarily dismissed for serious misconduct. Mr Maddock claimed he was unjustifiably dismissed and disadvantaged due to being suspended. He also claimed Pallet breached section 120 of the Employment Relations Act 2000 (the Act) by failing to provide a written statement of the reasons for his dismissal when requested.

Mr Maddock kept a notebook containing issues he experienced with his management and the workplace. These were to do with feeling unwelcome and laughed at, alongside other incidents. On 2 June 2021, Mr Mudgway, a production manager, enforced a new rule that Mr Maddock disagreed with, because he was checking in on his work. Mr Maddock went to management because "he had had enough of [previous matters]".

During the discussion, Mr Maddock said Mr Mudgway appeared agitated and made threatening gestures towards him, punching his clenched fist against his open hand. Mr Maddock cautioned Mr Mudgway as he considered it threatening. Mr Maddock and Mr Mudgway agreed to go elsewhere to discuss the concerns in Mr Maddock's notebook.

Meanwhile, Mr Mudgway said Mr Maddock had come in aggressively, and Mr Robertson, a production manager, warned him his manner was threatening. Mr Maddock told Mr Robertson not to get involved because "he was in big trouble too". Mr Maddock also allegedly said to Mr Mudgway, "watch yourself or I'll knock your block off" and responded to Mr Robertson that he was next, and in serious trouble.

Mr Maddock then brought up a record he made of Mr Mudgway saying, "I suppose [the Health and Safety Officer] was Indian." At this, Mr Maddock said Mr Mudgway expressed offence at what he perceived was Mr Maddock's inference that his remarks were racist. Mr Mudgway confirmed he was offended and agitated, and did swear, but stated it was not at Mr Maddock.

Pallet's managing director became involved and suggested Mr Maddock be stood down on full pay, which he agreed to. Mr Maddock said he left with Mr Mudgway following him down the stairs, yelling at him that he was not a racist. The managing director emailed Mr Maddock that afternoon confirming a suspension for the length of an investigation. Mr Barton, a director of Pallet, wrote a letter to Mr Maddock dated 2 June 2021, inviting him to a disciplinary meeting "to explain why [he] threatened" Mr Mudgway and Mr Robertson, and referencing Pallet's house rules policy.

Mr Maddock's representative wrote to Mr Barton on 14 June 2021, raising a formal complaint against Mr Mudgway. He alleged that there had been a physical assault and referred to Mr Maddock's suspension. The parties discussed their options and ultimately held the disciplinary meeting on 17 June 2021. During this, the issues were discussed, and Mr Barton requested Mr Maddock's explanation, which he gave.

Mr Barton considered Mr Maddock's allegations of Mr Mudgway pushing him and gesturing. He weighed this against other evidence and discarded it on the balance of probabilities and adjourned to discuss the issue. When the meeting resumed, Mr Barton confirmed the summary dismissal of Mr Maddock for serious misconduct. On 18 June 2021, Mr Maddock's representative requested the reason for the termination of his employment in writing, which was not provided.

The Employment Relations Authority (the Authority) considered whether Mr Maddock was unjustifiably disadvantaged by his suspension. While his employment agreement did not have a suspension clause, the Authority found it was initially justified on the health and safety concern of Mr Maddock's driving duties.

However, on 11 June 2021, Mr Maddock's representative wrote that Mr Maddock was fit to return to work. Mr Maddock should have been provided with reasons for a continued suspension and asked for his feedback beforehand. Therefore, Mr Maddock was held to be unjustifiably disadvantaged from this date onwards. During his continued suspension, Mr Maddock did not know if he would be paid after his sick leave finished, and it increased his anxiety prior to the disciplinary meeting. To remedy this, the Authority ordered a payment of $2,000.

Whether Mr Maddock was unjustifiably dismissed was based on the Act criteria of whether Pallet acted fairly and reasonably and followed procedural fairness. Turning to consider Mr Maddock's dismissal, the Authority noted that he was informed of the allegations, including his right to a support person, the possible outcomes and relevant information; and provided an opportunity to explain, which Pallet considered.

Pallet's letter did not list dismissal as an outcome, but it referenced the employment agreement and policies, which did. Pallet also did not formally respond to Mr Maddock's formal complaint but provided the opportunity to address it in the meeting and considered it. The Authority found Mr Mudgway's swearing was an adjective, so not abuse, even if it was offensive; therefore, the complaint was unsubstantiated. The flaws were minor, consistent with the employer's resources, and did not result in unfairness. Mr Maddock was therefore not unjustifiably dismissed.

