



IN THIS REVIEW...

- Sick & Tired of Persistent Absence
- Q&A – 'Tis the season to be jolly – or is it?
- Forthcoming legislation
- Without prejudice discussions
- Case Law Update
- Health & Safety

SICK AND TIRED OF PERSISTENT ABSENCE

Employee absence from work is a significant cost for most employers both financially and with regard to productivity. It can also place the burden of additional workload on employees who remain at work - sometimes to unacceptable levels - and when this occurs during an economic slowdown the impact can be critical.

Clearly it is impossible to eliminate absence completely as there will always be a certain level of sickness absence in any Company. The cost and consequent damage which absence can cause can obviously be reduced where there are effective policies in place covering absence from work and sensible procedures for implementing them. In addition to genuine sickness absence, there will be other times when staff are absent from work for annual leave, special leave and to accommodate the range of statutory provisions allowing employees to take time off for maternity leave, public duties, trade union duties etc. The type of absence this article focuses on is persistent short term sickness absence - in particular that caused by the "serial offender".

All employees have a contractual obligation to attend work consistently. It is essential that absence for whatever reason is monitored and controlled by the employer. Managers have to be responsible and committed to deal with all absence, especially that related to persistent offenders. It is advisable that a method of calculation is adopted that can be uniformly and consistently applied to all levels of staff and which facilitates comparisons between departments.

There are a number of different measures that can be used to assess absence, each of which gives information about different aspects of absence.

A simple calculation for time lost is to divide the number of days absent in a given period by the number of days the employee was available to work and multiply by 100. The

resulting absence percentage can then be used to set the business absence ceiling and determine a "trigger point" for follow up action.

Another widely used control tool is the "Bradford Factor" which identifies persistent short term absence for individuals by measuring the number of spells of absence, and is therefore a useful measure of the disruption caused by this type of absence. The formula for this absence measure is - $E \times E \times D = \text{Bradford Factor Score}$ - where E is the number of episodes of absence and D is the total number of days absent in a rolling 52 week period.

So, for employees with a total of 10 days absence in one year, the Bradford Factor score can vary enormously, depending on the number of episodes of absence involved. For example:

One absence episode of 10 days is 10 points (i.e. $1 \times 1 \times 10$)

Five absence episodes of two days each is 250 points (i.e. $5 \times 5 \times 10$)

Ten absence episodes of one day each is 1,000 points (i.e. $10 \times 10 \times 10$)

Short, frequent and unplanned absences are often more disruptive than longer absences. If the pattern of absence is repeated regularly the employee will have a high Bradford Factor score which may raise questions about the genuineness of any illness.

Management of attendance is an exercise to "persuade" employees to attend work regularly so as to help the employer to minimise absence and sick pay costs.

Best Practice for Absence Control

- Establish the attendance standard and inform new employees during induction training
- Train Line Managers to implement and manage the absence policy
- Have a laid down absence reporting procedure.
- Inform employees exactly what standards of evidence are required should sickness occur, and what penalties will be imposed (both financial and disciplinary) if they fail to meet these standards. The standards should be set out in writing and form part of the contract of employment. It is important that the employer reserves the right for the employee to attend an examination by a doctor appointed by the employer and to request a report from the employee's GP.
- Ensure that all absences are recorded accurately. This provides a good visual display of the "patterns" of absence which may occur. Employees are often

surprised that they have demonstrated “Monday off syndrome” without realising! In the event of any disciplinary proceedings, especially if they result in Employment Tribunal action, such records are vital in defending the employer’s position.

