

1.1

I understand that applying employment law can be time-consuming and complex. A CIPD (2017) survey found that over a quarter (28%) of employers perceive it as an administrative burden. However, despite its challenges, its application remains essential for several reasons.

Employment law is vital for managing the employer-employee relationship and protecting the rights of our clinicians and support staff. Many rights now considered fundamental, such as the right to basic pay, the right to be consulted and join a trade union are a result of employment law; without these, employers might be inclined to compromise these standards, exploiting labour and prioritising profits over the welfare of their workforce (Taylor and Wilkinson, 2022). Despite this, it is argued that law alone is not always enough. "Micro-violations," such as the under-recording of hours or insufficient rest breaks, can quickly become workplace norms (Ioannou and Dukes, 2021). When professionals, like yourself, fail to actively enforce these required standards, social justice is undermined and employees are conditioned to accept substandard treatment.

While some argue that employment law might deter hiring certain groups such as women of child-bearing age for fear of claims (Taylor and Wilkinson, 2022), it should be viewed as an essential assurance of equality. This protection is necessary; for instance, data shows ethnic minority workers are significantly more likely to have promotions rescinded during economically challenging periods (Mayne, 2025). Looking ahead, the Employment Rights Bill 2025 and the Equality (Race and Disability) Bill will further enhance fairness by expanding paternity leave, protecting minimum wage workers, and mandating ethnicity and disability pay gap reporting for larger companies (People Management, 2025). Concentrating your efforts on these areas will be key to achieving your stated goal of enhancing the employee experience within the Trust.

As you raise, legal compliance requires an investment of time and money. Increases in National Insurance and the National Living Wage puts immense pressure on the Trust's budget (CIPD, 2025b) which could potentially impact the quality of services provided. Nevertheless, the cost of non-compliance is significantly higher. Beyond financial payouts, the average Employment Tribunal case takes up approximately 19 days of management time (Taylor and Wilkinson, 2022). Ultimately, the initial costs of compliance are outweighed by the benefits. Advantages include enhanced employee well-being and productivity, driven by a focus on employee rights, and access to a broader talent pool, a direct result of greater equality (UK Government, 2026).

1.2

Although the jurisdiction of the European Court of Justice (ECJ) concluded with the UK's departure from the EU, most of its pre-brexit judgments remain binding on lower courts and tribunals in the UK (Daniels, 2025). These have remained "good law" as they have not been overturned or repealed.

The relevance of many past judgments persists because the European Union (Withdrawal) Act 2018 integrated most EU legislation into domestic law as assimilated law (Daniels, 2025). The most recent figures indicate that 6,925 laws have been retained and 847 have been retained but have undergone amendments (Department for Business & Trade, 2025). As a result, judges must still refer to previous ECJ case law to guarantee consistent interpretation when applying assimilated laws to new cases. While any UK law enacted after Brexit takes precedence over retained EU law, the UK is incentivised to maintain prior EU employment standards due to a 'non-regression' clause introduced by the EU Trade and Cooperation Agreement (CIPD, 2025g). The UK is permitted to amend EU laws, but to avoid trade tariffs, their standards should not be weakened below their existing level. Therefore, pre-Brexit case law remains valid and will continue to be enforced by judges unless a higher UK court, such as the Supreme Court or Court of Appeal, exercises its power to depart from these established rules (CIPD, 2025g).

The continued relevance of assimilated EU law is demonstrated by The Working Time Regulations 1998. Despite being introduced under EU influence, it continues to set the maximum average working week at 48 hours, guarantees minimum rest periods, and provides the right to paid annual leave (CIPD, 2026). In a healthcare context, it was applied and expanded in the landmark case of *NHS Leeds v Larner* (2012). An employee on long-term sick leave was initially denied a year's accrued holiday pay upon dismissal, as the Trust argued she had not formally requested to take or carry over the leave. The Court of Appeal, however, ruled that because Ms. Larner's illness prevented her from taking the leave, the entitlement automatically carried over (Woods, 2012). The UK government has since incorporated the right to carry over leave due to sickness through the *Employment Rights (Amendment, Revocation and Transitional Provision) Regulations 2023*. This demonstrates how assimilated law remains in force and can only be improved, not weakened, under 'non-regression' trade agreements. To avoid non-compliance with EU regulations that have undergone revisions, it is vital that you stay up to date with developments in employment law.

