Entertainment Human Resources Network

July 2012

Titles link to articles.

EHRN Update

Hope your summer is off to a great start thus far!

Although we don't have any immediate plans for another EHRN event we always welcome any ideas/suggestions and of course, volunteers.

We will most likely begin planning later this summer or early fall for another event and will keep you informed. We will continue to keep the EHRN distribution list updated and send out on a regular basis and encourage you to invite others to join the group and be added to this growing network. Thanks for your continued participation and support!

We hope you enjoy the latest edition of the EHRN newsletter.

Sincerely,
The EHRN Steering Committee

For questions about EHRN or the newsletter contact:

Sarah Tilley
sarah.tilley@disney.com

Amy Baker
abaker@ilvstudios.com

Tim Wright
twright1984@sbcglobal.net

Progressive Discipline: Some Things You Need To know

By Paul Falcone

The biggest question I've gotten over the years as an instructor in UCLA Extension's School of Business and Management is, "Why do we have to issue progressive discipline (i.e., corrective action) to employees who are hired at will?" It's a valuable question with a not-so-straightforward answer, but once you understand the logic and history behind our system, it will all make sense.

First, let's start with a brief history lesson . . . Our nation's early employment law structures mirrored our European forefathers, and the basic notion of the right to work was protected under the Fourteenth Amendment. Specifically, no American worker should arbitrarily lose their job without due process, meaning they should have advance notice of what the problem is, what they need to do to fix it, how long they have to demonstrate improvement, and what the consequences will be if they fail to act (i.e., termination). That concept became known as the "job as property doctrine" and stood unchallenged until the 1930s. At the point of the Great Depression, companies were going out of business left and right, and Congress loosened the rules of the job as property doctrine by creating what was known as "employment at will." This meant that companies could terminate workers at whim, and we all know from our history books what that looked like—long lines of workers queued up outside the factory doors waiting to get a chance to work as soon as someone was injured or made an error and was fired on the spot.

Employment at will became a basic "property right" of employers from the '40s through the '70s, which corresponds with the massive growth of unions in our nation's history. The number one reason why workers joined unions wasn't for the compensation and benefits rewards—it was for the job security. That's because unions guaranteed that covered workers would not be held to an "at will" (read that: *arbitrary*) employment standard but to the traditional "termination for just cause only" standard that was common under the job as property doctrine prevalent before the Great Depression.

However, that all changed again in the early 1980s when a California court ruled that there could be exceptions to employment at will: statutory considerations (e.g., Title VII protections), public policy exceptions (e.g., firing someone for whistle blowing or for filing a workers' comp claim), implied covenants of good faith and fair dealing (i.e., terminating someone just before they were about to vest in a company's pension plan, for example), and implied contract exceptions (e.g., being bound by "promises" published in an employee handbook) could all erode the employment-at-will affirmative defense and inadvertently trigger a "termination for just cause only" standard.

Okay, so what does this look like in reality? Legal actions typically face separate hurdles at the (a) hearing and (b) trial stages. At the hearing stage, the employer's defense counsel will attempt to assert the "employment-at-will affirmative defense," arguing that the case should be immediately dismissed (via "summary judgment") because the plaintiff (i.e., your company's ex-employee who is now suing you) was hired at will, understood that he was at will, and the company did nothing to abrogate the employment-at-will relationship. If this is successfully argued at the hearing stage and your company wins a summary dismissal of the case, then voila—your employment-at-will relationship with your employee protected your organization from liability. Congratulations!

But not so fast . . . Plaintiff attorneys typically do a very successful job arguing that the employment-at-will relationship was indeed breached for any of the reasons outlined above, especially the statutory considerations mentioned. (After all, who *isn't* protected in one form or another in California?) And if the plaintiff attorney can convince a judge that the employment-at-will relationship may have been breached, then the judge will want to hear the case in its entirety. That means that you're going to stage two—the trial.

