EMPLOYMENT LAW — CHECKLIST

1.0 API	PLICATION OF THE FWA	
2.0 EM	IPLOYEE OR CONTRACTOR?	4
2.1	GENERAL CHECKLIST	4
2.1.1	Labour Hire Agreement – Agency And Worker	6
2.1.2	Sham Contracts	7
2.1.3	Independent Contractor Protections	
3.0 FAI	IR WORK ACT APPLICATION	9
	COMMON LAW EMPLOYEE	
	NATIONAL SYSTEM EMPLOYEE	
	CASUAL EMPLOYEE	
4.0 FW	A: MINIMUM STANDARDS	12
4.1	APPLICATION OF THE NES MINIMUM STANDARDS (PART 2-2)	13
4.1.1	Period Of Continuous Service	13
4.1.2	Maximum Weekly Hours — Div 3	
4.1.3	Flexible Working Arrangements — Div 4	
4.1.4	Unpaid Parental Leave — Div 5	
4.1.5	Paid Annual Leave — Div 6	
4.1.6	Personal/Carer's Leave — Div 7	
4.1.7	Notice Of Termination — Div 11, Subdiv A	
4.1.8	Redundancy Pay — Div 11, Subdiv B	
4.1.9	Fair Work Information Statement — Div 12	
	MODERN AWARDS – PART 2-3	
4.2.1		
	EQUAL REMUNERATION ORDERS	
	/A: ENTERPRISE AGREEMENTS	
	THE BARGAINING PROCESS REQUIREMENTS	
5.2	APPROVING AN ENTERPRISE AGREEMENT	
5.2.1	Single Enterprise Agreement With Employee's Themselves	
5.2.2	-	
5.2.3	Single Enterprise — Greenfields — New Enterprises	
	Multi Enterprise — Greenfields — New Enterprises	
	PROTECTED INDUSTRIAL ACTION	
5.3.1	Grounds For FWC Terminating Protected Industrial Action	37
6.0 FW	/A: ENFORCEMENT	40
6.1	THREE AVENUES FOR RESOLVING A DISPUTE	
6.1.1	Pursuing A Dispute Under An Enterprise Agreement	
6.1.2	Pursuing A Dispute Under A Modern Award	
6.1.3	Litigation For Contravention Of An Obligation Under The Fwa	
6.1.4	Serious Contravention	42
7.0 WC	ORK HEALTH AND SAFETY LAW	43
7.1.1	First Tier — General Duties On Employers	43
7.1.2	Second Tier — Regulations	44
7.1.3	Third Tier — Compliance Codes/Codes Of Pratice	
7.1.4	Consequences/Penalties	44
3.0 CO	MMON LAW CONTRACT OF EMPLOYMENT	46
8.1	IS THERE A VALID CONTRACT?	46

8.2 II	CONTRACT VALID, WHAT SORT OF BREACHES MAY BE RELEVANT?	46
8.2.1	Terms Implied By Fact	46
8.2.2	Terms Implied By Custom And Practice	46
8.2.3	Terms Implied By Law — Implied Obligations Of Employees	46
8.2.4	Terms Implied By Law — Implied Obligations Of Employers	48
	MANAGERIAL POLICIES AND CODES OF CONDUCT	
8.3.1	Does The Policy Have Contractual Force?	
8.3.2	Evidence Indicating Policy Has Contractual Force	
8.3.3	Has There Been A Breach?	
8.3.4	If Not Contractually Binding, Do The Policies Have Any Other Impact?	51
9.0 ANT	I-DISCRIMINATION	52
9.1.1	Direct Discrimination	53
9.1.2	Victimisation	57
10.0 ADV	/ERSE ACTION	58
	ROHIBITED GROUNDS	58
10.1 P		
10.1 P	ROHIBITED GROUNDS	58
10.1 P 10.1.1 10.1.2	ROHIBITED GROUNDS	58 59
10.1 P 10.1.1 10.1.2 10.1.3	Workplace Rights (S 340)	58 59
10.1 P 10.1.1 10.1.2 10.1.3 10.1.4	Workplace Rights (S 340)	58 59 59
10.1 P 10.1.1 10.1.2 10.1.3 10.1.4 10.1.5	Workplace Rights (S 340)	58 59 59
10.1 P 10.1.1 10.1.2 10.1.3 10.1.4 10.1.5	ROHIBITED GROUNDS	
10.1 P 10.1.1 10.1.2 10.1.3 10.1.4 10.1.5 11.0 ANT	Workplace Rights (S 340)	585959596061
10.1 P 10.1.1 10.1.2 10.1.3 10.1.4 10.1.5 11.0 ANT	Workplace Rights (S 340)	
10.1 P 10.1.1 10.1.2 10.1.3 10.1.4 10.1.5 11.0 ANT 11.1.1 11.1.2 11.1.3	Workplace Rights (S 340)	
10.1 P 10.1.1 10.1.2 10.1.3 10.1.4 10.1.5 11.0 ANT 11.1.1 11.1.2 11.1.3 11.1.4	Workplace Rights (S 340) Industrial Activities (S 346) Race/Sex/Disability/Carers/Sexual Preferences (S 351) Causation Exceptions I-BULLYING ORDERS Application For An Anti Bullying Order Was [X] Bullied? Exceptions	