2.1

Under almost all circumstances, it is unlawful to require a job to be carried out exclusively by a man or a woman. The Equality Act 2010 deems a job advertisement discriminatory if it restricts opportunities based on protected characteristics like sex. This could apply to bias within the criteria, job title, or even the images used (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2024). For example, advertising for a 'shop girl' suggests a preference for young female applicants (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2010). Similarly, using an image of a female nurse to advertise positions in the Trust would reinforce the stereotype that nursing is only a role for women.

When assessing candidates at the selection and interview stages, you must use objective criteria directly related to the role's requirements which are free from any direct or indirect sex bias. For instance, assessing non-essential requirements like 'ability to work unsociable hours' can disadvantage female applicants with caring responsibilities (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2010). Moreover, asking questions targeting a candidate's sex constitutes unfavourable treatment and violates employment law (CIPD, 2025f). This was seen in the case of *Lee v R & F Properties QS*, where a female employee's job offer was withdrawn hours after the hiring manager asked about the age of her children (Brown, 2024).

You are only permitted to stipulate gender requirements when there is a justifiable occupational requirement. Examples within the NHS would include advertising specifically for a female employee to provide care for elderly women (CIPD, 2025f) or to deliver specialist care to female victims of rape (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2024). Positive action is also permitted during the recruitment process to encourage applications from underrepresented groups, such as women. However, it is essential that all applications are welcomed, and individuals with protected characteristics must not be given preferential treatment over others during the final selection stage (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2024).

Should the role you are considering not satisfy the criteria for occupational requirements, I recommend advertising widely using a neutral job description. Furthermore, to ensure a fair, transparent, and legally compliant recruitment and selection process, you should implement measurable, consistent assessment criteria and involve a diverse panel of managers in making the final appointment decision (CIPD, 2025f).

2.2

I am unable to approve your request to upgrade the pay of your two male healthcare assistants as it would constitute a violation of the legal obligation for equal pay, as mandated by the Equality Act 2010.

The decision to increase the male HCA's pay is indefensible, given that no valid reason can be provided for prioritising the use of surplus funds to upgrade their pay over that of their female counterparts. The Trust lacks a 'material factor defence'; a non-gender-related reason for the pay difference, such as red-circling, geographical location, or level of experience (CIPD, 2025c). Furthermore, this decision would undermine the NHS Job Evaluation Scheme and could lead other employees to challenge their banding (NHS Employers, n.d.).

Given that women constitute 80% of the Trust's HCAs, an employment tribunal is highly likely to rule in favour of the equal pay claim, interpreting the pay disparity as a decision driven by sex discrimination. The female HCAs have a strong basis for a claim, as they can identify two male comparators receiving higher pay for performing 'like work.' This is defined as work that involves the same job or which requires the same or similar skills, however claims can also be brought in cases of work evaluated as equivalent or of equal value (ACAS, 2024). The tribunal only requires the claimant's job to be broadly similar to the comparator's to rule in their favour (CIPD, 2025c). For instance, the tribunal ruled that female store staff at the clothing retailer, Next, should have received the same pay as its male warehouse workers (Hooker, 2024). Considering all your HCAs are employed to perform the same duties, a successful claim is highly probable.

The potential financial, legal, and reputational fallout would be severe. Similar breaches have had significant consequences for other public sector bodies. For example, Birmingham City Council was ordered to pay over £250 million after a tribunal found that female-dominated roles such as teaching assistants and care workers were denied bonuses given to male staff in roles of equal value such as refuse collectors (Jackson, 2024). The Trust would also be mandated to undergo a public equal pay audit, causing considerable reputational damage (Daniels, 2025). This is particularly damaging given that we are legally obliged under the Public Sector Equality Duty to actively promote equality and eliminate unlawful discrimination (Daniels, 2025).