Finally, section 120 of the Act is a strict rule. It is breached by failing to provide the written reason for termination. The Authority considered Mr Maddock's distress over his dismissal against Pallet's small resources and considered a penalty of $1,000, with half going to Mr Maddock and half to the Crown. Costs were reserved.

Maddock v The Pallet Company Limited [[2022] NZERA 594; 14/10/2022; E Robinson]

Constructive dismissal claim dismissed as concerns were not raised during employment

Mr Juhyun Lee was granted a three-year work visa on 29 August 2019. He began working as a mechanic for Motor King on 9 September 2019 until he resigned on 5 October 2020. Motor King was run by Mr and Mrs Lee and Mr Ng worked alongside Mr Lee in the workshop. Mr Juhyun Lee's resignation letter stated that he resigned because of the unsafe work environment and that he was required to do work that was not part of his role.

On 13 October 2020, the parties met and discussed his resignation, which was the first time any of the concerns mentioned in the letter were raised. Mr Juhyun Lee said he would not return even if the environment was improved. Accordingly, a personal grievance was raised to the Employment Relations Authority (the Authority) alleging that the workplace was so unsafe that he sustained eye and shoulder injuries and that he had to undertake work outside of his job description.

The Authority assessed the merit of the claim of Mr Juhyun Lee's eye injury which he sustained while doing rust work on a vehicle without adequate safety goggles. During his induction, three types of safety goggles were provided. Additionally, a mechanic with ten years' experience did not need to be told to wear goggles with side shields when doing work where debris was likely to fly around. This injury was only reported after twelve months to Mr and Mrs Lee and was not declared as a work-related injury to his doctor.

In relation to Mr Juhyun Lee's claim that they serviced heavy trucks which was beyond his expertise, the Authority found that the basic maintenance work did not require specialist licences. Any issues that required a heavy vehicle technician were sent out to a specialist mechanical centre. During the interview, the applicant understood the work to be part of the job. He complained that he did not receive any guidance but did receive guidance from Mr Lee and only did basic things such as changing oil and light bulbs in the trucks, the same way it was done for cars.

When Mr Juhyun Lee questioned why his hourly rate did not match that of a heavy vehicle automotive technician, he was told that he did not have the necessary qualifications. Mr Lee told him that he did not have to work on trucks if he did not want to. Mr Juhyun Lee was unclear when asked what additional guidance or support he needed, and instead complained about the basic tools he had to use to which the Authority said were not essential from a safety point of view.

In relation to the allegation that Mr Juhyun Lee had to do panel beating work outside of his job description, the minor body repairs were found to be within the applicant's job description and anything major was sent out to a panel beater, while he was only involved in work with small rust patches. Mr Juhyun Lee produced video evidence, which was not shown to Mr or Mrs Lee as a safety concern during the employment, showing a vehicle with extensive rust which he claimed he worked on. There was no evidence that Mr Lee knew or instructed the applicant to do the rust work.

Mr Juhyun Lee also alleged he got a shoulder injury from working in a confined space where he was working underneath a truck while it was slightly raised. The equipment used to hold up the car was able to support the weight of the truck and so the injury was caused by his own 'human error' and not a health and safety breach by Mr or Mrs Lee. After four weeks of ACC leave, Mrs Lee asked for a medical certificate before he was allowed back in the workplace to ensure he was fit and able to work.

Ultimately, no safety issues were breached by Mr or Mrs Lee and the issues complained of were not reported during the course of employment. Mr Juhyun Lee was not constructively dismissed but voluntarily resigned because he was unhappy with the work he was employed to do, wanted to be paid more and had intentions to move to Australia, proven by his visa application made roughly two months before he resigned.

The claims failed and Mr and Mrs Lee were entitled to a contribution to their actual legal costs and $8,000 for their time for the two day investigation. Costs were reserved.

Mr Lee v Mr & Mrs Lee Limited [[2022] NZERA 582; 9/11/22; R Larmer]

Dismissal for breach of health and safety policy deemed to be fair and reasonable in the circumstances

Mr van der Berg worked for James Hardie New Zealand Limited (James Hardie) from 2015 until his dismissal in 2020. He was dismissed on the grounds that he breached James Hardie's health and safety policies and procedures. Mr van der Berg raised a personal grievance for unjustified dismissal, seeking reimbursement of lost wages and compensation for hurt and humiliation. James Hardie denied the claim and said Mr van der Berg's dismissal was justified.