FAIR WORK ACT APPLICATION

THINK: Is [x] an employee under 2.0 above? FWA only applies to common law employees or NES employees

EXAM: Whether the FWA applies to [client] is contingent on whether they are a 'national system employee' (FWA s 13) or 'employee' within the meaning of the common law (See, s 15). The FWA uses these two 'standard' definitions interchangeably at the beginning of each Part to determine the scope of that Parts application.

[1] Think:

[a] Which State is [x] employed in? If they're employed in WA they can only be an NES employee if they're caught by the s 13 + 14 approach as WA isn't a referral state.

IS [X] A COMMON LAW EMPLOYEE?

[1] See above.

IS [X] A NATIONAL SYSTEM EMPLOYEE?

TWO APPROACHES — Go through both!

(A) Section 13 + 14 Approach

State:

[1] [Client] is an NES employee so far as [he/she] is employed by an NES employer (s 13). Therefore whether [client] is an NES employee under the s 13 + 14 approach is contingent on whether [firm/employer] is an NES employer (s 14)

NES employer test (s 14)

- [1] Constitutional Corporation (s 14(1)(a)):
 - [a] **State:** A Constitutional Corporation is a corporation includes all <u>foreign corporations</u>, and <u>trading</u> and <u>financial</u> corporations formed in the Cth within the meaning of s 51(xx) of the Constitution.
 - [b] Apply:
 - State: [employer] is a [foreign/trading/financial] corporation, therefore... [apply below].
 - [ii] <u>Foreign Corporation:</u> Automatically covered (see s 51(xx).
 - [iii] <u>Trading Corporation:</u> Apply Activities test (Adamson)
 - (a) **State:** The court will apply the activities test from *Adamson* in determining whether [employer] is a trading corp. This threshold requirement is difficult to apply. This test will look at whether [employer's] trading activities are a <u>substantial</u> or <u>not insubstantial</u> proportion of their activities (*Adamson*).
 - (b) Apply
 - [iv] <u>Financial Corporation:</u>
 - (a) **State:** The same test applies for financial corps as trading corps (*State Superannuation Board*). The court will therefore apply the activities test from *Adamson* in determining whether [**employer**] is a financial corp. This threshold requirement is difficult to apply. This test will look at whether [**employer's**] trading activities are a <u>substantial</u> or <u>not</u> insubstantial proportion of their activities (*Adamson*).
 - (b) Apply.
- [2] The Commonwealth itself (s 14(1)(b))

[2]		III A III 25 - 4 4/4 //)			
[3]					
[4]	Person employed in connection with constitutional trade, who is employed as s 14(1)(d):				
	[a] A flight crew officer s 14(d)(i);				
	[b]	Maritime employee; or s 14(d)(ii)			
	[c]	Waterside worker s 14(d)(iii)			
(B) Eı	mploye	d in a Referral State [Everywhere except WA who hasn't referred any power]			
[1]	State	As [X] works in [Anywhere but WA] they may also be an NES employee to the extent of the States referral (s			
	30C,	30D, 30E) .			
[2]	Apply	:			
	[a]	<u>Victoria:</u>			
		[i]			
	[b]	ACT:			
		[i] State: In ACT the national system includes <u>all</u> employees <u>except</u> a law enforcement officer or executive			
		in the public sector. Therefore, [X] is/is not an NES employee.			
	[c]	NSW, Qld and SA:			
		[i] State: In [NSW/Qld/SA] the national system includes all employees, except most state government			
		and local government employees.			
	[d]	NT:			
		[i] State: In NT the national system includes all employees except members of the police force.			
	[e]	<u>Tasmania:</u>			
		[i] State: In Tasmania, the NES includes private enterprise and local government, but excludes state			
		government.			
		IS [X] A CASUAL EMPLOYEE?			
		13 [A] A CASUAL LIMIPLOTEL:			
EXAM:	: The FV	VA does not define 'casual worker.' The most common definition of a casual is simply someone who is specifically			
		paid' as a casual (Stewarts Guide, 4.2). However, the case law relating to whether employee's can be correctly			
charac	terised	as 'casual' is very ambiguous (See, eg. Williams; Skene and cf. Telem)			
[1]	Is there	e a <u>modern award</u> or <u>enterprise agreement</u> in play?			
	[a]	Does it define 'casual employment'?			
		[i] Yes – apply the definition in the award			
		[ii] No – State rule below.			
	[b]	STATE RULE: Modern awards generally define 'casual' employee's in line with the common definition that			
		someone who is 'engaged and paid' as a casual is thus a casual.			
[2]	Does ti	ne agreement between [X] and [employer] contemplate the future?			
]		STATE RULE: One similarity in the case law concerning casual employment is that where the agreement between			
	[a]	the employee and employer in some way contemplates future matters (<i>Williams</i>) and/or <u>fails to make</u> a 'firm			
		advance commitment as to the duration of the employee's employment or the days/hours they will work' (<i>Skene</i>			
		approving <i>Hamzy</i>) this will help to suggest a casual relationship.			
		•			
[3]	Analog	ize — Williams v McMahon			
	[a]	Facts:			

