

CHRONICLE

October 2006

Collective bargaining and industrial conflict in the health sector again dominated the media reports of employment relations (see September Chronicle). Food and service workers employed by New Zealand's 21 district health boards were campaigning for a single national collective employment agreement covering the hospital boards and four major contract companies. Actions included a nationwide series of rallies and protests. For example, the *Timaru Herald* and the *Southland Times* reported that food and service workers employed by local hospitals manned pickets outside their workplace. The workers alleged that the only time they received a pay rise was when the minimum wage was raised. The *Timaru Herald* cited the example of an employee who had worked in the Timaru Hospital kitchen for 28 years and was still only receiving the minimum wage of \$10.25 per hour.

Meanwhile the *Dominion Post* reported that hospital radiographers were planning their fourth strike in less than a month after health board managers rejected a mediated pay settlement (see September Chronicle). A planned five days strike in November would be their longest strike to date.

However, the long running dispute involving junior doctors appeared closer to a solution (see August Chronicle). The *Dominion Post* reported that junior doctors were poised to reach an agreement with District Health Boards and suggested that most of the key bargaining issues were resolved with only technical details still outstanding. Both sides seemed willing to compromise on a process that would allow them to trial new roster systems without having to go through a formal bargaining process.

In an article voicing the frustration and concern of hospital administrators, the *Press* presented the Canterbury District Health Board members' view that doctors, nurses and other hospital staff should be treated as essential workers and thus, having restricted access to take strike action. The article suggested that the position was prompted by a presentation to board members showing that although personnel costs had increased by \$20 million in the last three years, productivity had not kept pace.

According to the *Press*, plans by Air New Zealand to shed 1675 baggage and check-in operators was part of a strategic decision to outsource the operation to a Spanish company, Swissport International. Air New Zealand claimed that no decision had been made but unions for the affected workers claimed that the cuts would irreparably damage Air New Zealand's goodwill and image and lead to security concerns. The plan to contract out the services was estimated to save Air New Zealand \$20m.

Meanwhile the *Press* also reported that another section of Air New Zealand's workforce was embroiled in an industrial dispute. About 270 workers at the Christchurch Engine Centre (a joint venture between Air NZ and US company Pratt & Whitney) refused to work overtime after a failure to reach settlement on working conditions. The Union acting for the staff claimed that the key issue was the employer's attempt to cut an existing extra week holiday entitlement after six years

service. Subsequently, the stakes were raised when the workers were told that their jobs were at stake after Pratt and Whitney had decided it would not supply any more jet engines to be serviced at the Christchurch Engine Centre.

The *Press* reported that Mount Cook Airline pilots ended their industrial action after reaching an agreement with their employer over new working conditions (see August Chronicle). The long-running dispute was settled after a negotiation process facilitated by the Employment Relations Authority.

Television New Zealand staff walked off the job in what was described as the biggest action of its type at the company for 30 years. Around 120 union members in Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch picketed for an hour in support of their claim for a 5 per cent pay rise and better annual leave entitlements. The workers claimed they were frustrated at being offered a 2.25 per cent pay rise after seeing the salaries of some high profile newsreaders.

A postie caught on camera taking a cell phone in a shop lost her job of 30 years when the Employment Relations Authority rejected the employee's claim that New Zealand Post had unjustifiably dismissed her. The cell phone was taken from the counter of a fast-food outlet, and staff contacted NZ Post after examining security camera footage. The employee claimed that she did not notice she had the phone until she had returned to her car and her advocate argued that the security camera footage was not enough to establish the alleged serious misconduct. However, the Authority was satisfied from the security film footage that the employee had deliberately picked up the phone. The Authority found that it was "tragic" that the employee had lost her job after 30 years but a reasonable employer would have dismissed her in the circumstances.

A senior Victoria University academic, who clashed with his employer in a public e-mail fracas and then received a written warning, was cleared of any wrongdoing by the Employment Relations Authority. The warning stemmed from five e-mails written by the academic criticising the university's disciplinary process, which were copied to 200 fellow academics. The Authority found that the university did not investigate the academic's behaviour before deciding it was worthy of a disciplinary offence. However, the academic was criticised by the Authority for antagonising management with the tone of the e-mails and the Authority rejected his argument that forwarding the copied e-mails to colleagues was an exercise of academic freedom.

