BusinessCentral

EMPLOYER BULLETIN

13 May 2024
A Weekly News Digest for Employers

EMPLOYER NEWS

Government introduces Bill to modernise insurance law

On 2 May 2024, the Government announced that it would modernise and improve insurance law so that consumers and businesses can effectively protect themselves against risk.

It sets clearer rules on what to disclose for consumers, ensures proportionate remedies for when disclosure rules are breached, and requires insurance policies to be written and presented clearly, as well as other improvements.

The Government intends to pass this Bill by the end of the year.

To read further, please click here.

Charges over schoolboy's caving death

WorkSafe has charged the Whangārei Boys High School Board of Trustees for health and safety failures related to the death of a student a year ago.

15-year-old Karnin Petera died on a school trip to Abbey Caves on 9 May 2023.

"We acknowledge the profound impact of this tragedy on whānau, friends, and the wider community. A year on, our sympathy and thoughts are with all of those who knew and loved Karnin," says WorkSafe's Head of Inspectorate, Rob Pope.

An extensive WorkSafe investigation has now pieced together the circumstances of this sad tragedy, and charges have been filed in the Whangārei District Court.

"We encourage school boards of trustees across the country to reflect on their own systems and processes to ensure they are meeting legal requirements for education outside the classroom. Students should be able to participate safely, and parents must have confidence their rangatahi will be kept safe," says Rob Pope.

To read further, please click here.

NZ and the UAE launch FTA negotiations

Minister for Trade Todd McClay today announced that New Zealand and the United Arab Emirates (UAE) will commence negotiations on a free trade agreement (FTA).

Minister McClay and UAE Trade Minister Dr Thani bin Ahmed Al Zeyoudi announced the launch of negotiations on a Comprehensive Economic Partnership Agreement (CEPA) and discussed strengthening economic ties between New Zealand and the UAE.

This follows the conclusion of successful exploratory discussions, as well as public consultation, which demonstrated the importance of pursuing a high-quality agreement to boost our economy and unlock greater export opportunities.

Kiwi exporters are integral to revitalising our economy, which is why the Government has set the ambitious target of doubling exports by value within 10 years. New opportunities in the UAE will open further commercial opportunities that will lift domestic incomes and reduce the cost of living.

"A CEPA with the UAE would also complement our ongoing negotiations towards a free trade agreement with the Gulf Cooperation Council, and I was pleased to advance these discussions during my visit to Saudi Arabia last week and my discussions with Saudi and GCC counterparts", Mr McClay said.

To read further, please click here.

Update on employer accreditation renewals

New guidance is available to support employers and their advisers with renewing their accreditation.

The guidance covers who should renew their accreditation; the best time to apply (Immigration recommends six weeks before accreditation expires); choosing the right accreditation type; the evidence to provide for faster processing; and how to apply.

For faster application processing, provide supporting documents up front that show evidence of being a viable and genuinely operating business or organisation, compliance with business standards and settlement support for their AEWV employees.

To read further, please click here.

Enhancing telecommunications consultation

The Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE) has opened submissions to the release of the 'Enhancing telecommunications regulatory and funding frameworks' discussion document.

Access to high quality telecommunications services supports productivity and economic growth, which is important to our increasingly digitised economy. Ensuring our regulatory settings are fit-for-purpose supports the delivery of innovative mobile and internet services across New Zealand.

The discussion document seeks feedback on some telecommunications matters to ensure our regulatory settings are flexible, fit for purpose, continue to support innovation and competition in the market and reflect changes in technology, such as uptake in satellite use. It proposes changes to the funding settings for rural connectivity, as a foundational step towards sustainably addressing rural connectivity challenges.

It will also look at removal of some restrictions from our smaller fibre infrastructure providers, the expiry of the rights that allow access to shared property for fibre installations, access to dispute resolution

mechanisms and requirements around the provision of emergency location information to support emergency responses.

You can read the consultation document and provide your feedback before 19 June 2024, 5pm, via the link on the website.