- Ensure that you identify factors that may be the cause of absence and seek a remedy eg. poor motivation, job insecurity, family responsibilities, drink or drug related problems, work related stress or a perception by staff that low priority is given to absence control. Welfare of the individual whilst at work is a management responsibility and improvement should always be encouraged.
- Establish and record “return to work” discussions. Employees who know that they will be “quizzed” on return to work are perhaps going to be less likely to take casual time off.
- If absence builds beyond an acceptable level then disciplinary action should be seriously considered. It is vital that such action is fair and reasonable and is properly documented, especially as the employee may eventually be dismissed as a result of poor attendance
- Ensure the procedures are being consistently and uniformly applied within and between departments. Special care needs to be taken in relation to absences directly related to disabilities or pregnancy related illnesses in any scoring of absences. Also one off operations, which may distort a person’s sickness record, should be treated with caution. Disciplinary action taken in these circumstances could be discriminatory
- Clearly identify those people whose absence is long term and who may not be able to resume work in the foreseeable future. It is inappropriate to use the disciplinary procedure regarding these staff, where chronic or terminal illness will require particular sensitivity. We will look at this more complex issue and its handling in our next bulletin.

‘TIS THE SEASON TO BE JOLLY!!!..... OR IS IT?



It’s that time of year again. The perils and pitfalls of the Company Christmas party are back in the news and all the evidence is that employers are getting increasingly concerned about whether having a seasonal event at all is a good idea. The worry of course, is about the possibility of disciplinary issues and legal action following the Christmas party, if things go wrong. Parties can leave bad feelings between employees if jokes are taken too far or the supply of alcohol in a more relaxed environment can lead to unprofessional behaviour. Once again, as we approach the party season we are expecting a substantial number of calls in relation to employers’ responsibilities at these events. Some of the commonly posed questions are outlined below:

Q. At a recent office social event one of our employees got a bit “frisky” toward a female employee. She was quite offended by this and whilst she did not wish to formally complain she has been overheard to say that if he behaves in the same manner at the Christmas party she would take the Company to Tribunal. **Can we be held responsible for how employees behave outside the workplace? After all we have included an Equal Opportunities policy in our employee handbook, so we have done everything expected of us.**

A. All employers may be held vicariously liable for acts of unlawful discrimination or harassment committed by their employees “in the course of employment” whether or not the employer approves or even knows about them. Because functions such as Christmas parties tend to happen outside normal working hours and away from the workplace, many employers assume that this means their employees’ actions are not “in the course of employment”. However, case law has made it clear that this will not always be so and that outside functions may all be deemed to be an “extension of employment”.

In order to help avoid claims of vicarious liability, you need to be able to demonstrate that you have taken all reasonable steps to prevent the harassment occurring or recurring. This entails more than just having equal opportunity and harassment policies. You must make sure that the content of such policies are brought to the attention of your employees, ideally during induction training and that you seek to consistently enforce them in the workplace at all levels. You may wish to consider issuing a memo shortly before the Christmas party reminding all your staff that these policies continue to apply at such functions and reminding them what constitutes unacceptable discriminatory conduct, together with the penalties such behaviour would attract. Remember also, that changes to the Sex Discrimination Act 1975 made in April 2008, means that employers will now be liable for failing to protect their employees from sexual or sex based harassment by third parties. Therefore this too will have implications for the Christmas party if it involves employee interaction with third parties - for example guests, clients, entertainers, bar and waiting staff, or members of the public.

Q. Can we discipline an employee for being drunk at the Christmas party?

A. Being under the influence of alcohol outside work is generally not sufficient grounds for taking disciplinary action, unless the employee’s ability to carry out his/her job is seriously affected and/or the employee’s actions bring the employer into disrepute. It would be unreasonable for an employer to expect staff to remain sober, particularly during the festive season and if they are providing some or all of the drinks.

If the actions do warrant disciplinary action, adequate investigations would have to be conducted and there would have to be evidence that genuine business interests were

threatened by the employee's behaviour. Whether dismissal is appropriate, will depend on the gravity of the misconduct.

Even when an employee commits a serious act of misconduct, if the employer has condoned or encouraged drinking, this may be seen as a mitigating factor as was found in a case where three employees were dismissed for getting drunk and fighting at a Christmas party. Although the tribunal found that their behaviour was unacceptable, it decided that dismissal was unfair in a context where the misconduct had taken place outside working hours and was due to a heavy drinking session which the employer had financed.