3.1

A breach of contract, such as an employer altering working hours without the employee's consent, can give rise to a valid claim for constructive dismissal. The employee may perceive this change as a breach of trust or an unreasonable requirement imposed by the employer (Landy, 2017). Therefore, in altering the radiographer's hours, the Trust must evidence whether the employee was consulted and agreed to the change in hours and, crucially, if the change was necessary and justifiable in achieving the business' intended objective.

Provided the Trust can evidence that it explored all other alternatives, it can maintain a solid defense that the change was necessary. For example, if the change was to reduce costs, did you first explore opportunities to save in other areas? Alternatively, if the change was necessitated by a service requirement or patient need, were options like staggering or compressing the existing hours explored? (ACAS, 2025a). The case of *McBride v Capita Customer Management Services* highlights this risk. A part-time employee successfully claimed constructive dismissal because her employer could not adequately demonstrate why converting her job to a full-time position was necessary to perform the role more effectively (Baska, 2019). Providing evidence to demonstrate the necessity of the change, alongside a signed contract or document showing the employee's acceptance of the new terms, would significantly undermine a claim of constructive dismissal (Landy, 2017)

Secondly, for the employee to successfully pursue a claim, they must establish a causal link between the change and their decision to resign (Landy, 2017). In this case, the radiographer should have explicitly stated in their resignation that the change to their working hours was the reason for their departure from the Trust. Moreover, it is important that the resignation was received without delay following the suspected breach of contract. If the employee continued working without complaint following the change, the law will consider this an acceptance of the new terms, thereby preventing a claim for constructive dismissal (Daniels, 2025). There are strict limits for making a claim; three months minus one day from either the last day of their notice period or the date of their resignation (ACAS, 2026b). Provided the change was managed correctly, or if the employee has failed to meet the above requirements, you can be confident that a claim cannot proceed.

3.2

Although I understand the need to complete this redundancy process as swiftly as possible to minimise disruption to the Trust, it is essential that it is careful, considered, and well-structured in order to avoid significant legal and cultural implications.

My primary concern relates to your motivation for undertaking these redundancies. To remain legally compliant, redundancies must be driven by a necessary business requirement, such as a workplace closure or a decreased requirement for specific types of work, rather than a desire to dismiss specific individuals (Daniels, 2025). If we eliminate a genuinely necessary post just to remove a particular person, we undermine the fairness of the selection process and leave the Trust vulnerable to claims of unfair dismissal (Smyrl, 2025). To mitigate risk, objective selection criteria should be devised using the most up to date performance data, absence records and appraisal documentation, ensuring these are applied consistently to all affected staff (Coyne, 2026). If the process is perceived as targeted or unjust, this may lead to resignations by remaining staff who no longer feel secure or valued within the Trust (CIPD, 2024b).

While there is pressure to move quickly, we are strictly bound by statutory timelines. Because over 20 employees are impacted, the law mandates a minimum consultation period of 30 days (Daniels, 2025). This window is essential to facilitate the formal selection of employee representatives and to allow staff meaningful time to digest information, propose alternatives, and voice concerns (CIPD, 2024b). Given the NHS's recognition of trade unions, strict adherence to this timeline is essential to facilitate their involvement and mitigate the risk of legal penalties. During this period, we are legally required to explore all viable alternatives to redundancy, such as redeployment or changes to working hours. We must also ensure that staff on maternity, adoption, or shared parental leave are prioritised for any suitable alternative roles, as failing to do so would trigger claims of discrimination (Smyrl, 2025). The administrative burden of this process is extensive. We are legally obligated to provide all employees with written confirmation of all proposals and, crucially, submit a HR1 notification to the Secretary of State for Business and Trade. Any procedural errors or omissions in this consultation can lead to a 'Protective Award', where a tribunal may order the Trust to pay up to 90 days' gross pay per affected employee (Daniels, 2025).

Ultimately, we have a moral duty to manage this transition sensitively, acknowledging redundancy's impact on staff mental health and wellbeing (CIPD, 2024b). It is vital to proceed with diligence rather than speed to protect the Trust's reputation, ensure legal compliance, and safeguard our workforce.