The *Dominion Post* reported that a creative director at a top advertising agency was awarded \$130,000 after his manager sent a "premature and precipitous" e-mail announcing his resignation. In early 2005, the employee became the company's creative director of brand and direct marketing earning a salary of \$280,000. In April 2005, the employee was told that he "would be a casualty" of a decision to purchase another advertising agency. The employee was upset at the news, sought legal advice and offered to resign in return for an exit package. When mediation failed to reach a solution, the manager sent an email to staff saying that he had received letter of resignation. The Employment Relations Authority agreed that the employee had not resigned and had offered to do so only if certain conditions were met. As well as four months salary as compensation, the employee was awarded \$15,000 as compensation for distress and humiliation.

In a review of the work stoppages in the year to 30 June 2006, both the *Independent Financial Review* and the *NZ Herald* reported that pay issues accounted for most of the 59 work stoppages. This was the highest number of stoppages since 1997, which had 69 work stoppages. President of the Council of Trade Unions (CTU) Ross Wilson claimed that employers who were “unrealistic about the need for a decent wage increase” would continue to see workers exercising their right to take industrial action in support of a wage claim. He added that work stoppages “remain historically low” and “the vast majority” of employment agreements were settled without industrial action. Figures from Statistics New Zealand supported these claims when it was shown that work stoppages had shown a downward trend since a peak in the late 1970s. From annual levels of more than 400 work stoppages in the late 1970s, the number of stoppages had reduced to less than 100 a year since 1990.

The Business NZ-KPMG survey of compliance costs showed that the compliance cost burden on businesses continued to grow. The report estimated that firms with fewer than 10 employees faced annual compliance costs averaging \$3,000 per employee. Companies with more than 50 employees had annual compliance costs of less than \$1,000 per employee. After tax, the next biggest concern amongst business was the cost of complying with the Employment Relations Act, Holidays Act and Health & Safety in Employment Act. In particular, respondents’ comments indicated they were unhappy with the complicated work imposed by the Holidays Act and by the provisions of the Employment Relations Act that allow for spurious grievance claims. Responding to the report, CTU President Ross Wilson stated that the report was an “annual moan” from the business sector and that the World Bank had judged New Zealand to be the second easiest place in the world to do business (and first in the world for the two previous years) which put the constant complaints from business in an international context. Wilson argued that the Employment Relations Act had restored a commitment to international labour conventions, which guaranteed the right for workers to choose to join unions and bargain collectively, as well as providing a framework of good faith within which to negotiate.

November 2006

The *National Business Review* reported that the Minister of Labour Ruth Dyson had instructed the Department of Labour to investigate employment laws that ‘penalised’ employers for dismissing even their worst employees. In a letter to the Employers and Manufacturers Association (Northern), Ms Dyson admitted her concern about whether there was the right balance between “the substantive reason to dismiss and the correct processes for an employer to follow”.

The Department of Labour released a discussion paper on flexible work. The paper proposed that employees should have the ability to negotiate greater flexibility in work hours and conditions with their employers. Meanwhile, a coalition of business, union and women groups was launched in Parliament to support Green MP Sue Kedgley’s Private Member’s Bill aimed at introducing legislation on flexible working hours. Both the coalition and the discussion paper were the result of a period of consultation, which the Transport and Industrial Relations Select Committee had requested after considering the Bill.

The *National Business Review* revealed that the Ministry of Health had lobbied the government not to pass a law requiring employers of 'vulnerable workers' to open their books to competitors (see March Chronicle). Documents obtained under the Official Information Act showed that the Ministry of Health opposed the introduction of disclosure provisions in the Employment Relations Amendment Act, which were added to the Bill by a last minute supplementary order paper on the day it was passed by Parliament. Crown health organisations are the largest employers of 'vulnerable workers', such as cleaners, caterers and laundry staff. A cabinet paper said that the Ministry of Health believed the existing provisions were sufficient to protect vulnerable workers and the disclosure requirements would not add any further protection to those employees.

It was reported that the Maori Party would vote to stop the Probationary Employment Bill from progressing any further when the Bill returned to the House (see August Chronicle). The Bill had passed its first reading with Maori Party support but with the proviso that it would not disadvantage Maori workers. The party had since come under pressure from unions and members to reject the Bill. National Party Spokesperson Dr Wayne Mapp said he was disappointed that the Maori Party had made up its mind before hearing all the submissions, and warned the party that probation periods and other industrial law reform would be a priority for National at the 2008 election. After months of controversy the Bill was voted down in its second reading.