If you are having a staff Christmas party the best advice would be to make it clear to all employees beforehand exactly what behaviour is not acceptable. If you do have an instance of misconduct, treat the case on its own circumstances, investigate thoroughly and seek further advice from us before making any decision to take disciplinary action.

Q. What can employers do about an employee who attends work still under the influence of alcohol following the Christmas party?

A. Where there are clear rules in relation to attending work under the influence of drink, employers will find it easier to justify any subsequent disciplinary action, particularly if there is a health and safety risk. Each case should be treated on its own merits.

Employers must always undertake a full investigation in order to help establish the circumstances and any mitigating factors which may need to be taken into account, before making decisions regarding disciplinary action.

Q What happens if a member of my staff phones in sick the day after the Christmas Party?

A. Again, it is probably a good idea to warn staff beforehand that unauthorised absence the day after the event may be treated as a disciplinary issue. However in the event of absence occurring, you would obviously require them to adhere to the laid down absence reporting procedures and therefore clarify precisely the reason for the absence. You may, of course, have strong suspicions that a hangover is the real reason for absence, but you would really need to have some evidence of this if you intended to go down the disciplinary route. It would be important to also follow this absence up with a return to work interview to satisfy yourself that the absence was indeed genuine and to treat employees consistently in the event that it applies to more than one.

Q. We have a very multi cultural workforce and certain groups have suggested that they may not attend the employer's function because there is nothing on the menu which their religion allows them to eat. How should we respond?

A. It is important to make sure that you take care to avoid disadvantaging anyone whose religion forbids alcohol by ensuring that there are plenty of non alcoholic beverages available. Furthermore, some religions may be vegetarian or unable to eat certain foods such as pork or beef etc. Therefore it is probably wise to make enquiries about any dietary requirements beforehand so that these can be accommodated.

Q Our Company is in the throes of planning this year's Christmas party. In recent years we have seen an increase in excessive drinking with all the consequences that follow, which has inevitably upset many of our older and foreign members of staff. Do you think it would be a good idea for us to ban alcohol this year?

A. Well if you ban alcohol completely, the chances are that the party is not going to be much of a party for those who would like a drink or two and your decision would doubtless alienate or demoralise them. Therefore you should consider some simple but effective steps in relation to alcohol and the party in general. For example, set a limit for the number of free drinks that are available and ask people to stop drinking if they appear to be a little worse for wear and to have a soft drink instead. Additionally, think about how staff are going to get home as you have a duty of care to ensure that they don't drive when they are up to their 7th pint of beer! Consider hiring coaches or minibuses to leave at set times towards and at the end of the event, or provide the telephone numbers for local taxi firms. If entertainment is to be provided, ensure that this is suitable and will not offend, exclude or be discriminatory in any way. And finally, remember that your Managers should be setting a good example and not insisting that their employees go and join them under the mistletoe. Make sure that you are not seen to be condoning such behaviour, as it will become difficult to take action against any employees who do step out of line. Oh, and remember to unplug the photocopier!!!!

Q. What should the employer do if there is evidence of drug taking at the Christmas party?

A. Where there is evidence that employees were using illegal drugs, dismissal following a fair procedure is likely to be a reasonable response, although the fairness or otherwise of the decision could be influenced by the type(s) of drugs taken and the business of the employing organisation.

Employers would be able to argue that the Company's reputation has been, or will be, damaged by the employee's conduct and that its trust and confidence in the employee has been undermined. Both the employee and the employer could also be committing a criminal act. Again, employers will find it easier to justify such a response where they have a clear policy regarding drug use.

FORTHCOMING LEGISLATION

Equalities Bill

The Government Equalities Office has published 'Framework for a Fairer Future – The Equality Bill' which outlines the details of the proposed Equality Bill. The purpose of the Bill is to have one single piece of legislation covering all the different forms of discrimination in an easy to understand format.

