BusinessCentral

EMPLOYER BULLETIN

7 August 2023

A Weekly News Digest for Employers

EMPLOYER NEWS

Government prescribes daylight disinfectant to modern slavery

The Government is working alongside business to deliver on its commitment to address modern slavery by introducing new legislation that requires organisations and businesses to be transparent about their operations and supply chains through a new public register.

Organisations with over $20 million in revenue will be required to report and outline the actions they take to address exploitation risks in their operations and supply chains.

"Since the pandemic, we've seen modern slavery balloon globally. The International Labour Organization and Walk Free now estimates that 50 million people are in modern slavery on any given day, compared to an estimated 40 million in 2016.

"The changes will mean that conscious Kiwi consumers will have more transparency about the products and services they consume. World Vision estimates Kiwi households inadvertently pay an average of $34 each week to industries whose products are implicated in modern slavery.

"We have commitments in our Free Trade Agreements with the United Kingdom and the EU to take steps to prevent modern slavery in our supply chains and promote responsible business conduct. A lack of action will be detrimental to our trading relationships."

New Zealand Government [28 July 2023]

Nurses accept pay equity offer

More than 30,000 Te Whatu Ora-employed nurses will receive a pay rise and a one-off lump sum payment to address historic pay equity issues, as announced by Minister of Health Ayesha Verrall.

"Under this Government, last year more than 8000 nurses registered for the first time, a 60 per cent increase from the previous year, and in the last quarter the number of nurses registered to practice in New Zealand grew by about 2000.

"We're also committed to improving pay rates for our nurses to help address decades of under-payment, and to remove the undervaluation of work performed by women.

In addition to increased pay rates, nurses will receive a lump sum payment of up to $15,000.

The new pay rates will be backdated to 7 March 2022, providing pay equity increases of 6.5 per cent for senior nurses and 4.5 per cent for registered nurses, enrolled nurses, health care assistants and mental health care assistants.

Senior nurses will earn between $105,704 and $153,060 per annum full time, plus penal rates and registered nurses will earn between $69,566 and $99,630 per annum full time, plus penal rates.

"This is the second pay rise for nurses in the past nine months – the first being the interim 14 per cent pay equity adjustment paid in April this year and backdated to 7 March 2022, and the $10,000 lump sum payment (pro-rated) already part paid," Ayesha Verrall said.

New Zealand Government [31 July 2023]

Government welcomes startup report

The Government today welcomed the report of the Startup Advisors Council on steps to support a thriving environment for high-growth startups in New Zealand.

The report recommends actions to support and strengthen the environment for New Zealand startups, which in turn will drive economic growth, innovation, and job creation.

The report's 25 recommendations are centred on 4 themes. These include:

- fostering greater connectivity
- supporting capability building including attracting and growing talent
- increasing access to capital
- supporting a cultural shift to encourage more entrepreneurialism.

Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment [1 August 2023]

Annual wage cost inflation remains at 4.3 percent

"Annual wage costs continued to increase at historically high rates this quarter, equal to the 4.3 percent annual increase last quarter," business prices delivery manager Bryan Downes said.

Average ordinary time hourly earnings, as measured by the Quarterly Employment Survey (QES) in the year to the June 2023 quarter, increased 6.9 percent to reach $39.53.

"Public sector wage inflation tends to be driven by collective agreements across broad industry and occupation groups and can therefore be subdued in quarters when no major pay settlements occur," Downes said.

"However, in the year to June 2023 quarter, both public and private sector wage cost inflation were closer to each other, up 4.2 percent and 4.3 percent, respectively."

"The largest contribution to the LCI in the June 2023 quarter came from the retail trade and accommodation industry, up 1.5 percent on a quarterly basis, following a rise of 0.7 percent last quarter. The rise in minimum wage was a core driver for the increase in wage growth in this industry over the quarter," Downes said.

However, the minimum wage increase accounted for a relatively small proportion of pay increases overall across all industries, as more respondents cited factors such as cost of living, matching market rates, and/or retaining or attracting staff.

Statistics New Zealand [2 August 2023]

Unemployment rate at 3.6 percent

Unemployment, along with underemployment and the potential labour force, is one of the components that comprise underutilisation – a broader measure of spare labour market capacity than unemployment alone.

The underutilisation rate increased from 9.1 percent (revised) to 9.8 percent this quarter. The largest increase came from growth in underemployed part-timers, who wanted and were available to work more hours.