3.3

The merger of our trust's pharmacy operations with that of the neighboring hospital would constitute a business transfer, thereby making staff eligible for protection under the Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations 2006 (CIPD, 2024c). This means their existing contracts of employment, including their continuity of service, pay, hours, and holiday entitlements, remain legally binding (Daniels, 2025). Although occupational pension schemes are typically excluded from a TUPE transfer, we will inherit any contractual duty the existing employer has to contribute to a non-occupational scheme (Daniels, 2025).

For this reason, any financial and legal implications of the transfer must be carefully considered before finalising any agreement. The transferor must provide us with "Employee Liability Information", or a TUPE list, 28 days before the transfer, which outlines the employment particulars of each staff member involved in the transfer, including their hours and pay, as well as details of any disciplinary and grievance action (CIPD, 2024c). Receiving this information is crucial for us to fully assess the benefits and risks associated with inheriting employees under potentially different terms and conditions (CIPD, 2024c). For example, we must account for the cost of honouring salaries that may be higher than those of our existing staff, or account for the cost of any redundancies that may need to be made further down the line.

While there is no stipulated timeframe, we have a legal duty to inform and consult with affected employees through trade unions or elected representatives; this must include employees who will transfer into our Trust, as well as existing employees whose work will be affected by these transfers in (ACAS, 2026f). We are required to provide specific details, including the reason for the transfer, the expected date, and any changes to working practices we intend to make. Non-compliance carries significant financial risk, resulting in tribunal awards of up to 13 weeks' pay per affected employee (CIPD, 2024c). Beyond the legal penalty, consultation is vital for preserving the morale of the affected staff. It is essential for acknowledging and addressing concerns, soliciting suggestions, mitigating anxiety, and securing employee commitment to the transfer (ACAS, 2026c). While employees retain the right to object to the transfer, in which case their employment terminates without entitlement to a redundancy payment, our priority should be to maximise the number of transfers to ensure a smooth transition (CIPD, 2024c).

Although employees transferring from the hospital do not automatically gain the right to improved terms and conditions to match those of our current staff, the Trust should consider harmonisation to promote equality (ACAS, 2026a). The risk of not doing so is highlighted by the recent Great Ormond Street Hospital ruling, in which the Trust was found to have indirectly racially discriminated against transferred employees by operating a "two-tier" system, which subjected these staff members to inferior terms and conditions (Jackson, 2026). We must therefore consider setting an additional budget aside to ensure that any differences in treatment do not unfairly disadvantage particular groups.

4.1

Statutory holiday entitlement applies to all workers covered by the Working Time Regulations 1998, including our nurse bank staff who work irregular hours (CIPD, 2025a). The rate of holiday pay must reflect a worker's 'normal' earnings, including length of service, qualifications and regular overtime (ACAS, 2025b). As of January 2024, employers now have two primary ways to calculate holiday pay for irregular hours workers. They can use 'Rolled-up Holiday Pay,' where an additional 12.07% is added to every hour worked and paid to the employee immediately. Alternatively, they can use accrual, where the worker builds up holiday time at a rate of 12.07% of hours worked. When this accrued leave is taken, the pay is calculated using an average of their earnings over the previous 52 weeks (CIPD, 2025a). For workers employed for under 52 weeks, the employer calculates average pay based on all full weeks worked, excluding any weeks where the worker received no pay or reduced pay, such during periods of sickness (ACAS, 2025b). To ensure transparency and understanding, our employment contracts must clearly specify which of the two arrangements are in place.

Failing to calculate these payments correctly can lead to severe financial consequences. Workers can make a claim of unlawful deduction from wages within three months minus one day from the date of the last incorrect payment (ACAS, 2025b). While previously there was a two year limit on claims of underpayments, this has recently been challenged by the Tribunal, potentially allowing claims to go back as far as 1998 when the WTR were introduced (Ahmed, 2025). Moreover, tribunals can now award "interest-like" compensation to claimants because the unpaid money has lost value over time (Ahmed, 2025). For example, in the case *Main v SpaDental and another* (2024), an individual who should have been classified as a worker successfully claimed £83,500 for six years of unpaid holiday pay, plus an additional £42,000 in interest (Clarke, 2025).