The Government is still working on the Bill in an attempt to address the "serious inequalities that still exist in the UK". Proposals include:

- Closing the gender gap by forcing public bodies to publish pay rates
- Encouraging positive discrimination, whereby organisations discriminate in favour of female and ethnic minority job candidates as long as they are as equally suited for the job as their white/male counterparts
- Ensuring older people are not denied access to health or travel insurance
- Introducing wider powers to Employment Tribunals to make recommendations in discrimination claims e.g. reviewing pay policies - the purpose being to make changes to employers' practices so that the workforce as a whole benefits rather than just an individual claimant

The Bill is due to be published in the 2008-2009 Parliamentary session.

Agency Workers – the right to Statutory Sick Pay

Previously agency workers who had been engaged on a contract for less than three months were not entitled to SSP. As of 27 October 2008 they will be entitled to Statutory Sick Pay (SSP) regardless of the amount of time they have been working on a contract. Although agency workers are treated as employees of the agency for the purposes of SSP, employers may find that the price they pay to the agency will increase as a result.

Repeal of the Statutory Dismissal and Grievance Procedures – April 2009

The Employment Bill, which is due to come into force in April 2009, repeals the Statutory Dismissal and Grievance procedures.

As a result, ACAS have published a revised Code of Practice on discipline and grievance for handling workplace disputes. The Code is concise and principles-based, compared to the current statutory procedures which are complicated and unpopular.

ACAS has proposed that the new Code is introduced at the same time as the statutory procedures are repealed. The new Code will be used by Tribunals to either increase any award by 25%, if the employer fails to follow the Code of Practice, or reduce any award by 25% if the employee fails to follow the Code of Practice.

Identity cards for foreign nationals

The first stage of the National Identity Scheme roll-out starts from 25 November 2008, when foreign nationals in the UK, from outside the EEA, who successfully apply for an extension to stay on the basis of marriage, civil partnership, as a student or dependant will be issued with identity cards. Employers may be shown these cards as proof of identity and entitlement to live and work in the UK. The cards will show the person's name, date of birth, nationality and immigration status, including whether or not they have the right to work in the UK. They will be the same size as a credit card and will have an electronic chip that will hold biometric details, such as fingerprints and a digital picture of the person's face.

WITHOUT PREJUDICE / OFF-THE-RECORD DISCUSSIONS

Conciliatory correspondence can often create rather than solve problems - as Jane Austen's Mr Darcy discovered following his infamous letter to Miss Bennett in *Pride and Prejudice*. With the global recession, credit crunch and potential property crash on the horizon, employers will no doubt be looking to restructure and reorganise their organisations with resultant dismissals.

Often, and particularly at senior level, employers do not wish to go through a lengthy, time-consuming procedure and instead will use 'without prejudice' or 'off the record' approaches to negotiate an employee's departure. However, difficulties can arise when an employee refuses to do a deal and instead attempts to rely on the details of the negotiations, as the basis of a tribunal claim.

Historically, employees could not use details of without prejudice negotiations as evidence, because such details were privileged. It is a common approach by claimants to try and produce letters that were intended to be without prejudice to do the reverse and prejudice their former employer's position.

The 'without prejudice' rule

It is a long-standing tenet of UK law that parties should be encouraged to settle disputes, without recourse to the courts or tribunals. A fundamental aspect of this principle was to allow without prejudice communications between the parties in an effort to reach settlement. However, in a particular case in 2004, an EAT decision held that 'without prejudice' discussions that did not arise from a "genuine dispute" could be relied upon by the employee in founding a claim. The impact of this was widespread, as employers could no longer

seek to use the rule without considerable risk. However, in a further case, the Court of Appeal went a long way to restoring the sanctity of the without prejudice rule in finding that, in the absence of any "unambiguous impropriety" – i.e. fraud, blackmail or perjury on the part of the employer - without prejudice communications would be excluded from being used as evidence in any proceedings.