At trial, there's no such thing as employment at will. (That card was already exhausted at the hearing stage.) Instead, at the trial stage, our legal system reverts right back to its eighteenth century roots, and a "termination for just cause only standard" comes into play. So you—the employer—have got to show that you had cause to terminate the individual, and "cause" typically means that you accorded the employee *workplace due process* in the form of written corrective action. "After all, if it wasn't written down, it likely never happened" goes the court's logic. Do you see the connection now and how documented progressive discipline comes into play in the courtroom at the trial stage?

Good! Now here's the catch: Without a crystal ball, you can't know now how a case is going to play itself out in front of a judge six to eighteen months in the future. Specifically, it would be impossible to guess whether you'll win a summary dismissal of the case during the *hearing* stage or whether you'll need to demonstrate that you had just cause to terminate (via documented corrective action) at the *trial* stage. And since you can't foretell the future, you have to be prepared to *do both*: Protect your company by enforcing an employment-at-will policy (to win a summary judgment at the hearing stage) while issuing corrective action (in case this goes to trial and you have to prove that you had just cause to terminate). And there you have it—A neat and tidy explanation of the apparent dichotomy in issuing corrective action to workers who are employed at will.

Paul Falcone is the best-selling author of *96 Great Interview Questions to Ask Before You Hire*, and *101 Tough Conversations to Have with Employees*.

"I Need to Know Where This Relationship is Going"
Classifying Workers as Independent Contractors or Employees

By Karen Gabler, Esq.

Given the costs of doing business in today's economy, it's understandable that business owners and workers alike would want to avoid the heavy financial burden of hiring workers as employees by instead classifying them as independent contractors. With employee status comes significant cost: payroll taxes, unemployment insurance, worker's compensation coverage, and potential wage and hour liability for meal periods, rest breaks and overtime. And yet, with employee status may come significant benefits as well: health insurance, vacation and sick time, insurance coverage, and the protections of California's stringent anti-discrimination laws. To ensure the utmost protection for individual workers, classifying a worker as "independent" is difficult at best.

California law presumes that a worker is an employee (Labor Code §3357), but the employer can rebut this presumption by establishing that the "economic realities" of the situation demonstrate that the worker is an independent contractor. *S.G. Borello & Sons, Inc. v. Dept. of Industrial Relations* (1989). The most significant factor is whether the employer has the right to control the worker both as to the work to be done and the manner and means by which it is performed.

To make this determination, employers can create a "pro and con" list of sorts, reviewing whether the circumstances of the relationship with the worker appear to be more like that of an independent contractor, or more akin to employee status. Employers should consider a number of factors, such as whether the worker is engaged in an occupation distinct from that of the employer, whether the worker has invested in the equipment required by his task with an opportunity for personal profit or loss, whether the service rendered requires special skill and is usually performed by a specialist without supervision, the length of time for which services are to be performed and how those services will be compensated. The parties' agreement as to the nature of their relationship has some bearing, but is not determinative: a worker's request that he be treated as an independent contractor is irrelevant if his actual status is that of employee under the law.

Of critical importance is what might be referred to as the "production standard" – is this worker producing the work that your business exists to produce? A restaurant owner, for example, is in the business of serving food and drink to patrons. The workers who make that happen (the host or hostess, the kitchen workers, the bussers, the wait staff, the bartenders) are employees, because they are performing the services the business exists to provide. When the restaurant owner hires a painter to update the color scheme in the restaurant, that person is an independent contractor. Why? Because quite simply, the restaurant is not in the business of painting and does not regularly employ workers to engage in painting activities. Instead, they hire a contractor with his own painting business to provide those unique services.

Workers who provide services in the same industry in which your business operates are typically employees. Rare exceptions might apply if this worker provides services in a geographical area you do not typically serve, or provides a specialized skill not typically offered by your business. A category of worker regularly misclassified is that of salesperson: if the salesperson is entirely independent, travels and works when he wants to do so and is paid on commission, he is still an employee (albeit perhaps an exempt outside salesperson), if your company is in the business of selling products and hires workers to do so.