To read further, please click here.

Getting new job seekers on the pathway to work

Jobseeker beneficiaries who have work obligations must now meet with MSD within two weeks of their benefit starting to determine their next step towards finding a job, Social Development and Employment Minister Louise Upston says.

"A key part of the coalition Government's plan to have 50,000 fewer people on Jobseeker Support by 2030 is making sure the welfare system is geared towards helping people get back on their feet quickly.

"About 188,000 people currently receive Jobseeker Support but only about 53,000 of them have employment case managers at any given time, so early intervention is required to make sure the others are taking steps towards finding work.

"MSD's new Kōrero Mahi – Let's Talk Work seminars are one way we're doing this. People who come onto Jobseeker Support must now attend one within a fortnight to have their employment needs assessed and their next step decided.

"If they're ready to work, they could be helped to apply for a job. If they need re-training or upskilling, they could be referred to a programme that can help.

"This new initiative follows steps we've already taken to make the welfare system more proactive, which include our expectations about the application of benefit sanctions and new work check-ins for job seekers after six months."

To read further, please click here.

Immigration thwarts individuals entering New Zealand under false pretences

Immigration New Zealand (INZ) has intercepted 25 Bangladeshi individuals attempting to enter New Zealand without the required visas.

The men were travelling from Kuala Lumpur with electronic travel authorities enabling a stopover in New Zealand.

"The group was denied boarding on a flight to Auckland after routine checks identified eligibility concerns that raised red flags in our system," said Peter Elms, National Manager Border.

Subsequent inquiries by INZ's Airline Liaison Officer based in Kuala Lumpur, working with airline staff, confirmed the travellers' true intent was not to join a cruise or transit to Australia, but to enter New Zealand.

Preliminary inquiries indicate the group may have been misled by an unknown agent into believing they had valid work visas for New Zealand. INZ is pursuing leads to identify those behind the scam, but locating those involved in situations like this may be challenging.

"We take these situations very seriously and acted swiftly to prevent a potential border breach," says Peter Elms. "This incident serves as a prime example of our commitment to proactively managing risk offshore and protecting the integrity of the immigration system and New Zealand border."

"Anybody seeking to work in New Zealand needs to be very careful that they are not being tricked out of their money and falsely offered jobs. We advise people to protect themselves by checking with the companies involved, to ensure any offers are genuine.

"Anyone who is a victim of a visa scam should report it to their local law enforcement agencies in their country of residence, or the country where the scam occurred."

To read further, please click here.

Agreement delivers Local Water Done Well for Auckland

The Government has delivered on its election promise to provide a financially sustainable model for Auckland under its Local Water Done Well plan. The plan, which has been unanimously endorsed by Auckland Council's Governing Body, will see Aucklanders avoid the previously projected 25.8 per cent water rates increases while retaining local control of water assets.

The announcement was made at a joint press conference at Watercare's Central Interceptor construction site in Māngere this afternoon by Prime Minister Christopher Luxon, Local Government Minister Simeon Brown, and Auckland Mayor Wayne Brown.

"Under the Local Water Done Well solution we have announced today, Aucklanders will avoid the 25.8 per cent water rate increases previously proposed by Watercare. We have worked closely with Mayor Brown and Auckland Council, and are thrilled to announce that Watercare's more financially sustainable model will ensure water rates remain affordable both now and into the future," Mr Brown says.

The new model means Watercare will be able to borrow more money for long-term investment in water infrastructure and spread the borrowing over a longer period rather than front-loading the cost on to current ratepayers.

Auckland Mayor Wayne Brown says he has been working closely with central government to provide a simple, affordable water solution for Aucklanders, and that hard work paid off when the Council's Governing Body unanimously voted for their preferred option at last Thursday's meeting.

"This outcome is exactly what we've been looking to achieve. The new government asked us to come up with a preferred model, and they've agreed to implement it, which is good. I want to thank the Minister and the Prime Minister for the way they have handled this," Mayor Wayne Brown says.