This did not stop a claimant, in a recent case, trying to rely upon the without prejudice letter from her employer's solicitors as the "last straw", entitling her to claim constructive dismissal. Although the claim was unsuccessful and the letter was held privileged under the without prejudice rule, and could not therefore be relied upon to support the case, no doubt employees will continue to seek to rely upon such information.

Good Practice

Employers should therefore proceed with caution with any 'without prejudice' or 'off the record' discussions. Calling someone in 'out of the blue' and presenting them with dismissal terms is fraught with danger. It is also essential not to introduce proposals too early during any ongoing process e.g. in a redundancy situation. Proposals for a compromise agreement should not be introduced before commencing consultation. Without prejudice proposals should be separated from any other correspondence that forms part of the actual dismissal process.

It should still be possible for employers to approach employees on a 'without prejudice' basis, however, provided the situation is properly handled.

Key points

- Ensure there is a genuine dispute between the parties and have as much evidence as possible
- Beware of conflicting evidence when alleging poor performance or conduct
- Be careful of the timing of the raising of 'without prejudice' discussions during ongoing grievance and or disciplinary procedures
- Ensure all correspondence is marked 'without prejudice'
- Never indiscriminately use without prejudice discussions to remove individuals without good reason or any warning
- Avoid putting too much pressure on the employee or using misleading facts
- Give the employee sufficient time to consider the proposals and seek advice



CASE LAW UPDATE

We are continually looking to ever-changing case law in order to interpret key points of legislation, particularly in relation to new legislation, so that we can identify the impact on employers.

Rolls Royce plc v Unite the Union

Length of service criterion in redundancy selection was not unlawful age discrimination

In Rolls Royce plc v Unite the Union the High Court has held that giving credit for length of service in a redundancy selection policy could be considered a 'benefit' under Reg 32 of the Employment Equality (Age) Regulations 2006. As such, the policy potentially fell within the exemption from the general prohibition on age discrimination.

Background

RR plc and the union entered into two collective agreements relating to redundancy, one for staff and the other for works employees. Both agreements, the terms of which were substantially the same, provided that redundancy selection would involve a points scoring system, under which employees were assessed in various categories such as expertise and versatility. An individual could score between 4 and 24 points in each category and, as part of the process, each employee was to receive one point per year of continuous service. A dispute arose over whether this length of service criterion complied with the Age Regulations. The parties asked the High Court, under Part 8 of the Civil Procedure Rules, to settle the matter instead of an employment tribunal.

Decision

The High Court held that, while the criterion was age discriminatory, it was objectively justified under Reg 3. The collective agreements were a compromise between the parties designed to enable them to carry out any redundancies 'peaceably' and in a way perceived to be fair. In the High Court's view, this was a legitimate aim. Furthermore, the length of service criterion respects loyalty and experience and protects the older workforce from being made redundant at a time when finding alternative employment is harder. The Court did note, however, that its conclusion might have been different had the policy operated on a simple 'last in, first out' basis.

In any event, the High Court went on to hold that the agreements would fall within the exemption of Reg 32, which

provides that the Regulations do not prevent a worker being placed in a better position than other workers by the award of a benefit based on length of service. Giving points for long service in a redundancy selection procedure may mean workers keep their jobs, which 'would properly be described as a benefit'. While Reg 32(2) still requires employers to show that awarding a length of service benefit to employees with over five years' service reasonably fulfils a business need, this test would probably be met where the redundancy scheme was agreed with a trade union, and length of service was only used as part of a wider measure of performance, as was the case here. The inclusion of a length of service criterion in the collective agreements was not therefore unlawful.