Again, the Health sector again featured prominently in the media with strike action or strike notices amongst senior doctors, radiographers and medical laboratory workers. The *Press* reported that senior doctors were threatening industrial action and were accusing District Health Boards (DHBs) of failing to retain or attract enough high-quality specialists. The senior doctors' association - the Association of Salaried Medical Specialists - claimed that patients were falling through cracks in the health system, created by under funding. In an unprecedented move, the Association voted overwhelmingly to hold a national stop work meeting if no solution was found to their contract negotiations. The Association's Executive Director Ian Powell claimed that the DHBs had ignored the country's serious recruitment and retention of senior doctors. Mr Powell also cited the increase in DHB chief executive salaries of an average of 13.5 per cent to \$299,000 in a two year period. By comparison, he said, senior doctors had been offered increases worth an average of 2.4 per cent a year. A negotiator for the DHBs said that the senior doctors had been offered an extra 10.1 per cent over three years. The offer was worth \$60 million and could be used to fund a mix of pay increases and improved conditions.

Radiographers continued their industrial action when 260 radiographers 'walked off the job' for a period of ten days. The DHBs and the radiographers' union, the Association of Professional and Executive Employees (Apex), said they were willing to keep negotiating over the union's bid for higher pay but no date was set for further negotiations. Once again, there were concerns that the strike would endanger the safety of patients. In a response to the strike, members of the Canterbury DHB voted unanimously in favour of a motion to outlaw strikes by hospital workers on the basis that public hospital workers should be deemed essential services providers, such as police, who are not allowed to take industrial action (see October Chronicle). The motion also called for a clear national process for settling disputes in the health sector.

Yet another group within the health sector gave notice of strike action. Medical laboratory workers gave notice of a seven-day strike from November 29, with the strike likely to affect laboratories throughout the country and the New Zealand Blood Service. The *Press* noted that the Medical Laboratory Workers' Union shared its contracted negotiator, Deborah Powell, with the radiographers' union, which was currently on strike in seven District Health Boards. The National President of the Laboratory Workers' Union Stewart Smith said that the pay rates were already low and staff were not prepared to accept the offer of 1.5 per cent for the first year and 2.5 per cent for the second. Talks to prevent the strike failed and the *NZ Herald* reported that private and public hospitals cancelled virtually all scheduled surgery, because blood work and transfusions were unavailable. Health commentators claimed that the strike was probably more disruptive than the junior doctors' national strike in August.

However, the negotiations between junior doctors and District Health Boards (DHBs) finally came to a close. After nearly a year of negotiations and a nationwide strike (see October Chronicle), 2500 junior doctors working in public hospitals voted to accept a settlement. The package was estimated to cost DHBs \$10 million over 18 months and included a 5.6 per cent pay rise.

The *Press* reported that mediation had started in the long running contract negotiations between the Christchurch City Council and the union representing 1100 staff in an attempt to negotiate blockages, including pay rates and flexible hours of work. A Council spokesperson said the council was seeking to redress an imbalance in the salary structure where workers on lower grades were paid well above the market rates, while those in the higher grades were well below market rates. A Union spokesperson said that the union was seeking a settlement of around 4 per cent. The council was also seeking more flexibility over starting and finishing times but the union had concerns that some staff, such as working mothers, would not be able to meet such demands.

Finsec (the financial sector union) started its campaign for industry-wide parity in pay and conditions amongst the banks. The union's 'Better Banks' campaign was targeted at improving working conditions as well as staff training and customer services. Campaign director Andrew Campbell said it was the first time that bank workers had worked together across the industry to promote change since employment awards were removed in 1990. He also said that bank employees were not looking for a return to a single multi-employer collective agreement but were aiming to standardise claims across the industry. Finsec estimated that, over the past 10 years, staff levels had been reduced by 9 per cent, income per employee had increased by 103 per cent and bank profits had collectively increased by 170 per cent.

Around 100 staff at the Colgate Palmolive factory in Petone, Wellington were told they had lost their jobs. The National Secretary of the engineer union - EPMU - Andrew Little said that the intended closure of the factory was a huge blow to the process workers, most of who would struggle to find new jobs. Mr Little suggested the closure represented the 'ugly face of globalisation': despite making good profits and performing well, the Petone plant was to be superseded by imported goods from Australia and Malaysia. The *NZ Herald* added that the closure was the latest demonstration of how far New Zealand had lost control of its own economic destiny.