"The Government have worked closely with me to come up with this solution which will put water rates on a much more sustainable footing for the infrastructure we need."

To read further, please click here.

OECD reinforces need to control spending

The OECD's latest report on New Zealand reinforces the importance of bringing Government spending under control, Finance Minister Nicola Willis says.

The 2024 New Zealand survey was presented in Wellington today by OECD Chief Economist Clare Lombardelli.

Nicola Willis says the survey notes that "spending overruns" and "slippage" after the pandemic "led to a permanent increase in the government

spending to GDP ratio, resulting in a substantial deterioration of New Zealand's fiscal position" with the levels of macroeconomic stimulus "more inflationary than elsewhere". The report goes on to recommend

that “the government should set operating allowances and tax policies that will gradually reduce the fiscal deficit to reach budget balance”.

“This affirms the Government’s decision to steadily bring government spending under control through our ongoing fiscal sustainability programme. It also reinforces our approach of fully funding planned income tax relief through offsetting revenue and spending measures.”

The OECD highlights other areas for government attention including the need to enforce competition policy, ease overseas investment settings, lift educational achievement including through a more detailed national curriculum and advance reform of the resource management planning system.

“The Government is already acting on many of the initiatives proposed by the OECD and we will give consideration to its other recommendations.

“While we do not agree with the OECD about everything, we welcome its expertise and the opportunity to have our thinking tested by it.”

“This report reinforces the urgent need to rebuild the New Zealand economy after a period of elevated spending, inflation and interest rates. The Government is on the right track with our plan to drive greater value from public spending, lift educational achievement and give businesses the confidence they need to invest, hire and grow.

“Our Government’s work to strengthen the economy will deliver New Zealanders the cost of living relief, higher incomes and better public services they deserve.”

To read further, please click here.

EMPLOYMENT COURT: TWO CASES

Employee's arguable case allowed to continue

Mr Roberts was a corrections officer at the Department of Corrections (Corrections) from July 2013 and a member of a union, the Corrections Association of New Zealand (CANZ). Mr Roberts claimed that Corrections failed to take steps to ensure his safety between 4 May 2018 and 27 November 2018, breaching its duties under its collective employment agreement. Its failure to acknowledge or remedy his concerns caused him emotional distress. The questions for the Employment Court (the Court) were whether Mr Roberts' claim was blocked by the Accident Compensation Act 2001 (the Act), and whether his claimed emotional harm was technically separate from his personal injury.

The Accident Compensation scheme compensated Mr Roberts for his personal injury. In return, the Act rules that "no person may bring proceedings… for damages arising directly or indirectly out of… personal injury [that the Act covers]." Corrections argued that Mr Roberts' personal injury, and the emotional harm of an assault he experienced, were inherently connected. It suggested Mr Roberts' claim for damages for emotional harm was essentially for his personal injury, already covered by the Act. If that were the case, Mr Roberts could not bring proceedings for the emotional harm to get general compensatory damages. Corrections also submitted that if the breach of contract caused any emotional harm, the personal injury overshadowed it.

The Court had to find if there was any reasonable cause of action that allowed Mr Roberts' application to stand or to strike it out. Mr Roberts argued that striking out the proceeding would give employers a perverse incentive not to avoid harm or breaches, because subsequent claims would always be blocked by the Act.

Among other cases, Corrections relied on Northern Distribution Union v Sheridee Holdings Ltd. There, the embarrassment and distress were so minimal, if they existed at all prior to the injury, that they could not be the subject of compensation. Mr Roberts argued that it seemed adverse to public policy to close off a means of addressing an employment breach, simply because monetary damages were minimal.

The Court quoted Smith v Fonterra Cooperative Group Ltd: "Pre-emptive elimination is only appropriate where it can be said that whatever the facts proved, or arguments and policy considerations advanced at trial, a case is bound to fail." The Court did not feel Mr Roberts' case was bound to fail. It concluded that Mr Roberts had an arguable case. It was not so untenable as to never possibly succeed. Neither was this case an abuse of process. The Court did not strike out his claim. The Employment Relations Authority could continue on with its preliminary determination of the actual issue. Costs were reserved.

