LEV MINIKES CONSULTING

HR DOCUMENTATION HEALTH CHECK

ASSESSMENT REPORT

Clear policies. Consistent approach. Practical action.

PREPARED FOR	Asterlane Digital B.V. (fictional SME)
BUSINESS PROFILE	Digital services | 84 employees | Netherlands | English working language
REVIEW SCOPE	5 HR documents | 36 pages | 1 employment jurisdiction
REPORT DATE	19 October 2026

OVERALL ASSESSMENT: AMBER (targeted improvements required)

The reviewed documents cover several important HR processes and provide a reasonable foundation. However, inconsistent instructions, unclear responsibility for document maintenance and a potentially inappropriate request for employee medical information require management attention.

Most identified issues can be addressed through targeted corrections to existing documents rather than a complete rewrite.

01 Executive assessment

Asterlane Digital has documented several important HR processes, providing a useful foundation for consistent people management. However, the review identified inconsistent or unclear instructions, gaps in procedural guidance and incomplete document maintenance arrangements that may lead to inconsistent decisions, avoidable administrative work and employee confusion. One absence-reporting form also raises significant concerns about the collection of employees' medical information.

05	36	08	03
DOCUMENTS	PAGES	FINDINGS	HIGH PRIORITY

What is working

- The reviewed documents provide guidance on four important employee lifecycle areas: onboarding, performance management, leave and absence, and employee concerns.
- The Performance & Development Guide includes practical questions to support meaningful conversations between managers and employees.
- The Employee Concerns & Grievance Policy outlines investigation steps, providing a basis for handling employee complaints.

Three actions requiring priority attention

1. Correct the absence-reporting form immediately. **(F01)**

Remove questions requesting employees' medical diagnoses or other unnecessary medical details. Review the associated reporting instructions and assess whether previously collected information requires corrective action.

2. Establish one consistent sickness-reporting procedure. **(F02)**

Agree on whom employees should notify, by when, and how information should be passed between managers and HR. Align the relevant documents.

3. Provide an alternative route for employee grievances. **(F03)**

Ensure employees can raise concerns with someone other than their direct manager, particularly when the concern involves that manager.

Overall recommendation

Address the three high-priority findings first, then complete the remaining documentation improvements within 30 days.

Appoint an HR Lead to coordinate the corrections, involve the relevant managers and specialists where necessary, and assign clear ownership and review dates to each document.

Scope note: *This assessment is based on the documents reviewed. It does not establish how procedures are applied in practice or constitute a legal compliance audit.*

02 Review scope & document scorecard

The assessment covers five HR documents supplied by Asterlane Digital B.V., comprising 36 pages. The documents apply to the company's Dutch operations and are written in English.

The review examines document quality, consistency, usability and maintenance arrangements. No individual employee records or case files were reviewed.

ID	DOCUMENT	VERSION / DATE	PAGES
D01	Employee Handbook	v2.1 / Feb 2025	14
D02	New Starter Onboarding Checklist	v1.3 / Jun 2025	6
D03	Performance & Development Guide	v1.0 / Dec 2024	6
D04	Leave & Absence Procedure	Undated	6
D05	Employee Concerns & Grievance Policy	v1.0 / May 2024	4

ASSESSED DIMENSIONS

Each document was assessed against six dimensions:

- **Coverage:** Whether the document addresses the essential elements of its stated purpose.
- **Clarity:** Clear language, terminology and responsibilities.
- **Consistency:** Alignment with other reviewed documents.
- **Usability:** Clear and practical instructions for employees and managers.
- **Ownership:** Identifiable responsibility for maintaining and approving the document.
- **Maintainability:** Whether documents have clear version information, scheduled reviews and arrangements for keeping them up to date.

DOCUMENT	COVERAGE	CLARITY	CONSIST.	USABILITY	OWNER.	MAINT.	STATUS
D01 Handbook	Amber	Green	Red	Amber	Green	Amber	Amber
D02 Onboarding	Amber	Amber	Amber	Amber	Red	Amber	Amber
D03 Performance	Green	Green	Amber	Green	Red	Amber	Amber
D04 Leave / absence	Amber	Red	Red	Red	Red	Amber	Red
D05 Grievance	Amber	Amber	Amber	Red	Red	Amber	Red

Rating guide

Green - Satisfactory: The assessed aspect is adequately addressed.

Amber - Improvement needed: Weaknesses that could create confusion, inefficiency or inconsistent application.

Red - Significant issue: Material omissions, contradictions or unclear instructions requiring priority attention.

Ratings reflect the quality of the reviewed documentation. Overall document status considers the significance of identified issues rather than averaging individual ratings. The assessment does not certify legal compliance or establish how procedures operate in practice.

03 HR documentation architecture & duplication

In addition to assessing individual documents, the review examined how the documents relate to one another, whether information is repeated consistently, and how easily the documentation can be maintained.