Regular shift: 7 consecutive day shifts, then 7 consecutive night shifts (of 12 hours each), then 1 week off.

FIFO miner.

		[iii]	Contract: Written contract stated he was a casual; \$40 per hour flat rate. Contract terminable on 1 hours'			
		Ft1	notice.			
	[b]	FCA He	<u>W's claim</u> : seeking annual leave under Workplace Relations Act (equivalent to NES under FW Act).			
	[10]	[i]	FCA held that Williams was <u>NOT</u> a casual because:			
		[1]	(a) Casual work means engagement on an 'intermittent' and 'irregular' basis [40]			
			(b) The 'future was provided for' between Williams and McMahon Mining			
			(c) <u>Regularity of Employment:</u> The roster system meant that there was a 'regularity' of employment which was inconsistent with a casual employment relationship.			
	[c]	Applica				
		[i]	Is there some regularity in [X's] employment?			
		[ii]	Is the 'future provided for' \rightarrow therefore suggesting some form on ongoing employment that is inconsistent with a casual employment relationship			
[4]	Analo	Analogize — Telem v CFMEU				
	[a]	Facts:				
		[i]	Construction workers.			
		[ii]	Worked full time equivalent hours; regular start and finish times; attended work each day.			
		[iii]	<u>CFMEU Claim</u> : seeking redundancy pay under NES & Enterprise Agreement.			
	[b] Held by FWCFB:					
		[i]	"Casual" means that the worker was engaged as a casual under an Enterprise Agreement, and where			
			there is not an EA, then a modern award.			
	[c]	Applica	ition:			
		[i]	Look at whether there is an EA or MA on the facts which stipulates the worker is a casual employee.			
[5]	Analogize — Workpac v Skene					
	[a]	Facts:				
		[i]	FIFO truck driver.			
		[ii]	S a truck driver at a coal mine.			
		[iii]	S claim: seeking paid annual leave under NES.			
	[b]	FCAFC -	- Held:			
		[i]	Skene was entitled to paid annual leave under NES because he was not a "casual" due to his "regular predictable working arrangements".			

CONCLUSION: The above analysis suggests that [X] will/will not be considered a casual employee. However, I would advise [X] that this is an ambiguous area of law and the court holds a broad discretion in its interpretation of the factors indicating a casual or non-casual employment relationship.

FWA: MINIMUM STANDARDS

[1] THRESHOLD: Is [X] an NES employee or NES en	employer?
---	-----------

- [a] The minimum standards in Part 2—2 of the FWA only apply to NES employees and employers (s 60 FWA)
- [b] Yes? Carry on.
- [c] No? Minimum standards in the NES don't apply but

EXAM STATEMENT: Section 60 of the FWA applies the NES minimum standards in Part 2-2 of the FWA to NES employ<u>ees</u> and NES employ<u>ers</u> only. As [X] is an [NES employee/NES employer] the minimum standards apply. As an employer, [employer] must not contravene the NES standards (s 44 FWA).

- a) CONSIDER: Is there an <u>AWARD</u> or <u>ENTERPRISE AGREEMENT</u> in play on the facts?
- b) Yes? Statement below and consider rules.

EXAM STATEMENT: A modern award or enterprise agreement <u>cannot exclude the National Employment Standards</u> or any provision of the NES (s 55(1)).

