

BAJ NEWS

No 55 Quarterly August 2007

£400,000 Court triumph for sacked foreign corr

MEMBER John Phillips has been awarded damages and back pay worth the equivalent of at least £400,000 against *The Times* in the Tribunal of Rome for wrongful dismissal and failure to observe the terms and conditions of the National Journalists' contract in Italy.

The judge also ordered John's reinstatement. In addition, *The Times* has to pay pension contributions to the Italian journalists' fund for John worth some £133,000 and legal costs of some £25,000.

John worked for *The Times* for 14 years as a correspondent, starting in the Paris bureau in the early 1990s, transferring to Italy as Rome correspondent in 1992 and working as Balkans correspondent, still based in

Rome, from 2000. His service included spells as a war correspondent in Algeria, Bosnia and Macedonia.

His full-time service and his willingness to put his life in danger for the paper counted for nothing when he was fired, by telephone, by the then

Foreign News Editor, Martin Fletcher, in 2004. John tried to keep his job or get redundancy compensation, but the then Managing Editor, George Brock told him he was a freelance and had no employment rights.

A telephone conference was held

with BAJ's solicitor and John's solicitor in Rome. It was concluded that John would get better justice in Italy. So proceedings were issued in the Tribunal of Rome, with BAJ's support.

The Times played hard ball to the end. At the final court hearing, it would offer John only £44,000, inclusive of costs. The judge wasn't impressed.

The Phillips family have suffered untold hardship while waiting for the case to be heard. Work has been hard to come by in Italy and John, his wife and their two daughters were evicted from their home.

The Times have now been made to pay up big for their appalling treatment of a journalist who risked his life and gave his all for them.

Full report in the next issue.

CONFERENCE DATE

COME and have your say at BAJ's seventh biennial conference on Wednesday, September 19, in The George pub, The Strand, London. It takes place from 6.30pm for 7pm until 9.30pm. The pub is opposite the law courts. All members are welcome as active participants. Trainee members are welcome as observers. Wives, husbands and partners are also welcome as observers.

Members who intend to come must tell the BAJ office by Friday, September 10. Anyone who would like to submit a resolution for discussion should send it to the BAJ office by September 10. (NEC elections - see back page).

MGN Journalists vote for industrial action over 2007 pay claim

DETERMINED MGN members were taking industrial action over the 2007 House Claim as BAJ NEWS went to bed.

Journalists were operating a work-to-rule involving a ban on overtime and taking screen and meal breaks.

Members are seeking a basic pay rise of 3.75%, acting-up payments and improvements in minimum salaries, minimum rises, sick pay and graduate trainees' pay.

The Company has offered only a 3% basic pay rise when inflation in the relevant period was 4.4% and Chief Executive Sly Bailey has had a 41.8% increase in her mega-bucks remuneration package.

Industrial action has been forced on the MGN Chapels because the Company has

procrastinated for nine months over negotiations and refuses to come to arbitration other than on terms favourable to the Company.

The Chapels progressively reduced the 2007 claim, but the Company hardly budged an inch from its original unsatisfactory offer even during conciliation talks at ACAS.

The Company can well afford to treat journalists better. In difficult trading conditions last year, MGN's Nationals Division still made an operating profit of £80.2 million.

Now members have said enough is enough and voted for industrial action in a secret, postal ballot conducted by the independent scrutineers, Electoral Reform Ballot Services.

Ballot papers were posted to 144 BAJ

members at MGN. The result:

In favour of a strike: 61, Against 46, Invalid papers 2. Total: 109.

In favour of industrial action short of a strike: 80, Against 27, Invalid papers 2. Total: 109.

The votes in favour of a strike were not sufficient to comply with BAJ rules for strike action to take place.

The votes in favour of action short of a strike complied fully with BAJ rules for such action to take place.

BAJ rule 15 (d) says: "The General Secretary shall have power to authorise industrial action by any Chapel provided the ballot shows at least a two-thirds majority in favour of the action. The two-thirds majority must also constitute a majority of members eligible to vote in the ballot."

The Chapels have pledged to call off industrial action if the Company makes an acceptable new offer or agrees to come to conventional arbitration on all outstanding issues or pendulum arbitration on each outstanding issue.

This is the first time members on the Daily Mirror, Sunday Mirror and The People have been involved in industrial action since the union achieved MGN recognition in 2001.

General Secretary Steve Turner said: "BAJ is, of course, against industrial action, but members cannot be left powerless when MGN won't make a decent offer and will only come to arbitration on its own terms."

"We hope the Company will see the sense of sharing the Company cake more fairly without further ado."