ASSESSMENT AREA	OBSERVATION
Document structure	No major structural problems were identified in the reviewed documents.
Duplication & consistency	Sickness-reporting and performance-review instructions appear in multiple documents, without clearly explaining how the different requirements relate to one another (F02, F06).
Navigation & accessibility	References to an older HR directory may make it difficult for employees to locate current information (F08).
Document maintenance	Missing ownership and review arrangements, combined with inconsistent instructions, increase the likelihood of documents becoming outdated (F04).

OVERALL CONCLUSION

The main weakness is not the number or structure of HR documents, but the lack of consistency between them and insufficient arrangements for keeping them up to date.

Recommended approach: Identify the authoritative source for each HR procedure, align related documents with it, and establish clear ownership and review arrangements. Prioritise the leave and absence documentation, followed by the grievance policy and the remaining inconsistencies.

FINDINGS DISTRIBUTION:

HIGH (prompt management attention required) **= 3**

MEDIUM (correct within the next document update cycle) **= 4**

LOW ("housekeeping" improvement) **= 1**

Priority is based on document evidence and plausible operational impact.

04 Priority findings requiring action

The evidence quotes below are invented examples taken from the fictional documents listed in Section 02. Each finding identifies a document issue.

F01 HIGH | Inappropriate request for medical information in sickness-reporting form

Evidence: D04, p. 4: The sickness-reporting form contains a mandatory field labelled “Description of illness / diagnosis”.

Why it matters: Under Dutch privacy rules, employers generally cannot request or record employees' medical diagnoses or the nature and cause of their illness. The form therefore creates a risk of unlawful processing of sensitive personal information.

Recommended action: Remove the field requesting medical information and check the form for similar questions. Ensure that the revised form collects only the information permitted for sickness absence administration. If medical information has already been collected, arrange for a privacy specialist to assess whether corrective action is required.

Suggested owner: HR Lead

Timing: Immediate

Reference: Autoriteit Persoonsgegevens - Rules for employers concerning sick employees.

F02 HIGH | Unclear sickness-reporting instructions

Evidence: D01, p. 9: “Inform your manager before 09:00.” D04, p. 1: “Notify HR by email by 10:00.” Neither document explains whether employees must complete both notifications or how responsibility is divided between managers and HR.

Why it matters: Employees may follow only one instruction, while managers and HR assume the other party has been informed. This may lead to missed or delayed absence notifications, unnecessary follow-up and uncertainty over responsibility.

Recommended action: Agree on one clear sickness-reporting procedure specifying whom employees must notify, by when and through which channel. Define who is responsible for recording the absence and informing other relevant parties. Update D01 and D04 accordingly.

Suggested owner: HR Lead + COO

Timing: Week 1

F03 HIGH | No alternative grievance reporting route documented

Evidence: D05, p. 2: “Raise the concern with your direct manager first.” The policy does not specify an alternative reporting route when the concern involves that manager.

Why it matters: Employees may be reluctant to report concerns involving their manager if no alternative contact is identified. This can discourage reporting, create conflicts of interest and undermine confidence in the fairness of grievance handling.

Recommended action: Specify an alternative contact, such as the HR Lead, for concerns involving a direct manager. Provide a further escalation option when that contact is also involved. Clarify who is responsible for handling complaints and how confidentiality and conflicts of interest will be managed.

Suggested owner: HR Lead + CEO

Timing: Week 1–2

05 Additional improvement opportunities

The following findings are less urgent than F01–F03 but should be addressed during the next documentation update to improve clarity, consistency and ease of maintenance.

F04 MEDIUM | Incomplete document ownership and review arrangements

Evidence: D02–D05 all lack a designated document owner, while two of them also lack review dates.

Why it matters: Without clear responsibility and regular reviews, documents may become outdated or remain inconsistent after procedures change.

Recommended action: Assign an owner and approver to each document, establish review dates and maintain a simple register of current versions.

Suggested owner: HR Lead

Timing: Week 1

F05 MEDIUM | Unclear onboarding responsibilities

Evidence: D02, p. 2 states “IT prepares equipment” but does not specify who initiates the request or when equipment must be ready.

Why it matters: Unclear responsibilities and deadlines may result in delayed equipment preparation and disruption to employee onboarding.

Recommended action: Specify who submits the IT request, what triggers it, the required completion date and how readiness is confirmed.

Suggested owner: HR Lead + IT

Timing: Week 2

F06 MEDIUM | Unclear performance-review schedule

Evidence: D01, p. 11 refers to an “annual formal review”, while D03, p. 2 describes “mid-year and year-end performance reviews”. The documents do not clarify whether both reviews are formal.

Why it matters: Managers and employees may have different expectations about when formal reviews take place and what each review involves.