The legal environment is set to become significantly more regulated with the introduction of the Fair Work Agency through the new Employment Rights Bill. This agency will have the authority to order businesses to repay holiday pay dating back six years and can issue fines of up to 200% of the amount owed (Ahmed, 2025). Given the Trust's reliance on a flexible workforce, it should undertake an audit to ensure that all employees are correctly classified within our payroll system. Resolving any historic underpayments is essential to mitigate the risk of punitive fines and interest-heavy litigation before these changes come into effect in 2026.

4.2

Deciding between maternity leave and Shared Parental Leave (SPL) is a personal choice that should be based on your unique circumstances. To find the best fit, it is important to consider how the specific flexibility and legal rights of each option align with your family and career goals.

Both options differ in terms of eligibility requirements. Maternity leave is an individual right available to you from your first day of employment, providing up to 52 weeks of leave regardless of how long you have worked for the NHS (CIPD, 2025e). In contrast, SPL is only available if you choose to end your maternity leave early to share the remaining time with your partner, which also terminates your protection against pregnancy discrimination that is afforded during maternity leave (Maternity Action, 2025). Your eligibility for SPL depends on both you and your partner meeting specific employment and earnings tests. To qualify, you must have 26 weeks of continuous service by the 15th week before your due date, and your partner must have worked for at least 26 of the 66 weeks leading up to the birth (Maternity Action, 2025). To determine if SPL is an option for you, you must first discuss with your partner whether your respective lengths of service satisfy this criteria.

In contrast to the simpler process of notifying the NHS of your intention to take maternity leave, applications for SPL involve complex notification requirements, including six different types of notices that must be submitted at least eight weeks in advance (CIPD, 2025e). However, once established, SPL provides significantly greater flexibility in how time off is taken. Unlike maternity leave which must be taken continuously, SPL allows parents to take leave in separate blocks (CIPD, 2025e). This arrangement encourages greater equality in childcare responsibilities. It enables fathers to support women's careers as they return to work and it is also associated with improved mental health outcomes, allowing both parents to spend more time with their child (Clemon, 2024).

From a pay perspective, maternity leave is initially more advantageous, offering 90% of your average earnings for the first six weeks. While Statutory Shared Parental Pay (ShPP) is typically capped at a flat rate of £187.18 (Maternity Action, 2025), the NHS offers Enhanced ShPP to help parents share care more effectively. However, a couple is entitled to only one payment, even if both parents are NHS employees. Additionally, any family leave or pay already taken by either parent can proportionately reduce your total NHS occupational entitlement (NHS Employers, 2025).

Please ensure you are certain before submitting your request, as the notice to end maternity leave to transition to SPL can only be reversed in very specific situations, such as the death of a partner (Maternity Action, 2025). Weighing these financial, situational, and legal factors, and determining whether you prioritise total take home pay or flexibility, will ensure you and your partner choose the most beneficial option for your new family.

4.3

Under the Employment Rights Act 1996, refusing flexible working simply because it might set a precedent is not a valid statutory reason (CIPD, 2025d). In fact, such arrangements have proven to deliver benefits including improved work-life balance, increased productivity, enhanced employee wellbeing, and reduced absenteeism (CIPD, 2024a). Rather than perceiving the shift toward hybrid working as a risk, supporting such requests could help you attract and retain talent in the Trust.

While every employee maintains the legal right to request flexible working, employers are permitted to decline such applications based on one of eight defined statutory business grounds. These include additional cost burdens, difficulties in recruitment, or a detrimental impact on overall efficiency. Although you have identified service quality as a concern, which is a valid ground, you must clearly demonstrate how remote work would prevent the employee from meeting performance standards (CIPD, 2025d). This is particularly challenging to do for administrative roles that primarily use online systems. For instance in *Wilson v Financial Conduct Authority*, the employer argued that the lack of in-person collaboration or face-to-face meetings afforded by a hybrid arrangement impacted on performance (CIPD, 2025d). This requirement to justify refusals will intensify under the new Employment Rights Bill which will mandate providing a clear, evidence-based link between the request and its specific business consequences (Dando, 2026).