Mr van der Berg commenced employment with James Hardie on 21 November 2015. The parties entered into an individual employment agreement on 28 November 2018. It included a policy around health and safety and stated that any breach or failure to comply with the health and safety rules could result in disciplinary action, including termination.

James Hardie also had an "Asia Pacific Safety Pledge" ('Zero Harm Pledge') which included a commitment to not put productivity ahead of safety or enter machinery without locking and testing isolations. On 9 June 2017, Mr van der Berg signed the Zero Harm Pledge.

An employee had previously been killed at James Hardie's plant in 2009 when they were pulled into the sheet scrap conveyor machine when the conveyor had not been isolated and where the lock out, tag out procedure had not been utilised. Strict safety protocols were put in place to protect employees working on the machine following this incident.

On 28 May 2020, two contractors engaged by James Hardie arrived on site. Mr van der Berg said he and the contractors discussed the installation job and hazards on site.

While undertaking a plant walk to conduct safety observations, Mr Haridayil, James Hardie's former Environmental Health and Safety Manager, observed Mr van der Berg tightening the bolt of the railing with one leg over the cross bar. Mr Haridayil asked Mr van der Berg why he had not locked out the machine, who stated he considered it was safe to go on. Mr Haridayil told Mr van der Berg not to continue the task and that it would be completed the next day when the machine was isolated and locked out. Mr van der Berg followed Mr Haridayil's instruction straight away.

On 29 May 2020, Mr van der Berg attended a meeting with James Hardie's services manager, and Mr Barker, People and Performance Business Partner. During the meeting, Mr van der Berg was advised that James Hardie was considering suspending him on full pay while it investigated the incident. Mr van der Berg declined an offer to take time to consider the proposal to suspend him and stated he understood it was an important safety breach and he would follow the process.

On 5 June 2020, Mr Billingsley, the then plant manager, wrote to Mr van der Berg advising him that, following its investigation, James Hardie considered his actions may amount to serious misconduct. The letter invited Mr van der Berg to attend a formal disciplinary meeting on to discuss his response to the allegation. Mr van der Berg was provided with evidence alongside the invitation. On 8 June 2020, Mr van der Berg provided his response to the allegations.

On 15 June 2020, Mr van der Berg attended an outcome meeting. James Hardie proposed to terminate Mr van der Berg's employment with notice for serious misconduct. Mr van der Berg was provided with the opportunity to provide feedback prior to 17 June 2020 in advance of any final decision being made.

On 16 June 2020, Mr van der Berg provided written feedback to the proposed outcome. Mr van der Berg refuted the allegations against him. He asked James Hardie to reconsider its decision to dismiss. On 25 June 2020, Mr van der Berg attended a meeting. James Hardie confirmed its view that Mr van der Berg's behaviour had irreparably damaged the trust and confidence essential to the employment relationship. He was advised his employment was terminated effective immediately. Following the meeting, Mr van der Berg raised his personal grievance for unjustified dismissal and unjustified disadvantage.

The Employment Relations Act 2000 (the Act) requires the Employment Relations Authority (the Authority) to assess on an objective basis, whether an employer's actions were what a fair and reasonable employer could have done in all the circumstances at the time the dismissal occurred. A dismissal must be effected in a procedurally fair manner.

Mr van der Berg was provided with the details of the allegations and concerns raised against him, given opportunities to respond to them, and when he requested relevant documents, James Hardie provided them. The Authority was satisfied James Hardie took into account Mr van der Berg's responses about what happened before it reached its findings.

The Employment Court has long considered safety issues to have a status of their own, and where safety is genuinely involved in the operations of an employer, it is not just another ingredient in the mix.

The Authority found Mr van der Berg was well aware of the importance James Hardie placed on health and safety and of its Zero Harm Pledge, to which he had signed up to as an employee. The Authority concluded that James Hardie's decisions that Mr van der Berg's actions constituted serious misconduct and dismissal was an appropriate outcome were fair and reasonable in the circumstances. Mr van der Berg's application was unsuccessful. Costs are reserved.

Van der Berg v James Hardie New Zealand Limited [[2022] NZERA 543; 25/10/2022; S Blick]

LEGISLATION

Note: Bills go through several stages before becoming an Act of Parliament: Introduction; First Reading; Referral to Select Committee; Select Committee Report, Consideration of Report; Committee Stage; Second Reading; Third Reading; and Royal Assent.

Eight Bills are currently open for public submissions to select committee.

