

HR09 · STEP 1 · INTERIM

Employee Relations Case Summary & Risks

Individual Case Summaries

Per-case fact summary with verbatim evidence, source pointers, and policy references before severity scoring or cross-case conclusions.

ABOUT THIS DOCUMENT

This is a **sample** deliverable from the **Employee Relations Case Summary & Risks** workflow (HR09) in AGASI AiOS. It shows the expected structure and tone. All names, numbers, and facts are **fictional**.

Individual Case Summaries

Prepared by: Employee Relations Specialist, People Operations — Northbridge Advisory Partners Date: Current case review cycle Review Period: Current case review window Cases in Scope: 4 Classification: Internal Confidential — Restrict Access

Case ER-2026-014

Case Overview

- **Case Type:** Grievance
- **Date Opened:** Current case review cycle
- **Current Status:** Under Review
- **Parties Involved:** Associate Consultant (Risk & Compliance Advisory), Practice Head (Risk & Compliance Advisory)

Documented Facts

Step	Event	Source Document	Verbatim Excerpt
1	Verbal concern raised about absence of regular check-ins	Employee Relations Specialist case note	"Associate Consultant raised verbal concern ... about lack of regular check-ins since the post-acquisition onboarding period" (condensed excerpt)
2	Written request for fortnightly meetings sent to Practice Head; no response documented	Associate Consultant email on file	"Associate Consultant emailed the Practice Head requesting a recurring fortnightly meeting; no response documented in system"
3	Issue escalated to HR Business Partner during scheduled 1:1	HR Business Partner case note	"Associate Consultant raised the issue again with the HR Business Partner during a scheduled 1:1"
4	Formal grievance submitted	Grievance form	"persistent management absence and failure to provide reasonable supervision"
5	Practice Head response submitted	Written response	"I have an open-door policy. The Associate Consultant has not approached me directly during office hours."
6	Calendar review confirms 68% travel days for Practice Head in a recent multi-week window	Employee Relations Specialist calendar review	"Practice Head's calendar shows 68% travel days" in a recent period

Relevant Policies

Policy Section	Relevance to Case
Section 2: Grievance Policy (2.3)	Formal grievance procedure — determines timeline and process obligations
Section 3: Performance Management (3.1)	Annual review and documented check-in expectations for line managers
Section 5: Workplace Conflict Resolution (5.2)	Early intervention obligation when management becomes aware of issues

Open Items

- Probation review (due at the scheduled 6-month checkpoint) has not been completed
- No documented onboarding plan exists for this Associate Consultant in the HRIS
- Investigation into Practice Head's compliance with supervision expectations is pending
- Grievance hearing has not yet been scheduled (15-working-day investigation window applies per Section 2.3)

Case ER-2026-017

Case Overview

- **Case Type:** Workplace Conflict
- **Date Opened:** Current case review cycle
- **Current Status:** Open
- **Parties Involved:** Senior Consultant — legacy Northbridge (Data & AI Advisory), Senior Consultant — former Meridian (Data & AI Advisory)

Documented Facts

Step	Event	Source Document	Verbatim Excerpt
1	Both Senior Consultants assigned as joint technical leads on analytics migration project	Practice Head project brief	"Both Senior Consultants assigned as joint technical leads"
2	Legacy Northbridge Senior Consultant reports conflicting methodology decisions	Email on file	"conflicting methodology decisions"; "The Meridian approach to documentation and sign-off is overly bureaucratic and slowing the project down"
3	Practice Head declines to designate a single lead	Email on file	"You are both experienced. Work it out between yourselves."
4	Former Meridian Senior Consultant files written complaint about being dismissed in front of junior staff	Written complaint	"My counterpart has repeatedly dismissed my input in front of junior team members. A recent design review was the third time I was talked over when presenting the Meridian approach."
5	Anonymous ethics hotline report about team morale impact	Ethics hotline report	"The tension between the two leads is affecting team morale. People are starting to pick sides."
6	Formal case opened by Employee Relations Specialist	Employee Relations Specialist case note	—

Relevant Policies

Policy Section	Relevance to Case
Section 5: Workplace Conflict Resolution (5.2)	Early intervention obligation — the Practice Head's follow-up after the initial exchange may not meet the standard
Section 5: Workplace Conflict Resolution (5.3)	Mediation has not been offered despite escalation
Section 1: Code of Conduct (1.1)	Professional standards expectation regarding conduct in meetings