Although an independent contractor agreement is not dispositive, it is highly recommended in any contractor relationship. Agreements should include the scope of services to be provided and the required deliverables, the contractor's right to set the hours and location of work and hire staff to perform the work, the method of compensation (ideally, by invoicing the business owner, with the contractor to pay his own expenses), and the contractor's obligation to provide and maintain his own equipment, licenses and insurance coverage and pay his own taxes. The contractor can be required to maintain the confidentiality of the employer's information, return the employer's property, and comply with the company's anti-harassment policy (but not the rest of the employee handbook!).

The failure to follow these stringent standards has always carried significant potential liability: back taxes for both employer and employee, worker's compensation penalties or damages, unemployment benefits, and wage and hour liability for the worker who failed to take required breaks and meal periods or worked overtime without compensation. This year, those penalties increased exponentially: effective January 1, 2012, penalties of $5,000 - $15,000 per violation are assessed against an employer who "voluntarily and knowingly misclassifies" an independent contractor. For the employer who engages in a "pattern and practice" of misclassification, the penalties increase to $10,000 to $25,000 per violation. Liability is also imposed upon any person who "knowingly advises" an employer to treat a worker as an independent contractor (although attorneys and company employees such as human resource professionals are exempt from this liability).

If your independent contractor seems to be an employee, the risks of failing to correct that misclassification are indeed substantial. When determining whether your worker is an independent contractor or employee, remember the old saying: "if it looks like a duck, walks like a duck and quacks like a duck, *it's probably a duck*."

Karen L. Gabler is a partner and co-founder of the LightGabler LLP law firm, specializing in employment advice and litigation, business litigation, and intellectual property law. Further information regarding the firm's practice areas, seminars and articles may be found at www.lightgablerlaw.com.

The Truth About Motivation

By Ange Matthews

There are two ways to influence employee behavior. Either inspire it, or manipulate it. Leadership inspires it, whereas money and fear manipulate it. The way you motivate your employees says a lot about your culture, how you lead and whether or not you value your employees' talents and skills.

Which motivation technique best characterizes your company?

Pay is the main motivator. Pay can be overused and overvalued by management. Some managers think "they get a paycheck, isn't that enough?" or "With a recession, having a job should be their motivation" and "To keep your best employees, you have to throw money at them from time to time."

Or leadership, purpose in work, communication, acknowledgement and praise are the main motivators. Employees feel they are a part of something bigger than themselves; they get to contribute, use their skills, are challenged and recognized for their work.

If your company has a culture where pay is the primary motivator, you're likely not maximizing the investment. Emphasis on pay provides short term benefits and in the long run is not effective. Employee engagement surveys from Gallup and respected consulting firms who study employee satisfaction and engagement have shown for years that there is a lot more to employee engagement than money. Pay as a primary motivator is flawed because the money can run out -- and even highly paid loyal employees can eventually lose their motivation, burn out, or consider another opportunity that provides them something money can't buy.

Alternatively, managers who spur motivation invest in long term benefits and get more value from employees. Better and faster problem solving, more innovation, more flexibility, more work ownership and faster buy-in result (this assumes employees are already being compensated fairly).

Motivation Stands the Test of Time

So what do managers need to know and do in order to really motivate their employees? To not just get employees to comply and do their jobs correctly, but also facilitate a culture where employees care and are passionate about their work? To start, we need a basic understanding of human motivation. For that, we turn to renowned motivational theorist Frederick Herzberg and his theory on Motivators and Hygiene Factors.

According to Herzberg's theory, dissatisfaction and satisfaction are influenced by separate factors: "hygiene" and "motivators." He theorized that dissatisfaction results when an employee perceives that "hygiene factors," such as pay and security, are missing or inadequate. Alternatively, he theorized that satisfaction results when employees feel they benefit from "motivator factors" such as meaningful work, feeling of achievement, opportunities for growth and advancement and the like.