Please use the enclosed form to sign up a member

Your finances

THE audit of BAJ's 2005 accounts has been completed. The auditors, Civials, of London, W1, found our affairs to be in order. You'll see BAJ had a deficit of £9,845 on the income and expenditure accounts which arose from the high cost of legal fees spent on helping members last year. The deficit was covered by reserves. Enclosed is a copy of the audited accounts. Section 32A of the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992 requires members to be told every year that:

"A member who is concerned that some irregularity may be occurring, or has occurred, in the conduct of the financial affairs of the union may take steps with a view to investigating further, obtaining clarification and, if necessary, securing regularisation of that conduct.

"The member may raise any such concern with such one or more of the following as it seems appropriate to raise it with: the officials of the union, the trustees of the property of the union, the auditor or auditors of the union, the Certification Officer (who is an independent officer appointed by the Secretary of State) and the police.

"Where a member believes that the financial affairs of the union have been or are being conducted in breach of the law or in breach of rules of the union and contemplates bringing civil proceedings against the union or responsible officials or trustees, he should consider obtaining independent legal advice."

The law also requires members to be told that the General Secretary was paid £17,000 salary with benefits of £584 last year. No salary or benefits were paid to the National Chairman or other members of the NEC.

Our management accounts from 1 January until 30 June 2007 are:

INCOME

Advance/arrears subs	4,050.00	Subs received	
Donations	9,634.76	January	9,591.50
Bank interest	225.52	February	9,583.50
Legal fees for		March	9,533.50
compromise agreements	250.00	April	9,458.50
Dividends	0.56	May	9,621.00
Sale of old mobile phones	81.93	June	9,653.50
		TOTAL	71,684.27

EXPENDITURE

Legal expenses/Helpline premium	9,292.92	Website	39.99
Legal advisers' retainers	12,129.32	Photocopying	286.04
Legal adviser's, NEC's and FOC's insurance	679.24	Postage	400.41
Other legal bills/court charges	12,919.39	Stationery/printing	1,310.16
Tax Helpline	587.52	Secretarial	2,950.00
BAJ Press Cards	75.61	Bookkeeping	535.00
UK Press Cards	279.74	Audit fees	2,085.62
Student Press Cards	20.00	Bank and BACS charges	218.00
Company search fees	86.37	Office rent	2,169.36
BAJ NEWS	1,237.07	Office rates	632.40
Bounty payments	100.00	Office water rates	179.74
MPA/IRD affiliation fees	330.00	Sundry expenses	50.00
Pay/NIC (S.Turner)	9,717.25		
Pay/NIC (D.Thomas)	9,325.33	TOTAL	70,259.09
Keyman insurance	487.50	TOTAL INCOME	71,684.27
Telephones (4)	1,389.00	TOTAL EX	70,259.09
Facsimilies (2)	318.00	IN HAND	£1,425.18
Mobile telephones (2)	384.11		
Computer support	44.00	Previous surplus	£15,918.48

LEGAL BRIEFING

ANYONE under threat of redundancy must be consulted fully even if he/she is the only one affected in an office.

Barrister Michael Uberoi explains:



Michael Uberoi

I AM asked to consider the position that would arise in the context of an employer raising its intention to have fewer than 20 redundancies. How would this lower figure affect both its duty to consult, and the timescale required?

In the case of 20 or more proposed redundancies, the law is clear. With 20-99 redundancies, the employer has to consult staff representatives for at least 30 days. With 100 or more proposed redundancies the consultation process is at least 90 days.

However, there is no law or authority stating precisely what kind of timetable is appropriate where there are fewer than 20 redundancies. Instead, what is relevant is the accepted case law on unfair dismissal and failure to consult in general.

The importance of individual consultation was shown in the case of *Herron v Citylink Nottingham* [1993]

INJUN

For te

MGN Management threatened to seek a court injunction against General Secretary Steve Turner for telling the truth about BAJ's recent Protective Award case against MGN.

Turner and the BAJ National Executive Committee stood firm against the attempted intimidation and MGN backed off.

BAJ lost the Protective Award case at Stratford Employment Tribunal because the panel believed the incorrect evidence of Shaun Milne about the cessation of Scottish Daily Mirror production in Glasgow.

Milne's evidence which included his email sent to MGN bosses on 12 December 2005 stopped BAJ winning compensation of up to 13 weeks' pay for the 16 journalists who lost their jobs on the Scottish Daily Mirror.

Turner circulated ex-Assistant Editor Milne's email to the redundant Scottish journalists and asked what they made of it. Then came the injunction threat.