In the year to the June 2023 quarter, the labour force participation rate reached 72.4 percent, the highest rate recorded since the Household Labour Force Survey (HLFS) began in 1986.

"Despite its small size, a quarter of all annual employment growth was recorded in key tourism-related industries," Collett said.

In the year to the June 2023 quarter, the number of people employed increased 113,000 (4.0 percent) to 2,927,000. The employment rate reached 69.8 percent, the highest rate recorded by the HLFS since the series began in 1986.

The employment rate for women increased to 65.4 percent, the highest rate since the series began. The employment rate for men increased to 74.4 percent, the highest rate since 1987.

Within the potential labour force, available potential jobseekers were up 5,500 to 67,600 and unavailable jobseekers were up 3,000 to 26,000.

Statistics New Zealand [2 August 2023]

More Kiwis in work as wages keep pace with inflation

More than 110,000 people joined the paid workforce in the past year as the number of those in jobs hit a record high. Wages continue to outpace inflation as the Government's economic plan supports businesses to add jobs and grow wages and ease cost of living pressures, Grant Robertson said.

"People in work in record numbers and robust wage growth is a positive result in what is a challenging global environment. The economy added 113,000 jobs in the June year and average hourly wage wages rose 6.9 percent to $39.53, keeping pace with inflation.

"Our economic plan is working. We have added 322,000 jobs since 2017, unemployment continues to be relatively low, firms are continuing to hire despite an uncertain global environment and inflation is heading in the right direction," Grant Robertson said.

"We are investing in building the productive capacity of the economy. More than 200,000 people are in apprenticeships and trade training, research and development spending hit record levels last year and we're investing in digital and technology such as games development to build for the future. Infrastructure spending will top $71 billion over the next five years, with another $6 billion in the National Resilience Plan to build back better.

"This reflects our focus on getting young people ready for work through such programmes such as the Apprenticeship Boost Scheme which has seen 60,000 apprentices supported by the Scheme. There are also more people earning, learning or upskilling through other employment programmes like Mana in Mahi, Māori Trades and Training and He Poutama Rangatahi.

"Māori unemployment has fallen, with more in paid work, while the Pacific unemployment rate rose slightly. Overall, it shows our interventions are working and are key to unlocking the potential of Kiwis as well as bolstering the workforce and our economy," Carmel Sepuloni said.

On comparable measures, New Zealand's 3.6 percent unemployment rate matches Australia and the US, and is below the 4 percent in the UK and 5.2 percent in Canada. The OECD average is 4.8 percent.

New Zealand Government [2 August 2023]

Clearer pricing at supermarkets imminent

New regulations will require grocery retailers to consistently and clearly display pricing by weight, volume or number.

Kiwis will find it easier to compare product prices at the supermarket, with new regulations due to come into force at the end of August, Consumer Affairs Minister Duncan Webb announced today.

"New unit pricing regulations are a step forward in the Government's wider work to increase competition in the retail grocery sector," said Duncan Webb.

"Unit pricing will support inter-brand competition and encourage grocery retailers to compete on best value for money, benefitting customers in the long term."

"This will help Kiwis to make informed choices to suit their needs while shopping. This is particularly helpful where products are sold in different sized packaging and by various brands." Duncan Webb said.

While the regulations come into force on 31 August, there will be a transitional period before compliance is mandatory, providing retailers time to put the required systems in place.

Statistics New Zealand [3 August 2023]

EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS AUTHORITY: FIVE CASES

Labour Inspector discovers several breaches by employer

The Labour Inspector (LI) brought claims for penalties against Elev 8 Global Limited (Elev 8) and Mrs Jeon, the sole director and shareholder of Elev 8. The claims against Mrs Jeon were as a person involved in Elev 8's breaches of the Employment Relations Act, the Minimum Wage Act, and the Holidays Act.

Elev 8 operated Elev 8 Skincare Academy and Beauty Clinic, K-Beauty and Elev 8 Toning Table Centre from commercial premises in Dunedin. In late 2019, complaints regarding employment standards at Elev 8 were made to Immigration New Zealand and to the LI about Elev 8 and Mrs Jeon. The LI required Elev 8 and Mrs Jeon to provide a list of employees employed between May 2017 and January 2020, copies of their employment agreements, time and wages records and holiday records of certain employees. While Mrs Jeon provided some information, the LI sought further information through the complainants and had further exchanges with Elev 8 and Mrs Jeon. The LI set out her views in a draft report in April 2020 and the present claims were lodged in the Authority in August 2020.