The *Manawatu Standard* reported a confidential settlement between a teacher and his employer. The teacher had lodged a personal grievance case after complaining that his students bullied him because of anti-American feeling. The teacher claimed that the school failed to provide a safe working environment by refusing to address student misbehaviour and instead blamed his “character flaws”. In a separate complaint to the Human Rights Commission (which could not proceed), the teacher claimed he was a victim of xenophobia and a scapegoat for antipathy against US foreign policy.

A survey by the ANZ Bank showed that the internet now carried more job advertisements than newspapers, with the overall total of job ads is rising. In the three months to September, the combined number of job advertisements in papers and online in New Zealand topped 170,000 for the first time, up more than 7 per cent compared to the previous three months. There were 78,000 newspaper advertisements in the quarter and more than 92,000 internet-based advertisements.

According to the *Independent Financial Review*, a Massey University study argued that the new workplace-based unions formed under the Employment Relations Act 2000 were an employee-led phenomenon with little evidence of employers dominating or precipitating the process. This argument contradicted other scholars who had argued that employers had played a significant role in the formation of workplace-based unions since the introduction of the ERA in 2000. Overall, the New Zealand Union movement had been marked by the rapid formation, registration and proliferation of new, small, workplace-based unions, in contrast to prevailing trends in most Western industrialised countries where organised labour was in decline.

December 2006

The Government discussed plans to change legislation to ensure greater patient safety when health workers go on strike (see November Chronicle). Health Minister Pete Hodgson conceded that patient safety might have been at risk in a series of strikes by Health workers. The Minister of Labour Minister Ruth Dyson announced that she intended to make changes to the Code of Good Faith in the Employment Relations Act with specific reference to the health sector. The Code of Good Faith required health providers to provide for patient safety during industrial action by ensuring life preserving services were maintained. But the schedule did not explicitly mention permanent disability, leaving it open as to whether life preserving services meant preventing death and nothing more. It was claimed that clarification would go a long way towards protecting the right to strike in the health sector.

As the strikes dragged on in the health sector the *NZ Herald* reported on further calls to outlaw stoppages by health workers (see November Chronicle). The Medical Council and the Orthopaedic Association argued that health workers’ right to strike for pay rises should be replaced by compulsory arbitration. Health sector unions said that compulsory arbitration or related approaches have failed in the past, most recently under labour laws repealed by the National Government in 1991. Dr Deborah Powell, Chief Executive of the Medical Laboratory Workers Union, said that the root cause of the unrest was that there was not enough money in the sector to pay health workers.

Prime Minister Helen Clark entered the fray when she singled out Dr Powell as the common link behind a rash of strikes disrupting the health sector. In a *Dominion Post* article, the Prime Minister stated that it was interesting that it was Dr Powell who represented the various groups of health workers who had taken industrial action this year. The Prime Minister stated that “the records would show that there’s been more willingness to negotiate by other unions in the sector than there is with these ones led by the same person”. In response, Dr Powell said the Government and District Health Boards were using her as a scapegoat and to deflect public attention from health workers’ reasonable demands for more pay.

The *Press* reported the angry response to the Prime Minister’s comments by the health sector unions. Health sector strikes were due to inadequate pay offers not individuals, said unionists who disagreed with Prime Minister Helen Clark’s public criticism of Dr Powell. District Health Board negotiator Nigel Murray told the *Press* that he did not want to comment on Dr Powell specifically, but said the prime minister had made “some good points”. Unions led by Dr Powell had jointly taken 30 days of strikes and issued 150 notices for less disruptive action which had been “designed to disrupt patients and their treatment”, Mr Murray said. He also added that “you would be hard pressed to find an observer that didn’t say these series of strikes are not in some way co-ordinated”.

Reporting on the background to the seven day strike by 1200 laboratory workers, the *Dominion Post* suggested that the industrial action in the health sector started when nurses received a substantial pay increase. Since then, other health workers had lobbied their employers (in effect, the Government) for pay increases arguing that they too had skills that were scarce and deserve reward. Like the nurses, radiation therapists, radiographers and laboratory workers had a strong case, although the article concluded that no matter how much money the Government “threw” at district health boards, they would be constantly “strapped” for money.