Even where a valid statutory ground for refusal exists, maintaining the correct timeframes and undertaking the correct process is critical to avoiding legal claims of unfair procedure. You must invite the employee to a consultation meeting without unreasonable delay to discuss the request in private and respond to their request within two months (ACAS, 2026d). If a permanent move to full-time remote work is not feasible, the ACAS Code of Practice recommends exploring alternative options or compromises (ACAS, 2026e). Implementing a trial period would also help test whether service delivery is actually affected by the change before a final decision is made (CIPD, 2024). Additionally, to avoid claims of indirect discrimination, you should consider whether your decision has an impact on protected characteristics. For example, if the administrator has childcare responsibilities, a refusal could lead to an indirect sex discrimination claim under the Equality Act 2010, as women are statistically more likely to have primary caring roles (CIPD, 2024). Similarly, if the request relates to a health condition, you have a separate legal duty to consider reasonable adjustments for disability (ACAS, 2026d).

If you are concerned about receiving multiple applications should you grant this request, you should consider each in the order they are received and evaluate what is operationally possible for each role rather than matching previous decisions (ACAS, 2026e). To better manage potential influxes of flexible working requests from wider team members, consider discussing flexibility needs during annual employee reviews (CIPD, 2024).

Bibliography

ACAS (2026a) *Changing a contract after TUPE*. Available at: <https://www.acas.org.uk/tupe/advice-for-employers-and-employees/changing-your-employment-contract-after-a-tupe-transfer> (Accessed: 12 March 2026).

ACAS (2025a) *Considering changes—Changing your employees' contracts*. Available at: <https://www.acas.org.uk/changing-an-employment-contract/employer-responsibilities> (Accessed: 22 February 2026).

ACAS (2026b) *Constructive dismissal*. Available at: <https://www.acas.org.uk/dismissals/constructive-dismissal> (Accessed: 5 March 2026).

ACAS (2024) *Equal pay and the law*. Available at: <https://www.acas.org.uk/equal-pay/equal-pay-law#:~:text=This> (Accessed: 22 February 2026).

ACAS (2026c) *Informing and consulting employees*. Available at: <https://www.acas.org.uk/tupe/advice-for-employers-and-employees/how-your-employer-should-inform-and-consult-you-during-tupe> (Accessed: 12 March 2026).

ACAS (2025b) *Irregular hours and part-year workers: Holiday pay*. Available at: <https://www.acas.org.uk/irregular-hours-and-part-year-workers/calculating-holiday-pay> (Accessed: 14 March 2026).

ACAS (2026d) *Statutory flexible working requests: What flexible working is*. Available at: <https://www.acas.org.uk/statutory-flexible-working-requests> (Accessed: 19 March 2026).

ACAS (2026e) *Statutory flexible working requests: Considering a request*. Available at: <https://www.acas.org.uk/statutory-flexible-working-requests/considering-a-request> (Accessed: 19 March 2026).

ACAS (2026f) *What a TUPE transfer is*. Available at: <https://www.acas.org.uk/tupe/advice-for-employers-and-employees> (Accessed: 10 March 2026).

Ahmed, E. (2025) 'Employers shouldn't let holiday pay errors catch them out' *People Management*, 28 April. Available at: <https://www.peoplemanagement.co.uk/article/1915639/employers-shouldnt-let-holiday-pay-errors-catch> (Accessed: 14 March 2026).

Baska, M. (2019) 'Employee unfairly dismissed after job share was turned into full-time role, tribunal rules' *People Management*, 15 October. Available at: <https://www.peoplemanagement.co.uk/article/1744847/employee-unfairly-dismissed-job-share-turned-full-time-role-tribunal-rules> (Accessed: 24 February 2026).

Brown, L. (2024) 'Mother who had job offer rescinded after being asked children's ages wins £90k at tribunal' *People Management*, 10 July. Available at:

<https://www.peoplemanagement.co.uk/article/1880255/mother-job-offer-rescinded-asked-childrens-ages-wins-90k-tribunal> (Accessed: 16 February 2026).