HYGIENE FACTORS

- **Pay**
- **Status**
- **Security**
- **Working Conditions**
- **Fringe Benefits**
- **Polices & Administrative Practices**
- **Interpersonal Relations**

Herzberg contends that employees are never motivated by hygiene factors, only demotivated by them if they feel something is missing or they feel treated unfairly. Herzberg concluded that hygiene factors need to be satisfied first -- and only then can motivator factors be used to increase job satisfaction.

MOTIVATORS

- **Meaningful Work**
- **Challenging Work**
- **Recognition for Accomplishments**
- **Feeling of Achievement**
- **Increased Responsibility**
- **Opportunities for Growth & Advancement**
- **The Job itself**

In a nutshell, money, title and perks will help reduce or avoid dissatisfaction, but do not influence satisfaction. It's really the motivators that influence satisfaction and it is the motivators that should be management's focus because motivators inspire your employees.

How Leaders Motivate

Start by becoming very clear about your company and department values. Ensure the above motivators are aligned with the values of your department and company as a whole. Once aligned, you won't make the common mistake of sending mixed messages. Once you are clear about your values, then you need to effectively communicate them so that employees understand them, agree with them and ultimately make them their own values.

When your employees see your passion and you take time to let them know how their work makes a difference, you collectively start to build something priceless; a professional working relationship and teamwork progressing toward a common goal.

Show that you care about them as professionals -- and spend time with your employees so that they can learn from you while you demonstrate a natural and productive way of listening to their ideas, perspectives and suggestions. By making the time and showing interest, you signal that they are valued by you.

Consider hiring a leadership coach to educate, guide and hold you accountable to proven and effective leadership behaviors. A structured coaching program will help you discover and articulate your working values, develop a shared vision with the people you work with and ensure that you are focusing on inspiring, motivating, rewarding and recognizing the behaviors your department and company needs to achieve its business goals.

Ange Matthews is a leadership coach and human resources expert who provides HR Consulting, Change Management Solutions and Leadership Development. Ange can be reached at 562-577-0776 and ange@HR4Entrepreneurs.com.

Protecting Your Confidential Information from Defecting Employees

By Glenn J. Dickinson

Employees are important assets of any company, and particularly so for service providers. Employees involved in sales and other front-office operations are the point of contact with customers – the *really* important assets. Back-office staff keep the firm running smoothly, so the sales force can focus on their own jobs. The value of these employees lies in their knowledge, experience and skills. These are the tools of the trade. But who owns those tools?

In California, general skills and knowledge possessed by employees belong to the employees. Workers are free to leave and take the tools with them. This is true, even if the company taught them everything they know.

What a company can do is protect trade secrets. A company can prevent ex-employees in possession of trade secrets from using or disclosing those trade secrets for any purpose other than performing the company's business. So, guarding against competition from defecting employees means guarding your trade secrets.

"Trade secret" is a technical term under the law. It doesn't mean just any information that management might prefer to keep out of the hands of competitors. A trade secret is (1) information, (2) that has value from not being known by others who can obtain value from its use, and (3) that is the subject of reasonable efforts to protect its secrecy. California Civil Code § 3426.2(d). Any list, data, or compilation must meet these three criteria in order to be protectable

The first element seems easy to grasp: Information is all around us. The challenging issue here is that the law protects information in the abstract, not just concrete items like paper files, data files, thumb drives, and disks. The consequence is that even information in an employee's memory can be the property of the company. Under trade secrets law, a person's brain is just another hard drive that stores information.

The second element is the heart of the matter: Value from not being known by others who can obtain value from its use. It seems obvious that a trade secret has to be a secret, but even secrets are known by someone. The key is that the information must not be known by anyone else who can obtain value from its use. This almost always means competitors: If one of your competitors already knows the information, then it's not the kind of secret the law can protect.