Roberts v The Chief Executive of The Department of Corrections [[2024] NZEmpC 25; 23/02/24; Judge K Beck]

Court overturns Authority's interpretation of payment clause

New Zealand Steel and E Tū were parties of a collective employment agreement (CEA). They ran into issues around the meaning of "make-up pay" in the CEA, so the Employment Court (the Court) was tasked with interpreting when it was payable to employees.

In general, make-up pay is an allowance paid to employees in certain circumstances, if they agree to a request to work outside their established ordinary hours. A clause should be interpreted objectively, with the aim to ascertain the meaning that the written agreement would convey to a reasonable person, if they had all the background knowledge reasonably available to the parties at the time. The Court said that the meaning of the clause could be found by reading it in context, focusing on the document as a whole and recognising that collective agreements are "relational agreements and are the product of compromise and opportunism".

New Zealand Steel argued that make-up pay only applied to employees working fewer hours per week than their 40 ordinary hours. Employees who agreed to work outside their normal ordinary hours, but still worked 40 hours in the week, should not be compensated. The Employment Relations Authority had agreed with this interpretation. The Court, however, sided with E Tū instead. E Tū felt that if an employee was prevented from working their contracted hours when they agreed to a request from New Zealand Steel, they should still be compensated for their contracted hours.

New Zealand Steel argued that the sole intention of make-up pay was to compensate employees where, because of a requested change in hours, they worked fewer than 40 hours a week. It focused on financial loss and included overtime hours in its assessment of hours worked.

The background here included the parties' custom and practice stemming back to the term's inclusion in a 2011 CEA. In the 2018 CEA negotiations, New Zealand Steel unsuccessfully sought for the clause to be reworded to the very position it was now arguing. The wording instead remained the same. The Court noted that the clause at present did not mention an intention. After looking at this background, the Court decided in favour of E Tū.

The CEA's make-up pay was ruled payable where, at the request of New Zealand Steel, an employee worked outside their ordinary hours of work; and as a result, could not complete their ordinary hours. New Zealand Steel then had to pay make-up pay for the ordinary hours not worked, even if the employee still worked to meet their contracted hours. Costs were not sought.

E Tū Incorporated v New Zealand Steel Limited [[2024] NZEmpC 29; 26/02/24; Judge J C Holden]

EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS AUTHORITY: THREE CASES

Employee owed wages and holidays arrears as company goes into receivership

Ayden Trading Limited (Ayden) employed Mr Singh as a lawnmower and gardener. He worked for Ayden from 1 March 2021 to 17 July 2022 with Ms Ure, sole director and shareholder. Mr Singh said he was not paid holiday pay or final wages on termination of his employment. He also sought other wage arrears, public holiday arrears, interest, and reimbursement of the Employment Relation Authority's (the Authority) filing fee. He asked for the Authority to issue a penalty for Ayden's failure to keep and provide wage and time records, and another based on his individual employment agreement (the agreement) contradicting requirements in the Holidays Act 2003. Finally, he asked for Ms Ure to be named as a person involved in the breaches and therefore also liable.

Mr Singh mostly worked by himself mowing lawns and completing other gardening maintenance services. He did not have a roster or set permanent days when he could expect work. The agreement did not specify work days or have an availability clause. Ms Ure sent Mr Singh a list of tasks through Google Worksheets.

Generally, work commenced at 8:00am and roughly finished at 4:00pm but varied on account of the nature of the work. The agreement established that a workday would be no more than 10 hours. Mr Singh said that he often worked on the weekend, with his workdays and hours fluctuating. Due to the outside nature of the role, if the weather was bad, Mr Singh could not work. If he could not complete his work during the week, he was regularly instructed to finish on the weekends.