The Employment Relations Authority (the Authority) outlined the issues that arose and the employees to whom the claims related, Ms Yuk, Ms Choi, Mr Yoon, Ms Park, and Ms Wang. Elev 8 and Mrs Jeon defended the claims and said that Ms Yuk worked as a volunteer, was never an employee and that records were only kept for its employees. In respect of Ms Choi, Mrs Jeon said the records were barred by a record of settlement between her and Elev 8. In respect of Mr Yoon, Mrs Jeon said he never started working so the company had no obligation to keep records. In respect of Ms Park, Mrs Jeon claimed that they could not provide pay records due to her accountant's mistake but said she was only in employment for 10 days in total. In respect of Ms Wang, Mrs Jeon compiled holiday, leave, wages and time records after the LI's request and were not kept during the employment.

Upon investigation, it was found that Ms Yuk was employed by Elev 8 and was owed arrears under the Minimum Wage Act and the Holidays Act. It was found that Mr Yoon did work for Elev 8 during February and March 2019 so Elev 8 should have kept employee records. The Authority also concluded that the record of settlement between Ms Choi and Elev 8 did not bar the Labour Inspector from seeking penalties for alleged breaches of the Holidays Act and Employment Relations Act. Elev 8 also breached the Holidays Act and Employment Relations Act by not keeping holiday and leave records for Mr Yoon, Ms Park and Ms Wang.

For the statutory breaches for not keeping employee records, Elev 8 was liable for penalties and Mrs Jeon was liable as the person involved in the breaches. The LI was advised to lodge submissions regarding the appropriate penalties to be recovered for the breaches so Elev 8 and Mrs Jeon could then lodge submissions in reply. Costs were reserved.

Labour Inspector v Elev 8 Global Limited [[2023] NZERA 223; 04/05/2023; P Cheyne]

Employer failed to properly consult and did not communicate the actual selection criteria for redundancy

Ms Sherard worked at NZ Bus's Glenfield depot from 2012, progressing into the role of duty supervisor. On 18 April 2020, Ms Sherard was made redundant after a restructure where she was an unsuccessful applicant for a role she applied for and declined a redeployment offer. Ms Sherard sought a claim of unjustified dismissal at the Employment Relations Authority (the Authority).

In 2020, NZ Bus restructured its mid-managerial tiers, disestablishing duty supervisors and establishing new roles like the Glenfield service delivery manager. NZ Bus asked everyone affected to apply to any of the new roles, gave their job descriptions and said selection would be determined by the interview panel. However, the interview panel did not ensure an objective assessment as they considered additional information, which was not initially discussed with Ms Sherard. Mr Wilson, the operations manager

spoke against Ms Sherard for her communication style; staff concerns about her which were never initially discussed; and a belief that she wanted additional days off. Ms Sherard was unaware of any of this.

On 25 March 2020, a staff member, W, advanced towards Ms Sherard, slammed a roster on her desk and yelled crassly at her about it. Ms Sherard left the room upset and emailed a formal complaint to Mr Wilson. Managerial staff investigated and rearranged the roster to divide W and Ms Sherard but did not communicate this or that the case was closed to her.

On 1 April 2020, Ms Sherard tried to arrange a meeting with Mr Wilson to discuss the complaint, but he could only talk on the spot, proposing an action that he did not undertake. He also informed Ms Sherard her application was unsuccessful due to another applicant having more experience. The applicant had less experience as a duty supervisor than Ms Sherard, so it was clear that NZ Bus was not being transparent with the selection process. She decided that the actual reasons for being unsuccessful were due to incidents of her risk-averse approach to handling sick staff during Covid lockdown, and her complaint about W.

To consider redeployment, Mr Wilson asked Ms Sherard if she was interested in being a service delivery supervisor for the Swanson depot. Although this position was a step towards being a service delivery manager, this was not communicated to Ms Sherard and she later claimed that had she known this, she would have accepted the offer. Ms Sherard was concerned that the Swanson depot had more problematic drivers and she could potentially encounter W. Mr Wilson added pressure by telling her the decision needed to be made overnight. She declined the role as the drivers were problematic, she needed to look after her own health, and there was the possibility of extended travel time. Mr Wilson responded that consequently Ms Sherard's last day would be 17 April 2020. Ms Sherard emailed Go Bus's human resources on 8 and 14 April 2020 about her complaint with no communication of action. On 15 April 2020, Mr Wilson said a new service delivery manager would investigate and send a meeting invite. Neither step was taken.