Let's get practical and consider the kinds of information that commonly meets the "trade secrets" test. Probably the majority of trade secrets disputes involve customer information. Specifically, this means:

- Customer names and addresses: This information allows companies to distinguish the proven customers from those that are only potential customers

- Individual contact information: Knowing the particular person within a large corporation who makes the purchasing decisions can be an important fact. It's one thing to know that MegaLarge Conglomerated, Inc., might be interested in your services; it's much better to know which particular person in which particular branch office is going to place the next order.

- Prices and discount terms: Price is the most important differentiator for most purchasers. If a company can shave a few points or cents off a competitor's price, the company immediately gains an advantage.

- Volume of business: Large companies might purchase a particular product or service in small volumes, while much smaller companies might have disproportionately large needs. Knowing who makes the big buys tells companies where to focus their marketing efforts.

Technical information also can constitute trade secrets, of course. This kind of information typically involves: procedures used in manufacturing or in performing certain services; chemicals and materials used in manufacturing process; software code that is made available to customers only in compiled form; details about products currently in development; and customer feedback about problems and weaknesses of products. Not every company has a secret sauce, but those that do are entitled to protect it.

Finally, the company must be making reasonable efforts to protect the secrecy of the information. This is an easy requirement to satisfy. Start with a Confidential Information Agreement that's signed by all employees who have access to the trade secrets. Also make sure your employee handbook contains provisions that spell out the company's policy regarding trade secrets. Limit employees' access to information on a need-to-know basis. Maintain effective password protection on computers and mobile devices. If practicable, have the company purchase and issue all computers and mobile phones: if the company owns them, the company can easily get them back. And make sure all cellular and other mobile connection services are in the company's name. The person whose name is on the account controls it. So if you let employees open the account themselves, then you're letting them keep the same phone number when they go to work for a competitor, which can greatly facilitate their competitive activities.

When the split happens, and you find out that employees are leaving, an effective exit interview can make a big difference. Remind defectors that they are expected to play by the rules after they leave. Make sure they empty their pockets, figuratively speaking: think about how contact information and other data automatically syncs and updates on multiple devices, and make sure you consider how to recover your trade secrets from any devices that are leaving with the employees.

Trade secrets are like the plants in your yard; they'll survive on their own in most cases, but they'll be a lot stronger if you make an effort to take care of them.

Glenn J. Dickinson practices in the areas of trademark, copyright, Internet law and competitive business disputes for the law firm LightGabler. His practice covers both litigation and transactional matters. He has trial experience in a variety of complex business disputes, particularly those involving trade secrets and unfair competition.

You can reach Glenn at gdickinson@lightgablerlaw.com.

It's Not Easy Being Green:

The Challenges In Establishing A Paperless Human Resources Department

By
Grace Y. Horoupian
Matthew C. Sgnilek

Despite cost and environmental reasons to reduce paper use, the completely paperless office has yet to arrive. According to research firm IDC, U.S. companies printed 1.5 trillion pages as recently as 2007. So what's the hold-up? More often than not the answer is the law. In the once-thought-inevitable transition from paper HR records to e-HR records, the law often gets in the way, leaving employers and HR professionals little choice but to keep paper records.

The primary obstacle to going paperless is determining the permissibility of storing legally required documents electronically. In this regard the law has not kept up with the digital age. There is no comprehensive federal or state law governing electronic records retention and management making a totally paperless office virtually impossible. Before digital technology made electronic recordkeeping possible, legal recordkeeping mandates were simpler. When the expected default record form was paper, record retention laws and regulations were short and to the point: create and retain the record for the defined period. The laws slow adoption of electronic recordkeeping mandates reflects societal uneasiness with relying solely on the availability of records that exist only as virtual "ones" and "zeros" in a digital matrix.

However, there is some good news. Federal and state agencies are increasingly permitting electronic record retention. For example, the Department of Homeland Security allows employers to fill out and store I-9 forms electronically and the EEOC has approved of electronic recordkeeping for Title VII, ADA, and ADEA documents. Additionally, the federal E-SIGN law generally makes electronic signatures and contracts just as legal and enforceable as paper contracts signed in ink for almost all transactions.