As a result of this, Ayden at times provided Mr Singh fewer than his guaranteed hours of work, then only paid for the hours he worked. Mr Singh also said he was not permitted to work on public holidays that fell on a weekday.

The Authority investigated Mr Singh's claims and found all of these issues in his favour. The Authority also considered penalties for the four types of breaches due to their high potential liability. However, the focus was on Mr Singh receiving wage and holiday pay arrears and Ms Ure indicated Ayden was going into receivership. The Authority declined penalties in order to prioritise Mr Singh's wage and holiday arrears.

The Authority ordered Ayden to pay Mr Singh the wage arrears of failing to pay his guaranteed hours, totalling $4,391.95. It ordered one week's annual holiday pay of $840, and Mr Singh's annual holiday entitlements Ayden owed at the end of employment, totalling $3,486.75. It also ordered the payment of Mr Singh's public holiday arrears of $2,499, the payment of interest and the Authority's filing fee. It named Ms Ure as a person involved in the breaches by Ayden, so she was liable for these breaches if Ayden defaulted in its payments. Costs were reserved.

Singh v Ayden Trading Limited [[2023] NZERA 695: 22/11/23; S Kennedy-Martin]

Did failure to act on bullying claims lead to a constructive dismissal?

Hospitality Services Limited (HSL) employed Ms Joo as a food and beverage attendant at the Grand Millennium Auckland Hotel, from 16 September 2022 until her resignation on 8 February 2023. While employed, Ms Joo raised a personal grievance of bullying by her co-workers. Upon the termination of her employment, she raised a further grievance that HSL constructively dismissed her. HSL said it had not taken any unjustified action to Ms Joo's disadvantage and she resigned. Both parties alleged the other breached the duty of good faith. The matter came before the Employment Relations Authority (the Authority).

On 4 December 2022, "the hot water incident" took place. Ms Joo alleged that while staff were emptying water into a sink, a co-worker deliberately poured hot water on her, causing burns. An investigation found no evidence of any injuries and HSL considered that no disciplinary action or procedural change was required. Ms Joo criticised the outcome and alleged the investigation was biased against her. The Authority did not agree and found HSL's actions were those of a fair and reasonable employer.

On 6 January 2023 in "the coffee lid incident", a co-worker threw a metal lid, striking Ms Joo's wrist. Afterward, Ms Joo left work on special leave for much of the time up to her resignation. HSL held another investigation and the co-worker underwent a disciplinary process. It did not share the outcome with Ms Joo.

HSL wrote to Ms Joo rejecting that it had not done enough to investigate the bullying concerns, and that it had not created a safe workplace for Ms Joo. HSL argued it did not need to disclose the disciplinary action taken against the co-worker in the coffee lid incident. The letter set out concerns HSL had about Ms Joo's behaviour and that upon her return to work HSL would undertake a disciplinary investigation. Noting that both parties had concerns, HSL suggested mediation as a possible way forward.

The Authority found that Ms Joo's resignation was not a foreseeable reaction when HSL had proposed mediation and did not pressure her to return to work. The Authority found that resignation brought the employment relationship to an end, prematurely and unnecessarily. HSL also had the right to raise its concerns with Ms Joo about her alleged behaviour and this could not be considered as contributing towards a constructive dismissal.

The Authority found that the incidents, and other events Ms Joo complained of, did not reach the point of unjustifiable disadvantage. HSL investigated these matters and addressed them reasonably.

The Authority considered three claims for breaches of good faith. Ms Joo asserted she was disadvantaged by not learning of the disciplinary outcome of the coffee lid incident. The Authority disagreed. Ms Joo had no right to know the outcome of another employee's disciplinary process. HSL did enough by advising Ms Joo that the matter had been dealt with. There was also contention on whether Ms Joo had received a copy of her employment agreement. The Authority did not come to a definitive conclusion, but when tied back to Ms Joo's complaints, she was not disadvantaged by any inability to read the printed words of the employment agreement.