The *Press* reported that a Christchurch businessman issued formal notice of his intention to sue for manslaughter if health strikes caused a fatal delay in his wife’s cancer treatment. The man said that if his wife’s treatment was delayed as a result of ongoing strike action he would sue those responsible. He issued formal notice to the Canterbury DHB and the New Zealand Blood Service as well as union officials and union members.

Strike action on Interislander ferries was averted after senior crew agreed to a new employment deal with Toll NZ. Merchant Service Guild members had threatened to strike over delays in settling a new collective agreement.

A Hastings meat works, which had set up a hi-tech smoking room for its employees, got involved in a bizarre court case. The company had a special problem because hygiene requirements meant that the clothes and equipment given to workers at the start of each shift could not be worn outside protective clothing areas. If workers wanted to smoke they had to change their clothes to go outside. In an effort to overcome this problem, the company had made a smoking room within the protective clothing area. The Ministry of Health prosecuted, alleging that the company had failed to take all reasonable steps to ensure that no one smoked in the workplace. The District Court agreed with charge and the High Court upheld the decision on appeal.

An editorial in the *Dominion Post* questioned whether Business NZ chief executive Phil O'Reilly and Business Roundtable chief executive Roger Kerr, who both argue that paying \$11.25 per hour minimum rate would make it hard for New Zealand to compete internationally, would be as enthusiastic if they were receiving \$410 a week to clean the toilets of high-earning executives. The editorial claimed that the position taken by critics of the statutory minimum wage increase ignored the reality of low paid employees. The minimum wage rise was expected to affect about 110,000 adult workers. For many employees the minimum wage was all they were likely to receive in the foreseeable future. The article concluded that many workers were insulted that they had to rely on state regulation to deliver pay increases.

A survey conducted by the Employers and Manufacturers Association (Northern) found that a quarter of businesses pay off 'problem employees' to avoid court litigation. The report estimated that more than 70 per cent of personal grievances were settled outside official channels such as the Labour Department's mediation service. The report argued that it was cheaper and less risky for an employer to pay off a worker with \$3,000 than face a minimum cost of \$5,000 for court action.

An expert in sexual harassment policies advised employers to have at least one sober person at Christmas parties to keep an eye out for drunken sexual behaviour. Jan Eggleton, a training consultant in harassment prevention, said that Christmas parties were a source of the rise in sexual harassment complaints. Ninety two per cent sexual harassment cases the commission receives were about men harassing women with the majority of men aged mid-to-late forties and the average complainant was a 21 to 23-year-old woman.

The *Dominion Post* reported on a workforce survey, which found that although New Zealand workers are less happy than four years ago, they still think their employers are okay. The international survey by Kelly Services, a staffing and recruitment company, found that 19 per cent of New Zealanders who suffered discrimination felt it was because of their age. The survey report recommended that employers needed to understand the differing needs and psyche of older employees.

January 2007

Yet more strike action occurred in the Health sector with cancer patients having their treatment disrupted when radiation therapists went on strike (see November 2006 Chronicle). Last ditch talks between the District Health Boards (DHBs) and the therapists' union Apex were held but were unsuccessful. Thus, strikes in Christchurch, Wellington and Auckland went ahead. Once again the strike was over pay with union secretary Deborah Powell arguing that DHBs had not offered a pay increase that matched the increased cost of living. In response, the DHBs claimed that therapists' salaries had increased by more than 25 per cent since 2001. In further reports in the *Dominion Post* and the *NZ Herald*, radiation therapists called on the Government to intervene in their pay dispute accusing the DHBs of refusing to negotiate in good faith.

The dispute between the DHBs and the radiation therapists was settled later in the month but the *Dominion Post* reported that tensions between the DHBs and the union

negotiators remained. Further strikes were called off after the union agreed to a reduced offer and a longer agreement period. The settlement included a 1 per cent pay rise backdated to April 2006, a further 1.5 per cent backdated to October 2006 and another 2.5 per cent from July 2007. The agreement will run until June 2008. Apex's National Secretary Deborah Powell commented that after nine months of negotiations the agreement "should do the trick" for members.