So what is an employer who wants go paperless to do? ERISA regulations in particular provide useful guidance for setting up an electronic recordkeeping system, even for employers not covered by the law. The following tips are gleaned from those regulations will help in developing a paperless office and managing electronic records.

- Make sure your electronic recordkeeping system has reasonable controls to ensure the integrity, accuracy, authenticity and reliability of the records.
- Maintain your electronic records in reasonable order and in a safe and accessible place, so that they may be readily inspected or examined, if necessary. For example, the recordkeeping system should be capable of indexing, retaining, preserving, retrieving and reproducing the electronic records.
- Make sure that electronic records can be readily converted into legible and readable paper copy.
- Electronic records also should have a high degree of legibility and readability when displayed on a video display terminal or other method of electronic transmission.
- Establish *and* implement records management practices. Such practices should include: following procedures for labeling of electronically maintained or retained records; providing a secure storage environment; observing a quality assurance program that incorporates regular evaluations of the electronic recordkeeping system including periodic checks of electronically maintained records; and retaining paper copies of records that cannot be clearly, accurately or completely transferred to an electronic recordkeeping system.
- Adhere to records management best practices by maintaining the confidentiality of medical records and other sensitive information.

•Generally, original paper records may be disposed of any time after they are transferred to an electronic recordkeeping system, except that original records should not be discarded if the electronic record would not constitute a duplicate or substitute record as required by state or federal law.

•Have a system in place that allows you to follow record retention guidelines. This means destroying records in a timely manner. Hitting the "delete" button is not likely to be sufficient. The documents that are no longer needed should not be retrievable at a later date. And, don't forget, if litigation is pending or you are aware that litigation is likely, do not destroy relevant documents—even if they are scheduled for disposal.

•Make sure that your electronic retention and destruction system complies with the most current federal and state law.

There are a number of issues to consider and address in preparing to go "paperless." Although the above guidelines set forth good strategies for converting to a paperless HR record system, employers should contact legal counsel for specific guidance and assistance.

Grace Horoupian is a partner in the Irvine office of Fisher & Phillips LLC. Her practice is focused on representing employers in a variety of employment cases, including claims for civil rights violations, harassment, discrimination, retaliation, wrongful termination, wage and hour claims, ADA and ADEA violations, unfair business practices, misappropriation of trade secrets, and class action disputes. Her firm's Web site www.laborlawyers.com has a wealth of resources, newsletters, state guidelines and free webinars for employers.

Stop Trying to Get a Seat at the Table

By
Scott Allender

The catch-phrase for HR practitioners throughout the mid 2000's was for everyone to "get a seat at the table". Sound advice at the time, the echoes of that mantra can still be heard. But what does that mean for today's HR professional? Is getting a "seat at the table" like running for city council, stopping just shy of placing election signs in the Company's courtyard and going door-to-department-door making campaign promises and asking for votes?

It is true that the HR profession had to move out of its administrative comfort zone and into the world of strategic impact. HR needed to change the minds of many who only thought of them when they had a question about the dental plan, or when there was a clean-up to be done on aisle two. The profession had to leave shyness at the door, flex some business muscle, and show-up to the C-Suite. I'm proud to be part of a field that has come so far in such a relatively short time, and which continues to evolve to meet the demands of an ever-changing world market.

For many, the transition from Personnel Manager to Business Partner was natural. Subject matter expertise, fresh ideas, and strong business acumen led the way to a permanent seat in the executive wing. For others, the transition wasn't so natural and, to this day, some HR Directors work for a CEO who seemingly can't be convinced of the value of HR's unique position in the organization.

Whatever your situation, it's time to stop running for office.