The Authority concluded that Ms Joo did not establish personal grievances for constructive dismissal or unjustified disadvantage.

Joo v Hospitality Services Limited [[2023] NZERA 715; 29/11/23; A Dumbleton]

Authority enforces phrasing in employment agreement

Restaurant Brands Limited (RBL) employed Mr Lino, a student, at a KFC restaurant in Auckland. He commenced work as a team member in March 2022 and worked two fixed shifts each week, on Friday and Saturday. Mr Lino claimed that RBL unjustifiably disadvantaged him, when they did not allow him to work all Saturday shifts as a shift supervisor, on a permanent basis.

KFC restaurant employees are either a restaurant manager, an assistant manager or a team member. Each shift must have a manager on duty: the restaurant manager or an assistant restaurant manager. If neither is working, a team member who has completed a Leading A Shift (LAS) qualification is appointed as shift supervisor for that shift or part of one. Each restaurant must have a team member qualified as a cook available on each shift, to correctly cook the product.

Mr Lino claimed that at a meeting on 22 November 2022, restaurant manager Mr Ali promised him that he could work all his fixed Saturday shifts as shift supervisor. He said Mr Ali then reneged on that agreement, misleading and disadvantaging him as a result.

The employment agreement set out the terms and conditions the parties agreed on. Mr Lino's role was written as team member, and he had qualified as a cook. He also qualified to run a shift as a shift supervisor when he completed the LAS qualification in November 2022. He was then entitled to receiving the LAS allowance when working as shift supervisor. The clause said an LAS-qualified employee "may be requested by the Employer to temporarily become the Shift Supervisor/Leader for a particular shift/s".

The Authority found the use of the words 'may' and 'temporarily' conveyed that working as a shift supervisor was not a guaranteed term of employment. There was no written variation. The five shifts Mr Lino worked as shift supervisor did not sufficiently establish a long-running custom and practice, to replace the agreed terms and conditions of employment without such a variation.

Mr Lino may have truly believed Mr Ali promised the Saturday shifts as a permanent shift supervisor, but the Authority found it more likely he was mistaken. There was no requirement that Mr Ali appoint Mr Lino as the shift supervisor on any shift, and Mr Lino had no entitlement to run the shift. The Authority determined RBL did not unjustifiably disadvantage Mr Lino by not providing him with Saturday supervisory shifts on a permanent basis. Mr Lino also claimed RBL discriminated against him in its actions, but could not link this to any of the prohibited grounds of discrimination in legislation, or other evidence.

Moreover, Mr Lino was not treated unfavourably in the rostering of Saturday shift supervisor shifts. He continued to be mostly rostered as the shift supervisor until an assistant restaurant manager was appointed in late February. Ultimately, he worked all Saturday night shifts as shift supervisor except for two. Mr Ali chose another employee to work as Saturday night shift supervisor, because he had been employed 5 years compared to Mr Lino's 8 months and had greater experience. Since Mr Lino was one of the few trained cooks in the restaurant, he could therefore only be utilised as a shift supervisor if another trained cook was available to work in his place.

The Authority determined RBL did not discriminate against Mr Lino. Costs were reserved.

Lino v Restaurant Brands Limited [[2024] NZERA 6; 10/01/24; E Robinson]

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.

Bills open for submissions to select committee: Seven Bills

Fisheries (International Fishing and Other Matters) Amendment Bill (15 May 2024)

Te Pire Whakatupua mō Te Kāhui Tupua/Taranaki Maunga Collective Redress Bill (22 May 2024)

Te Korowai o Wainuiārua Claims Settlement Bill (26 May 2024)

Restoring Citizenship Removed By Citizenship (Western Samoa) Act 1982 Bill (31 May 2024)

Contracts of Insurance Bill (3 June 2024)

Te Pire mō Ō-Rākau, Te Pae o Maumahara/Ō-Rākau Remembrance Bill (14 June 2024)

Privacy Amendment Bill (14 June 2024)

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.