CIPD (2025a) *Annual leave: UK employment law*. Available at: <https://www.cipd.org/uk/knowledge/employment-law/holidays/> (Accessed: 14 March 2026).

CIPD (2025b) 'CIPD urges government to provide clarity and support for employers as 4 in 5 expect costs to rise due to Employment Rights Bill', 6 March [Press release]. Available at: <https://www.cipd.org/en/about/press-releases/cipd-urges-government-clarity-over-employment-rights-bill-needed-costs-rise/> (Accessed: 3 February 2026).

CIPD (2017) *Employment regulation in the UK: burden or benefit?* Available at: <https://www.cipd.org/globalassets/media/knowledge/knowledge-hub/reports/2017-pdfs/2017-employment-regulation-in-the-uk-burden-or-benefit-report-21622.pdf> (Accessed: 3 February 2026).

CIPD (2025c) *Equal Pay: UK employment law*. Available at: <https://www.cipd.org/uk/knowledge/employment-law/equal-pay/> (Accessed: 17 February 2026).

CIPD (2025d) *Flexible and hybrid working: UK employment law*. Available at: <https://www.cipd.org/uk/knowledge/employment-law/flexible-working/> (Accessed: 19 March 2026).

CIPD (2024a) *Hybrid working: Guidance for people professionals*. Available at: <https://www.cipd.org/uk/knowledge/guides/planning-hybrid-working/> (Accessed: 19 March 2026).

CIPD (2025e) *Maternity, paternity, shared parental and adoption leave and pay*. Available at: <https://www.cipd.org/uk/knowledge/employment-law/maternity-paternity-rights/> (Accessed: 16 March 2026).

CIPD (2024b) *People manager guide: Redundancy*. Available at: <https://www.cipd.org/uk/knowledge/guides/redundancy-guide-for-managers/> (Accessed: 2 March 2026).

CIPD (2025f) *Recruitment: UK employment law*. Available at: <https://www.cipd.org/uk/knowledge/employment-law/recruitment/> (Accessed: 11 February 2026).

CIPD (2024c) *TUPE transfers: Guide for people professionals*. Available at: <https://www.cipd.org/uk/knowledge/guides/tupe-guide/> (Accessed: 10 March 2026).

CIPD (2026) *Working time: UK employment law*. Available at: <https://www.cipd.org/uk/knowledge/employment-law/working-time/#key-legal-principles> (Accessed: 11 February 2026). Taylor, S. and Wilkinson, K. (2022) 'Employment law', in Taylor, S. and Woodhams, C. (ed.), *Human Resource Management: People and Organisations*. Kogan Page, pp.90-113.

CIPD (2025g) *UK employment law and the EU*. Available at: <https://www.cipd.org/uk/knowledge/employment-law/uk-employment-law-eu/> (Accessed: 7 February 2026).

Clarke, N. (2025) 'Can a tribunal award interest-like compensation for unpaid holiday?' *People Management*, 10 July. Available at: <https://www.peoplemanagement.co.uk/article/1925021/tribunal-award-interest-like-compensation-unpaid-holiday> (Accessed: 15 March 2026).

Clemo, F. (2024) 'Hardly any dads have used shared parental leave since scheme was introduced 10 years ago, research finds' *People Management*, 11 December. Available at: <https://www.peoplemanagement.co.uk/article/1899450/hardly-dads-used-shared-parental-leave-scheme-introduced-10-years-ago-research-finds> (Accessed: 16 March 2026).

Coyne, D. (2026) 'What employers must legally provide on redundancy' *People Management*, 20 February. Available at: <https://www.peoplemanagement.co.uk/article/1949025/employers-legally-provide-redundancy> (Accessed: 2 March 2026).

Dando, G (2026) 'When can flexible working requests lawfully be denied?' *People Management*, 19 March. Available at: <https://www.peoplemanagement.co.uk/article/1952170/when-flexible-working-requests-lawfully-denied> (Accessed: 20 March 2026).