Open Items

- Mediation has not been offered to either party
 - No post-acquisition integration protocol exists for combined Northbridge/Meridian teams
 - Project is 3 weeks behind schedule; business impact assessment not yet completed
 - Practice Head's initial response ("Work it out between yourselves") has been flagged as potentially insufficient under Section 5.2
-

Case ER-2026-019

Case Overview

- **Case Type:** Performance / Disciplinary Concern
- **Date Opened:** Current case review cycle
- **Current Status:** Open
- **Parties Involved:** Consultant (Risk & Compliance Advisory), Practice Head (Risk & Compliance Advisory)

Documented Facts

Step	Event	Source Document	Verbatim Excerpt
1	Consultant received "Meets Expectations" in annual review; no development actions documented	HRIS extract	"Meets Expectations" rating; no development actions field populated
2	Practice Head requests immediate PIP citing declined work quality	Email on file	"This consultant's work quality has dropped significantly. Two client reports had to be rewritten. I need to put them on a performance improvement plan immediately."
3	Employee Relations Specialist requests documented evidence and prior feedback	Email on file	"Requesting documented evidence of performance concerns and details of any prior verbal feedback given to the Consultant"
4	Practice Head provides redline documents but confirms no prior formal feedback	Email on file	"No formal feedback conversations have taken place. I assumed the issues were obvious."
5	Formal case opened; procedural non-compliance noted	Employee Relations Specialist case note	"Performance Improvement Policy requires documented verbal feedback and a formal discussion before any PIP can be initiated"
6	Practice Head communicated PIP to Consultant via Teams without Employee Relations Specialist approval	Teams message screenshot on file	Consultant informed "being put on a PIP" — Employee Relations Specialist not consulted

Relevant Policies

Policy Section	Relevance to Case
Section 3: Performance Management (3.2)	Three required pre-PIP steps not completed: no documented verbal feedback, no formal discussion, no improvement period
Section 3: Performance Management (3.4)	PIP communicated without Employee Relations Specialist written approval — direct policy contravention
Section 3: Performance Management (3.1)	The most recent annual review documented no concerns, creating an evidence gap

Open Items

- The Consultant has not been given the opportunity to provide their account
- The gap between the cited performance issues in a late prior period and the Practice Head raising the concern in a later window is unexplained
- The unauthorised PIP communication creates a procedural complication — the Consultant may now believe they are on a formal PIP when no valid PIP exists
- This is the same Practice Head involved in Case ER-2026-014 (grievance about management absence)

Case ER-2026-021

Case Overview

- **Case Type:** Grievance
- **Date Opened:** Current case review cycle
- **Current Status:** Open
- **Parties Involved:** Consultant (Data & AI Advisory), Practice Head (Data & AI Advisory), HR Director (People & Culture)

Documented Facts

Step	Event	Source Document	Verbatim Excerpt
1	Consultant discovers salary discrepancy during informal peer conversation	Grievance form	"discovered a salary discrepancy during an informal conversation with a peer in the same role and grade"

Step	Event	Source Document	Verbatim Excerpt
2	Informal pay review request raised with HR Business Partner	HR Business Partner case note	"Consultant raised the concern informally... requesting a pay review"
3	HR Business Partner confirms 18% pay gap; peer has Meridian acquisition salary protection	HR Business Partner case note	"peer (same grade, similar tenure) is paid 18% more. The peer joined via the Meridian acquisition with a protected salary arrangement"
4	Formal grievance filed citing pay inequity	Grievance form	"pay inequity for substantially similar work"
5	Compensation Analyst confirms grievant at P32, comparator at P58 of market range	Benchmarking extract	"grievant sits at P32 of the external market range... The comparator colleague sits at P58 (\$116,200). The firm-wide compensation benchmark gap is 14% against a target of 5%."

Relevant Policies

Policy Section	Relevance to Case
Section 6: Equal Pay and Compensation Equity (6.1)	Commitment to comparable compensation for substantially similar work at the same grade
Section 6: Equal Pay and Compensation Equity (6.3)	Acquired employee salary protections — protection terms documented but no operational procedure for post-expiry
Section 2: Grievance Policy (2.3)	Formal grievance procedure applies; 20-working-day benchmarking review period per Section 6.2

Open Items

- Meridian salary protection terms were not communicated to non-Meridian employees
- No formal pay equity audit has been conducted since the acquisition
- The salary protection clause expires at the upcoming annual review cycle but no transition process is documented
- The grievant's last salary adjustment was below the firm-wide compensation benchmark improvement target
- The current engagement survey free-text comment ("My total compensation has barely moved in three years") may be from the same individual — unconfirmed