Recommended action: Confirm the intended performance-review cycle, distinguish formal reviews from interim discussions, and align both documents accordingly.

Suggested owner: HR Lead + CEO

Timing: Week 2

F07 MEDIUM | Incomplete leave approval instructions

Evidence: D04, p. 5 states “manager approves leave requests” but does not specify response time or responsibility for organising work coverage.

Why it matters: Employees may be uncertain when their requests will be decided, while managers may apply different approaches to approval and work coverage. For annual holiday requests, response deadlines may also have legal consequences.

Recommended action: Clarify the request and approval process, including response deadlines consistent with applicable Dutch requirements. Define managers' responsibility for arranging work coverage during approved leave.

Suggested owner: HR Lead + Managers

Timing: Week 3

Reference: Dutch government guidance on taking annual leave.

F08 LOW | Potentially outdated document references

Evidence: D01, p. 13 and D02, p. 4 refer to an older HR directory, while the intake information identifies PeopleHub as a newer resource.

Why it matters: Employees may encounter outdated information or have difficulty finding current HR documents.

Recommended action: Verify the current document location, update outdated references and ensure employees can identify where the latest versions are available.

Suggested owner: HR Lead

Timing: Week 3

06 30-day improvement roadmap

The following roadmap provides a suggested sequence for addressing the eight findings. Implementation is the client's responsibility and is not included in the Health Check. Responsibilities and deadlines should be confirmed by management.

WHEN	RECOMMENDED ACTIONS	RESPONSIBLE	EXPECTED RESULTS
Days 1–2	Immediately remove inappropriate medical-information questions from the sickness-reporting form. Initiate specialist review of any medical information previously collected (F01).	HR Lead	Reporting form corrected; review of previously collected information initiated
Week 1	Agree on one sickness-reporting procedure, including the manager–HR interaction (F02). Assign owners and approvers to all five documents (F04).	HR + COO	Agreed reporting procedure Document ownership register
Week 2	Define an alternative grievance-reporting route (F03). Clarify onboarding responsibilities (F05). Confirm the performance-review schedule (F06).	HR + CEO for F03 & F06 HR + IT for F05	Agreed grievance route, onboarding instructions and performance-review cycle
Week 3	Clarify leave approval and work-coverage arrangements (F07). Verify and correct outdated references (F08). Align all affected documents with the agreed procedures (F02, F06).	HR + Managers	Updated document drafts ready for approval
Week 4	Complete necessary specialist reviews, approve and publish revised documents, archive superseded versions and communicate changes to employees and managers.	HR + Document Owners	Approved, published and communicated documents; review dates established

Document maintenance checklist

Before closing the improvement process, confirm that:

- Each document has an identifiable owner and approver.
- Current documents have version information, effective dates and review dates.
- Related documents contain consistent instructions and references.
- The latest approved versions are available in one clearly identified location.
- Obsolete versions are archived, and affected employees and managers are informed of relevant changes.

Management decisions required

1. Authorise immediate correction of the absence-reporting form and any necessary privacy review.
2. Appoint an HR Lead to coordinate implementation and confirm document owners.
3. Approve the revised sickness-reporting and grievance procedures.
4. Agree on the responsibilities and target dates for completing the remaining improvements.

07 Method, Service Boundaries & Management Debrief

How the documents were assessed

Each document was reviewed against six criteria: coverage, clarity, consistency, usability, ownership and maintainability.

The review also examined how the documents work together, including overlapping instructions, inconsistencies, references to other documents and arrangements for keeping information up to date.

Identified issues were linked to supporting document evidence, prioritised according to their potential impact and accompanied by recommended corrective actions.

The assessment was based on the documents and organisational information supplied. Employee interviews, observation of actual practices and independent legal verification were not conducted.

Scope of the Health Check

INCLUDED

- Review of up to 5 HR documents (40 pages in total)
- One business unit and employment jurisdiction
- Assessment of document quality, usability, cross-document consistency and duplication
- Prioritised findings, supporting evidence and recommended actions
- Suggested 30-day improvement roadmap
- 45-minute management debrief

NOT INCLUDED

- Legal opinion or compliance certification
- Full rewriting or implementation of documents
- Employee interviews or verification of actual practices
- GDPR impact assessment or occupational health advice
- Technical audit of HR systems or access permissions

Important qualifications

The findings identify weaknesses and potential risks in the reviewed documentation. They do not establish whether procedures are followed in practice or whether legal requirements have been breached.

Matters requiring formal legal, privacy or occupational health assessment should be referred to appropriately qualified specialists.

MANAGEMENT DEBRIEF | 45 MINUTES

A discussion of the key findings, recommended priorities and management decisions required. The session provides an opportunity to clarify recommendations and determine immediate next steps.

Implementation of the recommendations remains the client's responsibility and is not included in the Health Check.

Prepared by Lev Minikes Consulting

HR & Organisational Advisory