The Authority considered the events that led to Ms Sherard's redundancy rather than redeployment. The panel at the interview considered different criteria than what it communicated it would, including issues not put to Ms Sherard. Her lack of information on the true criteria impacted her chances of success. She also said that had she been told of the new career pipeline, she would have taken Mr Wilson's offer. Rather, she was rushed into a decision without adequate information or exploration of her concerns. A more thorough discussion than an overnight offer could have uncovered these concerns. NZ Bus failed to properly consult with Ms Sherard and give her sufficient time. If NZ Bus correctly followed process on these two redeployment opportunities, Ms Sherard may not have been made redundant.

The Authority concluded NZ Bus unjustifiably dismissed Ms Sherard. She was awarded three months' lost wages at $15,284.75. The Authority also awarded $18,000 in compensation for hurt and humiliation as her confidence was seriously affected, and she became distressed in her general life. NZ Bus also did not meet its obligation to sufficiently follow up and investigate Ms Sherard's complaint, or its good faith obligation to update her. Mr Wilson's discussion in passing was not enough time to convey the incident's impact nor did he ask. NZ Bus did not take responsibility for properly investigating the complaint. As a result of this, Ms Sherard believed the complaint impacted on her non-appointment and it contributed to her rejection of the Swanson role. NZ Bus's actions were therefore to her disadvantage. Ms Sherard was strongly affected in the days following the incident and experienced anxiety seeing W out of work later. For this the Authority added on $3,000 in compensation. Costs were reserved.

Sherard v Transportation Auckland Corporation Limited [[2023] NZERA 228; 05/05/23; N Craig]

Unilateral redundancy process followed leading to termination of employee

Mr He was employed by Cheertop Trading Limited (Cheertop), a food wholesaler, as a delivery driver/warehouse assistant. He commenced his employment on 4 June 2019 and claimed he was unjustifiably dismissed when he was made redundant in June 2020. He also claimed he was unjustifiably disadvantaged in that he was issued a formal warning by Cheertop relating to an absence from work in May 2020.

On 29 May 2020, Mr He was advised that his employment would be terminated, Cheertop was restructuring and that his last day would be on 19 June 2020. Mr He confirmed that he was not given a written employment agreement but there was an agreement that he would be employed on a full-time basis working at least 40 hours a week. Cheertop produced records, printed from its electronic files, of Mr He's hours of work.

The Employment Relations Authority (the Authority) found that Mr He was overpaid by being paid for time he did not work and so his wages were reduced to 80 per cent commencing from 26 March 2020. Mr Chung, the employer, said that employees were spoken to as a group and individually, and that Mr He did not raise any concerns with the proposal. There was no written record of the terms and conditions of employment being varied, nor any other written record of the purported agreement.

Mr He claimed that his hours of work were reduced from 40 to 24 hours per week, with a change from five to three days of work per week, on the basis of a unilateral decision made by Cheertop. He said that the change commenced on Monday 16 March 2020. Cheertop submitted that Mr He's hours of work were reduced at his request as he wanted to engage in further education and/or selling real estate. There is no written record of the change in the days of work and no variation of an employment agreement was signed.

On 13 May 2020, Cheertop issued Mr He with a written warning by email in relation to his non-attendance at work that same day. The warning recorded that it was Mr Chung's expectation that Mr He was to attend work and that Cheertop's operations were significantly disrupted because of his non-attendance as a result. Following the lockdown in April 2020, Mr He says he returned to work on 29 April 2020 but was subsequently unwell and unable to work. He said he obtained a medical certificate for the period 20 April 2020 to 10 May 2020, following a request from Mr Chung that he do so. On 11 May 2020, Mr Chung sought consent from Mr He to speak to his doctor prior to his return to work. Mr He did not agree and assumed he would not be permitted to return to work by Mr Chung until he provided consent, or the issue was otherwise resolved. On 13 May 2020, Mr Chung contacted Mr He enquiring about Mr He's absence from work that day. Mr He said he informed Mr Chung he wouldn't be able to work that day given the late notice. The Authority found Cheertop did not take reasonable steps to investigate the matter alleged to have justified the issuing of the warning and that Mr He was not afforded an opportunity to address Cheertop's concerns prior to the warning being issued.