- [i] s 55(2): A modern award or enterprise agreement may include any terms that the award or agreement is expressly permitted to include:
 - (a) By a provision of Part 2-2 which deals with NES
 - (b) By regulations made for the purposes of s 127.
- [ii] s 55(4): A modern award or enterprise agreement may also include the following kids of terms:
 - (a) Terms that are ancillary or incidental to the operation of an entitlement of an employee under the NES
 - (b) Terms that supplement the NES.
- c) No? Move on

APPLICATION OF THE NES MINIMUM STANDARDS (PART 2-2)

PERIOD OF CONTINUOUS SERVICE

EXAM: A number of [X's] entitlements under Pt 2-2 are contingent on their length of continuous service. Continuous service is defined as the period in which [X] has been employed by [employer] but excludes some periods: s 22(1). This period will be determined here to help inform an analysis of their potential entitlements below.

[Apply below]

CONCLUDE: [X's] period of continuous service for Part 2-2 generally is [insert period of employment <u>less</u> any excluded periods] and for Divs 4 & 5 and Subdiv A of Div 11 is [insert period of employment <u>less</u> any excluded periods]

[1] GENERAL SERVICE: Part 2—2.

- [a] Excluded periods which do not count towards service:
 - Any period of unauthorised absence; s 22(2)(a)
 - [ii] Any period of <u>unpaid leave:</u> s 22(2)(b)
 - (a) <u>Note:</u> This doesn't include a period of stand-down under an EA or under the employee's contract: s 22(2)(b)(ii)
- d) SERVICE under Div 4 (Flexible Working Arrangement); Div 5 (parental leave) and Subdiv A of Div 11 (termination)

- e) Excluded periods under Div 4, Div 5 and Subdiv A of Div 11:
 - [iii] Any period of <u>unauthorised absence</u>: s 22(4)(a)(i)

I) MAXIMUM WEEKLY HOURS — DIV 3

PART 2-2 DIV 3 (ss 62-64)

[1] **FULL-TIME WORKER:**

EXAM STATEMENT: As [X] is a full-time employee, he/she is only required to work for 38 hours weekly, plus additional reasonable hours (s 62(1)(a)).

2) PART-TIME WORKER:

EXAM STATEMENT: As [X] is <u>not</u> a full-time employee, he/she is only required to work the <u>lesser of</u> 38 hours weekly (s 62(1)(b)(i)); or his/her ordinary weekly hours (s 62(1)(b)(ii)) plus reasonable additional hours. [X's] maximum hours will be [ordinary hours/38 hours] + reasonable additional hours.

- a) APPLY Can [X] refuse to work unreasonable additional hours? (For both Full-Time and Part-Time Employees).
- b) STATE: [X] has been asked to work additional hours. He/she can refuse provided these additional hours are considered unreasonable (s 62(2)). In determining whether these hours are unreasonable, the court <u>must</u> consider factors listed in s 62(3).
- c) TEST Section 62(3) Factors
 - [i] Risk to employee <u>health and safety</u> from working additional hours: s 62(3)(a).
 - [ii] Employee's personal circumstances, including family responsibilities: s 62(3)(b).
 - [iii] Needs of the workplace and the enterprise where employee is employed: s 62(3)(c).
 - [iv] Whether the employee is entitled to <u>overtime</u> or <u>penalty rates</u>: s 62(3)(d).
 - [v] Whether the employee is <u>well remunerated</u> (suggests an underlying expectation of working extra hours): s 62(3)(d).
 - [vi] Notice given by the employer of a need to work additional hours: s 62(3)(e).
 - [vii] Notice given by the <u>employee</u> of his or her <u>intention</u> to refuse extra hours: s 62(3)(f).
 - [viii] <u>Usual work patterns</u> in that <u>specific industry</u>: s 62(3)(g)
 - [ix] Nature of the employee's role and their level of responsibility: s 62(3)(h).
 - [x] Any other relevant matter: s 62(3)(j).
- d) Are hours being averaged over an extended period?
 - Option One Award or EA:
 - a) State: An MA or EA may include terms which averages hours over a specific period (s 63(1)).
 - (b) **Rule:** These averaged hours can exceed the normal thresholds for both full-time and part-time employees <u>provided they are reasonable</u> for the purposes of ss 62(1) (s 63(2)).
 - (c) Apply
 - [ii] Option Two [X] Agreed in Writing:
 - a) State: [X] has agreed in writing that [his/her] weekly hours will be averaged over [period].
 - b) **Rule [if relevant]:** Weekly hours must be averaged over a period <u>less than</u> 26 weeks (s 64(1)).
 - State Rule: These averaged hours can exceed the normal thresholds for both full-time and part-time employees provided they are reasonable for the purposes of ss 62(1). (s 64(2))
 - (d) Apply
 - [b] Conclude