Comment

Although the practice of using length of service as a criterion in a redundancy selection matrix was called into question by The Employment Equality (Age) Regulations 2006, the argument being that to favour employees with longer service indirectly discriminated against younger staff, we have always maintained that giving credit for length of service could qualify as an exemption under Regulation 32. Provided it is only one of a number of factors that an employee is scored against (as opposed to the only factor in the more obviously discriminatory 'LIFO' approach), and it can be objectively justified, we are satisfied that any claim of age discrimination could be successfully defended.

Redrow Homes (Yorkshire) Ltd v Buckborough and anor, EAT

When courts have tried to define what constitutes a 'worker' under the Working Time Regulations 1998, they have looked amongst other things at the provision of alternative labour as opposed to being required to carry out the work personally. However the above case has highlighted that the provision for this in the contract may be considered a sham, if the parties intend to deceive a third party or the court, or where the parties simply do not intend the term to apply.

Background

The Working Time Regulations 1998 entitle a 'worker' to a minimum of 4.8 weeks' paid holiday per year (to be increased to 5.6 weeks from 1 April 2009). When a worker's employment ends, he or she is entitled to be paid for any accrued holiday leave that has not been taken. A 'worker' is defined as an individual who works under a contract of employment or any other contract whereby he or she undertakes to **personally** perform work or services, other than as part of his or her own business undertaking. A substitution clause in a contract that permits an individual to delegate duties to someone else will generally defeat a claim that the individual is a 'worker' as it removes the mutuality of obligation condition necessary for the claim to succeed.

In the following case, the issue was whether bricklayers were 'workers' or self-employed contractors. RH Ltd sought to rely on a contractual term that permitted the bricklayers to substitute someone else to do the required work.

The bricklayers signed a document titled 'sub contract for a labour only bricklayer'. This identified them as self-employed bricklayers who could accept or decline work. The contract also stated: 'For the avoidance of doubt the obligation to perform the work is not personal to the contractor and their obligations may be performed by other labour. Further the contractor is required to provide other labour if it is necessary to carry out the works or to maintain the rate of progress stipulated by the company.' The bricklayers later submitted tribunal claims under the Working Time Regulations for accrued holiday pay. In order to proceed, as a preliminary, the bricklayers had to persuade the tribunal that they were 'workers'.

Decision

The employment tribunal decided that they were 'workers', stating that the contractual term which allowed them to provide others to do the work, was a sham in that it did not reflect the intention of the parties. The tribunal also decided that it was never intended that either claimant would refuse the work offered or seek to provide a substitute. It also found, that even if the term were valid, it still created enough obligation in respect of personal service to bring the bricklayers within the definition of 'worker'. RH Ltd subsequently appealed against both of the tribunal findings.

EAT conclusion

The EAT decided that there are two contexts in which a sham can occur. The first is where the parties have a common intention and create documents that appear to give rise to legal rights and obligations which both parties intend not to exist, in order to deceive third parties or the court. The second is where neither party intends the contract or the relevant provision to be effective or to constitute an obligation. In these circumstances there does not have to be a joint intention to deceive third parties or the court. It was into this latter category that the RH Ltd case fell.

The EAT determined that the tribunal had also been correct in focusing on the intentions of the parties at the time they entered into the contract and that they had not reached their decision based on what had actually happened in practice. They decided that the question of whether the written provision genuinely reflected what was expected to happen is likely to be one of fact for the tribunal. They ruled that the tribunal had been entitled to find as it did.

The EAT went on to confirm the tribunal's alternative finding that the bricklayers fell within the definition of 'worker'.

RH Ltd's appeal was accordingly dismissed.

Comment

Employers need to be careful when drafting self employed contracts. This case makes it clear that, in terms of contractual construction, it's not what is said or the way that it is said, but what the parties' intentions are, that is important.

Health and Safety

HEALTH AND SAFETY (OFFENCES) ACT 2008

The above Act received Royal Assent on 16th October 2008. The Act, which comes into force on 16th January 2009, raises the maximum penalties that can be imposed for breaching health and safety regulations in the lower courts from £5,000 to £20,000. The Act also broadens the range of offences for which an individual can be imprisoned.