On 14 May 2020, Mr Chung posted a message attaching a workplace change proposal to a WeChat group. Mr He said since the proposal affected only the part-time drivers, he was not concerned. The Authority found Cheertop's approach was primarily flawed in that it misinformed itself by classifying Mr He's role as part-time. As a result, Mr He was the only employee considered for redundancy under the proposal, despite there being another employed driver. The Authority found the method of communication was entirely inadequate and did not amount to proper consultation and notice. In summary, evidence showed that there was little or no change to the roles and responsibilities of employees working in other positions, notwithstanding that the restructuring proposal itself suggested such changes were to be made. The effect of the proposal was simply that Mr He would no longer be employed. The Authority also found that the decision to dismiss was affected by consideration of Mr He's absence from work the day prior to the proposal being communicated and the attempt to categorise Mr He as being employed in a part-time role.

The Authority accepted that Mr He felt significant humiliation because of the dismissal and being in a position whereby he was, albeit temporarily, unable to support his family, and additionally as to the

burdens and responsibilities he felt based on his culture. Cheertop was ordered to pay Mr He $283.20 relating to the period during which his wages were unilaterally reduced to 80 per cent; $2,674.05 on account of wages owed relating to the unilateral reduction to his hours of work; $3,024 as compensation for lost wages as a result of a Personal Grievance and $23,500 as compensation for hurt and humiliation. Costs were reserved.

He v Cheertop Trading Limited [[2023] NZERA 243; 16/05/2023; R Anderson]

Termination found to be justified while suspension found to be unjustified

Ms Edwards was employed by J. S. Ewers Limited (JSE) as a farm worker. In mid-2020 JSE gave notice of the introduction of a new staff uniform which became a requirement. Ms Edwards took exception to wearing the work uniform because she believed she would experience an adverse skin reaction to the material. Ms Edwards chose not to wear the uniform despite instruction to do so and the offer of a compromise. Following a discipline process for failing to follow reasonable instruction, she was dismissed and brought claims for unjustifiable dismissal and unjustified disadvantage at the Employment Relations Authority (the Authority).

Prior to the dismissal, Ms Edwards's supervisor complained about how she had behaved during their discussion on 19 February 2021. Specifically, the complaint alleged Ms Edwards had refused to wear her uniform despite specific repeated and reasonable instructions from her supervisor to do so and that this occurred despite the compromise which dealt with her concerns. Other concerns included that Ms Edwards had repeatedly yelled at her supervisor, she had behaved in a manner that was threatening to her supervisor by telling him she was recording their conversation and she had been disrespectful and ignored her supervisor by repeatedly telling him she could not hear him when she could.

JSE's general manager initiated an investigation of this complaint and found there was a matter of discipline to be dealt with. At a meeting held on 25 March 2001 between Ms Edwards and the general manager, Ms Edwards was given the preliminary decision to terminate her employment and was placed on special paid leave to give her time to reflect on the issues and to recognise the possible impact on her health. This leave was only meant to be for one day however was extended until 1 April 2021. A further series of meetings between Ms Edwards and the General Manager were held until notice of termination was issued on 19 April 2021.

In response to the disciplinary process and the termination of her employment Ms Edwards raised two personal grievances with JSE. Ms Edwards was unable to resolve her personal grievances with JSE so she lodged an application in the Authority.

In consideration of whether JSE acted as a fair and reasonable employer in the steps they took to dismiss Ms Edwards, the Authority determined that in terms of the process adopted by JSE it was satisfied that JSE acted as a fair and reasonable employer could in the circumstances. The Authority observed that JSE investigated the complaint, advised Ms Edwards of the complaint, gave Ms. Edwards multiple opportunities to comment on the complaint and that JSE did take into consideration comments offered by Ms Edwards. The Authority also concluded that a fair and reasonable employer would be justified in deciding to terminate Ms Edwards' employment after having regard to the events that occurred on 19 February 2021. The Authority was satisfied that JSE's actions in investigating the complaint and carrying out a disciplinary process were justifiable and that JSE's decision to dismiss Ms Edwards was substantively justified.