Department for Business & Trade (2025) *Retained EU Law / Assimilated Law dashboard*. Available at: <https://reul.businessandtrade.gov.uk/dashboard> (Accessed: 7 February 2026).

The Employment Rights (Amendment, Revocation and Transitional Provision) Regulations 2023. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukdsi/2023/9780348253269> (Accessed: 7 February 2026).

Equality and Human Rights Commission (2010) *Employment statutory code of practice*. Available at: <https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/equality/equality-act-2010/codes-practice/employment-code-practice-0> (Accessed: 11 February 2026).

Equality and Human Rights Commission (2024) *Guidance on discriminatory adverts* Available at: <https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/guidance/guidance-discriminatory-adverts> (Accessed: 11 February 2026).

Hooker, L. (2024) 'We did it!' Next shop workers win equal pay claim, *BBC News*, 27 August. Available at: <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/cj0817jd9dqp> (Accessed: 18 February 2026).

Ioannou, G. and Dukes, R. (2021) 'Anything goes? Exploring the limits of employment law in UK hospitality and catering', *Industrial Relations Journal*, 52(3), pp. 255–269. Available at: doi:10.1111/irj.12329.

Jackson, I. (2024) 'Historic day' for Birmingham City Council staff as equal pay settlement reached,' *People Management*, 16 December. Available at: <https://www.peoplemanagement.co.uk/article/1943263/historic-day-birmingham-city-council-staff-equal-pay-settlement-reached> (Accessed: 22 February 2026).

Jackson, I. (2026) 'Long overdue': Great Ormond Street Hospital cleaners win race discrimination appeal'. *People Management*, 26 January. Available at: <https://www.peoplemanagement.co.uk/article/1946244/long-overdue-great-ormond-street-hospital-cleaners-win-race-discrimination-appeal> (Accessed: 11 March 2026).

Landy, M. (2017) 'Constructive dismissal: a guide for employers' *People Management*, 18 September. Available at: <https://www.peoplemanagement.co.uk/article/1743377/constructive-dismissal-guide> (Accessed: 22 February 2026).

Maternity Action (2025) *Shared parental leave and pay*. Available at: <https://maternityaction.org.uk/advice/shared-parental-leave-and-pay/> (Accessed: 15 March 2026).

Mayne, M. (2025) 'Ethnic minority employees twice as likely to face pay and promotion cuts amid economic strain, study finds' *People Management*, 10 January. Available at: <https://www.peoplemanagement.co.uk/article/1901880/ethnic-minority-employees-twice-likely-face-pay-promotion-cuts-amid-economic-strain-study-finds> (Accessed: 5 February 2026).

NHS Employers (n.d) *Job evaluation*. Available at: <https://www.nhsemployers.org/topics/pay-pensions-and-reward/job-evaluation> (Accessed: 22 February 2026).

NHS Employers (2025) *Shared parental leave scenarios*. Available at: <https://www.nhsemployers.org/articles/shared-parental-leave-scenarios> (Accessed: 16 March 2026).

People Management (2025) *Employment law: what to expect in 2025*, 3 January. Available at: <https://www.peoplemanagement.co.uk/article/1901051/employment-law-expect-2025> (Accessed: 7 February 2026).

Smyrl, N. (2025) 'Common pitfalls when reducing your workforce – and how to avoid them' *People Management*, 23 May. Available at: <https://www.peoplemanagement.co.uk/article/1919142/common-pitfalls-when-reducing-workforce-%E2%80%93-avoid> (Accessed: 2 March 2026).

UK Government (2026) *Employment Rights Act 2025: Economic Analysis*. Available at: <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/695d3ebfbd1c076f787e7399/employment-rights-act-2025-economic-analysis.pdf> (Accessed: 5 February 2026).

Woods, D. (2012) 'Landmark Court of Appeal Ruling confirms employee on long-term sickness absence can carry annual leave forward into the next holiday year' *HR Magazine*, 26 July.

Available at:

<https://www.hrmagazine.co.uk/content/news/landmark-court-of-appeal-ruling-confirms-employee-on-long-term-sickness-absence-can-carry-annual-leave-forward-into-the-next-holiday-year> (Accessed: 5 March 2026).