According to the Chairman of the HSE, Judith Hackett, "The new Act sends out an important message to those who flout the law". She went on to say that she believed however that good employers and good managers should have nothing to fear and in fact much to gain. There were no changes to their existing legal duties and important safeguards were in place to ensure these new powers would be used sensibly and proportionately.

The HSE's enforcement policy targets those who cut corners in order to gain commercial advantage over competitors by failing to comply with health and safety law and who put workers and the public at risk.

HELP AT CHRISTMAS

Every Christmas, many young persons are drafted into the workforce of factories, shops, restaurants and bars to cope with extra demands of Christmas. Many of them suffer injuries whilst at work. In a recent five year period, 54 young persons ie under 18 years old were killed in the UK's workplaces and more than 12,500 seriously injured.

When employing young persons, there is a requirement to carry out risk assessments. Employers must then tell the young persons about the risks to their health and safety identified by the assessments, and the measures put in place to control them. They also need to be told about the procedures to be followed in the event of serious and imminent danger, such as emergency evacuation.

To help advise young persons, the Institute of Occupational Safety and Health has produced the following 'top-ten' tips for young workers:

- Only do work you've been shown how to do properly. If you don't understand the instructions, ask your supervisor to explain them or show you again.

- Don't play tricks or practical jokes at work.
- Only lift or carry those articles that you can easily manage.
- Always use the Personal Protective Equipment that you have been given and report to your supervisor if it is lost or damaged.
- If you do get hurt or see anything unsafe or faulty, tell your supervisor immediately.
- Don't run or rush around at work You may slip, fall or bump into something or someone.
- Obey safety signs and follow all instructions.
- Always wash your hands with soap and water before handling or eating food.
- Keep your work area tidy
- Find out about the dangers of drugs and substances such as tablets, alcohol solvents etc. Seek advice from a supportive adult.

An employer should not employ a young person in any work which:

- is beyond their physical or psychological capacity
- exposes them to hazardous substances, including carcinogens, toxic substances or radiation.
- exposes them to a situation where the risk of accidents may not be recognised due to their lack of experience or training.
- exposes them to risk to their health from excessive cold, heat, noise or vibration.

Training must be provided in all general safety procedures, not just in the use of machinery and equipment and competent supervision must be provided to ensure that the young person is corrected if undertaking tasks in an unsafe or incorrect manner.

Attention to the above points will ensure that both the young person and the employer will enjoy the Christmas experience!



Right to Reply

If you have any comments or feedback regarding this newsletter or would like to highlight a specific topic you would like covering in our next issue, please e-mail the details to us. If there are other individuals in your organisation who you feel would benefit from receiving future newsletters, please forward the details to the e-mail address below.

EML's consultants are on hand to assist you and provide a tailor made service to support your organisation in effectively

managing human resource or health & safety issues. Please contact any of our consultants on the contact number below if you would like to discuss any specific problem.

The information and any commentary on the law contained in this newsletter are provided for information purposes only. No responsibility is assumed for its accuracy or for any consequences of relying upon it. The information and commentary does not, and is not, intended to amount to legal advice and the writers do not intend that it should be so relied upon.

Have a gap to fill?

We have an extensive database of experienced HR Professionals.

Our consultants are experts in designing successful recruitment and selection processes to find you the right candidates for your business.

We are not interested in simply placing candidates to generate a high percentage fee. We offer a unique approach to delivering specialist recruitment needs at very competitive prices

Looking for work?

If you are a victim of the credit crunch, or simply looking for a career change, why not send your CV to us?

Over the years we have developed a network of excellent contacts who regularly keep in touch with vacancies which are not advertised

Why not give us a call now to see how we can source the right candidate for you or help you with your job search?

01942 727200



**EML would like to wish you all
a very Merry Christmas
& a Happy and Prosperous New
Year!**