In consideration of the allegation of unjustified disadvantage the Authority noted that whilst JSE describes Ms Edwards' time off work as agreed special leave, it was a suspension. The Authority noted it was clear that it was a unilateral decision by JSE that Ms Edwards remain away from work pending the outcome of the follow up meeting. The Authority determined that JSE's actions in suspending Ms Edwards was not justifiable. JSE did not follow a fair process – Ms Edwards was not given an opportunity to consider the proposed suspension and respond to it before a decision was made. And it was not substantively justified – giving Ms Edwards time to consider the issues was an insufficient

reason, particularly as the time was extended and there was no evidence to show that she needed time off for health reasons. In suspending Ms Edwards, JSE acted in an unjustifiable manner, and this caused her a disadvantage. Ms Edwards' personal grievance was established and her claim for unjustifiable action causing disadvantage was successful. To settle the grievance, JSE was ordered to pay Ms Edwards $6,500.00 for compensation. Costs were reserved.

Edwards v JS Ewers Limited [[2023] NZERA 281; 06/06/2023; P van Keulen]

Termination found to be justified

Mr Turner-McMillan was employed as a fabricator by Canterbury Aluminium (CA) from September 2021 to 23 February 2022. He resigned on 10 February 2022.

On 15 February 2022, during his notice period, Mr Turner-McMillan had a verbal exchange on the factory floor at his workstation with another staff member. The dispute related to Mr Turner-McMillan's phone use. This incident was reported to the managing director, Mr Averill who then arranged to see Mr Turner-McMillan in his office. The meeting was short and ended badly. Mr Averill said Mr Turner-McMillan became aggressive and left the office using profanity. After the informal meeting ended, Mr Averill went down to the factory floor and spoke with Mr Turner-McMillan. He said he verbally suspended Mr Turner-McMillan on full pay and asked him to leave the premises while CA carried out a disciplinary investigation.

CA wrote to Mr Turner-McMillan and invited him to attend a disciplinary meeting. The allegations put to him were that he refused to stop using his phone at his workstation when repeatedly asked to do so and that he used foul and abusive language in interactions with staff. The discipline meeting took place on 17 February 2022. After having regard to the feedback from Mr Turner-McMillan, CA wrote to him on 23 February 2022 giving notice of termination without notice.

Mr Turner-McMillan raised a personal grievance against CA in a letter dated 25 February 2022 for unjustified dismissal and disadvantage in employment claiming that the dismissal was unjustified both substantively and procedurally. He only progressed a claim of unjustified dismissal in the Authority.

In assessing this matter, the Authority needed to determine whether CA had shown that its decision to dismiss was justified based on what a fair and reasonable employer could have done in all the circumstances at the time the dismissal occurred. This includes asking whether the employer's substantive reasons were sufficient to justify the dismissal and whether the procedure the employer followed in making the decision was fair. Minor defects in the disciplinary procedure may not support a finding of unfair procedure if they have not had an unfair effect on the employee.

In considering the matter of the alleged phone use and considering the evidence, the Authority was satisfied that CA could reasonably have concluded that Mr Turner-McMillan was repeatedly being asked to get off his phone at work and that it was within scope for CA to consider that the repeated behaviour constituted serious misconduct because it was not in substance denied by Mr Turner-McMillan and the behaviour was included in the individual employment agreement as serious misconduct.

The Authority found it reasonable that despite some procedural flaws CA's substantive findings that Mr Turner-McMillan had repeatedly used his phone when asked not to do so as well as its finding that his behaviour towards Mr Averill was inappropriate and unacceptable were findings within the scope of what a fair and reasonable employer could have made at the time. The Authority also found it was within the scope of a fair and reasonable employer's potential actions that CA found these matters constituted serious misconduct to the extent it could not have trust and confidence in Mr Turner-McMillan to continue in the workplace albeit for only 11 more working days. Costs were reserved.

Turner-McMillan v Canterbury Aluminium [[2023] NZERA 292; 06/06/2023; A Baker]

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.

There are currently five Bills open for public submissions to select committee.

International treaty examination of the Free Trade Agreement between New Zealand and the European Union (9 August 2023)

Corrections Amendment Bill (10 August 2023)

Mclean Institute (Trust Variation) Bill (30 August 2023)

Employment Relations (Restraint of Trade) Amendment Bill (18 September 2023)

Emergency Management Bill (3 November 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 9930, 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.