- Māori Fisheries Amendment Bill (13 April 2023)
- Child Support (Pass On) Acts Amendment Bill (12 April 2023)
- New Zealand Superannuation and Retirement Income (Controlling Interests) Amendment Bill (24 April 2023)
- St Peter's Parish Endowment Fund Trust Bill (26 April 2023)
- Immigration (Mass Arrivals) Amendment Bill (27 April 2023)
- Resale Right for Visual Artists Bill (27 April 2023)
- Regulatory Systems (Education) Amendment Bill (1 May 2023)
- Education and Training Amendment Bill (No 3) (1 May 2023)

Overviews of bills-and advice on how to make a select committee submission-are available at: https://www.parliament.nz/en/pb/sc/make-a-submission/

The purpose of the Employer Bulletin is to provide and to promote best practice in employment relations.

If you would like to provide feedback about the Employer Bulletin,
contact: comms@businesscentral.org.nz
or for further information, call the **AdviceLine on 0800 800 362**

ENTERPRISE SERVICES

0800 800 362
advice@businesscentral.org.nz
www.businesscentral.org.nz

ADVICELINE

AdviceLine is your link to first-rate employment relations advice. Business Central understands the difficulties employers can have with managing employees, so supports you with dedicated employer advisors.

TRAINING SERVICES

Our training team provide you with practical training solutions across various employment topics to help upskill your staff, giving your business a competitive edge.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY CONSULTANTS

Health and Safety and the well-being of your employees should be of paramount importance to any employer. To help you along the way, we have a friendly and knowledgeable Health and Safety Consultant.

EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS CONSULTANTS

Employment Relations can be a difficult area to navigate. When you need close guidance on employment matters, you can rely upon our seasoned ER Consultants to be there to help.

LEGAL

When employees test the waters with a personal grievance, Business Central Legal are here to help. We offer representation in all employment law matters.

ENTERPRISE SERVICES

0800 800 362
advice@businesscentral.org.nz
businesscentral.org.nz

ADVICELINE

AdviceLine is your link to first-rate employment relations advice. Business Central understands the difficulties employers can have with managing employees, so supports you with dedicated employer advisors.

This service is 100% inclusive of your membership. There is no time limit to your call, and the team is available 8am–8pm Monday to Thursday and 8am–6pm Friday.

Our Employer Advisors are well trained and comprise a mixture of legal and business backgrounds. They understand your issues and can help advise you on legal requirements and best practices. They are backed up by a large resource base they can call on to support with you with written resources, guides, and templates.

TRAINING SERVICES

Our training team provide you with practical training solutions across various employment topics to help upskill your staff, giving your business a competitive edge.

Whether it be best practice processes under the Employment Relations Act and the Health and Safety at Work Act, leadership training or personal development, the Business Central training team are dedicated to facilitating your business's professional learning.

For more information about Business Central's public and customised in-house courses, or to register for a course, contact the team today.

For regular training updates in your area, subscribe to our Training Update newsletter.

04 470 994, training@businesscentral.org.nz, businesscentral.org.nz

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY CONSULTANTS

Health and Safety and the well-being of your employees should be of paramount importance to any employer. To help you along the way, we have a friendly and knowledgeable Health and Safety Consultant.

Adrienne has extensive experience with helping companies navigate Health and Safety requirements. She understands companies need to see sound return on investment for their well-being initiatives. Adrienne offers full support with compliance issues such as induction training and hazard identification and management. Additionally she can help with preparation for ACC 'Workplace Safety Management Practices'.

EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS CONSULTANTS

Employment Relations can be a difficult area to navigate. When you need close guidance on employment matters, you can rely upon our seasoned ER Consultants to be there to help.

Having someone equipped to help you do the work can take the stress out of a tricky situation.

Our Consultants have a wide range of experience and are prepared to help. Whether you need to update your agreements or policies, or embark on performance management, they have the experience to make a difference. There are so many areas they can help; it may be union issues and managing a difficult relationship or it could be confirming a restructuring selection matrix.

LEGAL

When employees test the waters with a personal grievance, Business Central Legal are here to help. We offer representation in all employment law matters.

Business Central Legal provides you best return on investment for legal advice on employment law matters. Our team of lawyers are only available to members, and can help solve your tricky issues.

While you may think of lawyers as representing people in court, this is far from everything they do. Employers take advantage of the value of the Business Central Legal team to help in drafting documents such as tailored employment agreements and offers of employment. Additionally they can help with key guidance on difficult issues as restructuring processes and rock solid performance management plans.