The real question is: Are you there to be valuable or to be seen as valuable? Of course, we all want both. And when executive management doesn't see the HR function as worthwhile, then our ability to be impactful is significantly diminished. However, it doesn't completely die with perception unless you allow perception to determine your reality. Even if you're in the "clean-up" environment, you can still make an impact. And when you do, your leaders will have no choice but to see your value; even the most stubborn of C-Suite Execs.

So, where do you start?

First, rethink what it is you're doing. Be willing to change all of it. Perhaps you've been measuring turnover for years and no one seems to care. Then why still measure it? If you're scrambling to put together and present metrics each month, to no avail, then you are measuring the wrong things. Perhaps your CEO doesn't care to hear about normal churn (unless it is significantly out of step with the market). Instead, what he really needs to know about is the regrettable departures; the high-performing, high-potential employees that had a bright future with the organization, but left anyway. He wants to know what we could have done about it, should have done about it, and what we will do about it next time.

Perhaps you've been telling her about how long, on average, it takes to hire a replacement for the person that just quit, when what she really wants to know is how long it will take to get the new person proficient enough in the job to generate as much revenue for the company as the person that left. What training procedures have you put in place to minimize the amount of time the organization will suffer from the expertise that just walked out the door?

And instead of boring everyone with a stale announcement of this year's annual performance review timeline (Zzzzzzz…..), show up with a year-over-year performance analysis, including trends and reasons for the increases/decreases in the achievement of organizational goals.

Secondly, know your business. This seems an obvious statement, but I continue to be surprised by how many HR practitioners know a lot about HR theory and recent case/labor law, but who don't really understand the strategy, goals, metrics and financials of the business that they support. Have regular meetings with the department heads of your organization. Take a few people to lunch. If you don't know your business then you cannot make a meaningful strategic contribution. And you won't be taken seriously.

Finally, know your material. Avoid the pitfall of reading from a piece of paper when you're speaking with your executives. If you sit down with your executive to communicate some important information, but need a cheat-sheet to explain it, then how will you instill confidence in your leader or gain their trust?

Every business has its relationship politics. But it's time to stop concerning yourself with perceptions and start focusing on creating your own value proposition. Trust me, if you know your business, know your people, show up with what they want to know, and deliver what it is they may not even know they want, you'll find yourself at the table… seat or no seat.

Scott Allender is an accomplished business executive with expertise in Human Capital. He is currently the Vice President of Global Human Resources for Warner Music Group, overseeing HR for two of its major divisions.

Scott began his business career in the coffee business in the mid 90's. During that time, he handled staffing, training, development, and employee relations for this private start-up, while contributing to the successful branding and growing of the business to a highly-profitable venture that would eventually be sold to a larger Company.

Scott then joined the HR team for a major music publisher. He quickly progressed into the role of strategic HR business partner. Scott is known for his ability to bring key business acumen to the table to improve organizational design, process, and capability. He continually pursues new challenges and education through various means such as, Six Sigma Green Belt training, and becoming SPHR certified in 2005 (He's been recertified twice since then).

Scott holds a Bachelor's of Science in Business from California Polytechnic University, with a degree in Human Resource Management. He lives in south LA County with his wife and daughter, and has another baby on the way!

Entertainment Human Resources Network

Thank you Karen L. Gabler for your article on an important topic on correctly classifying independent contractors.

Paul Falcone has submitted another fantastic article on progressive discipline. Thank you Paul.

Glenn J. Dickinson has submitted a second great article, this time on protecting company information from departing employees.

First time contributor Ange Matthews has provided an outstanding article on Herzberg's Two Factor theory.

Thank you Grace Y. Horoupian and Matthew C. Sgnilek for another terrific article on establishing a paperless HR Department.

We are thrilled to have a submission by first time EHRN member Scott Allender on the topic on how to become an important business partner to senior management.

We thank all the EHRN Members who have sent us referrals who want to get involved with EHRN and the Newsletter.

Please continue to support us. We cannot keep this effort moving forward without you. Thanks.