Meanwhile, there were developments in the Air New Zealand dispute with 1,700 of its passenger and ground-handling services employees (see October 2006 Chronicle). The *Press* reported that talks between the Engineering, Printing and Manufacturing Union (EPMU) and the airline had resumed. The EPMU's National Secretary Andrew Little said that negotiations had been formative but there was nothing in terms of a way forward. In a later article, the *Press* reported that Air New Zealand and the unions were likely to strike a deal. The parties were finding common ground after six days of talks although an agreement between the negotiating parties would have to be voted on by staff.

The *Press* reported that the impact of new holiday requirements could drive consumer prices up, as small businesses looked for ways to recoup the expense of an additional week's holiday for staff. Business advisory company Grant Thornton warned that the new minimum four weeks paid leave for employees, which would come into effect on April 1, would see some small and medium-size businesses struggle to cope with the increased expense. Grant Thornton estimated that the drop in productivity from having a worker away for another week of the year would be around 2 per cent for the average small business. In response, a policy analyst from the Department of Labour pointed out that British data showed growth in output and productivity from an additional week's holiday.

Employers faced with dismissing abusive employees could take heart from two recent court decisions. The *Waikato Times* reported the case of an employee who had been dismissed. The employee had been abusive to his employer when he was requested to provide a medical after he had been on sick leave for a week. After further abuse and a refusal to attend meetings to discuss the issue, the employee was suspended. While collecting his written warning he entered the office when specifically told not to and was subsequently dismissed. The Employment Relations Authority found the dismissal was unjustified through lack of process but the Authority also noted that if the employee had behaved decently the employer may not have lost patience with him and terminated his employment. The employee received no remedies because the Authority considered that he had contributed 100 per cent to his dismissal. In another case involving an abusive employee, the Authority found that an employee, who had been abusive and threatened to kill other employees, was justifiably dismissed. Furthermore, the Authority noted that even if the dismissal had not been justified due to poor process, the employee's conduct would have resulted in a 100 per cent reduction in remedies. The article concluded that where an employee's behaviour was totally unacceptable, highly offensive or there was a loss of all trust and confidence, a 100 per cent reduction in remedies would be appropriate.

Both the *NZ Herald* and the *Dominion Post* featured another Employment Relations Authority case which involved a senior clinician who was judged to be so incompetent that he would have failed medical school. The foreign trained clinician

had spent seven years treating mentally ill patients for four different District Health Boards. The story became public after the clinician challenged his dismissal as senior clinician at the Community Mental Health Centre in Otahuhu, Auckland. The Authority determined that his dismissal “was justified in all the circumstances”.

The Australian Industrial Relations Commission (AIRC) issued a ruling which allowed cinema company Village Roadshow to dismiss a long-serving manager with 19 years service because the complex, that he had previously managed, had been closed. The AIRC’s full bench overturned a successful unfair dismissal claim by the manager, ruling that Village Roadshow had proved there were ‘genuine operational reasons’ for the dismissal. President of the Australian Council of Trade Union (ACTU) Sharan Burrow suggested that the ruling demonstrated that the new Work Choices laws had given employers unwarranted power to dismiss employees at whim.

Mixed workplaces are happier places to work in according to recent British research. British recruitment consultants Office Angels interviewed 1800 employees about the types of people in their workplaces and asked them to describe people’s working styles, attitudes, philosophies and goals. After analysing the responses, it was found that the most productive British workplaces combine every element of the office political spectrum.

Likewise, other research reported in the *Dominion Post* found that family friendly policies enhanced employee job satisfaction and productivity as some organisations were starting to provide family friendly environments and flexible work arrangements for their staff. The Families Commission and Learning Media Ltd were described as two organisations that were leading the way in providing family friendly environments and flexible work arrangements for their staff. The Families Commission supported staff by providing paid parental leave, facilities at work where children can relax and play or rest if they are unwell, school holiday programs, space where mothers can breastfeed, and flexible leave options for staff to care for family members. Employees also had the capacity to work from home and could log into the central computer system. Learning Media Ltd provided support to all eligible staff over and above legislated requirements. This included a lump-sum maternity leave payout of four weeks of the employee’s gross salary, one week’s paid parental leave for the partner, as well as the statutory one to two weeks’ unpaid leave, open sick and domestic leave as appropriate, and flexible working arrangements to meet family needs that also ensured business needs are met. Both organisations emphasised the benefits to the company of allowing “home at work and work at home”.

Erling Rasmussen & Colin Ross
Auckland University of Technology