MGN's solicitors wrote to Turner: "It has come to our attention that you have recently circulated to members of the BAJ bargaining unit documents which were disclosed to you during the Protective Award proceedings.

"We require confirmation by return that you will not repeat this conduct.

"Our client is treating this matter very seriously. Should you commit any further breaches of the rules regarding disclosed documents, we reserve the right to draw the matter to the attention of the Tribunal.

"Furthermore, any future breaches will lead to an application by MGN for an injunction restraining you from misusing disclosed documents."

Turner asked, with the backing of the NEC, for details of the disclosed documents and full details of the court rules he was supposed to have broken.

MGN's bluff had been called, BAJ heard no more from the Company's solicitors.

BAJ asked barrister Jill Brown who presented our case at the Protective Award hearing whether we had grounds for a

success appeal over Milne's incorrect testimony and other inaccuracies in the written judgement of the tribunal panel.

Jill said an appeal would not succeed because although the tribunal had got some of the facts wrong, it had not been perverse in general. So the Employment Appeal Tribunal would not interfere with the Stratford Tribunal's decision.

Puzzling

BAJ accepted Jill's advice, but it was puzzling that Milne's email to MGN bosses on 12 December 2005 and his evidence to the tribunal could be believed when it was so obviously incorrect.

The email, sent on 12 December 2005 to MGN Group Managing Editor Eugene Duffy and other MGN executives, said: "The production team and sport have not indicated that this will be the last edition they work on tonight.

"They see little point in continuing when there is no prospect of any jobs being retained here for them."

Milne gave the impression that the Scottish Daily Mirror had been produced

BAJ IS

OF all the qualities desirable in a journalist I think tenacity is probably top of the list. Luckily for BAJ members, General Secretary Steve Turner is dogged in his pursuit of justice.

No-one wants to take a case to the Employment Tribunals, but in circumstances force it, then Steve is most stalwart support you could hope for.

Even one person f

IRLR 372. The Employment Appeal Tribunal refused to accept that the failure to consult the individual dismissed was justified by the employer's belief that the employee was the only person who could be made redundant.

The tribunal commented that even in an apparently clear case there may be factors known to the employee but unknown to the employer which would cause the employer to change his mind, such as the fact that the employee is willing to accept a lower paid job or a more junior post.

So failure to consult fully would almost certainly render the selection for redundancy unfair.

I would put forward the following as the sort of consultation process that BAJ

members should expect:

An employee should be given written notice that his/her role is "at risk" of redundancy.

In any meetings between the individual and the Company, the individual is entitled to be accompanied by a BAJ official or an office colleague.

An employee must tell an employee at risk of redundancy what redundancy terms will be paid if the employee is eventually selected for redundancy. The employee can argue for better terms.

Anyone at risk of redundancy must be put in a selection pool if there are other employees doing similar work within their office. All employees in the pool must be told in writing that they are at risk of

ACTION THREAT

Telling the TRUTH!

on December 8, 9 and 11 in Scotland before the alleged decision by journalists not to work after December 12. In fact, the last paper was produced in Scotland on December 7. The work thereafter was just dumped on London subs.

There was an unofficial paper produced by some journalists in Glasgow on 12 December in the forlorn hope that Management would realise that the paper being produced in London was an abomination and relent and keep Glasgow production alive. They gained unofficial access to the system.

Milne, who had become a News Desk executive on the Scottish Daily Record by the time of the tribunal hearing, told the panel that Glasgow production journalists stopped working of their own volition. It was not management who stopped production.

What nonsense! Workers do not please themselves over working or not working. If the boss says work, they work, particularly when substantial redundancy pay would be lost for being in breach of contract.

On the other hand, BAJ's witness Ellen

Arnison, who was Deputy Night Editor of the Scottish Daily Mirror, told the tribunal that Management had shut down production when Eugene Duffy announced the redundancies to a meeting of the journalists on December 8.

Ellen said that even as the meeting was being held, Management changed the passwords and access codes to the production system so that no-one could actually do any work although staff could still access email accounts and the internet.

Convincing

That sounds pretty convincing evidence that Management had pulled the plugs on Glasgow production, but the tribunal panel was not impressed.

Ellen said that MGN Group Managing Editor Eugene Duffy who announced the redundancies to the staff said the Scottish Daily Mirror would from that time onwards be produced in London.

Ellen was not at the 8 December meeting. But she was given the full facts by colleagues and was told she did not have to go to work any more. Management

certainly never asked her to work again.

The Tribunal didn't believe Ellen. Its written Judgement said: "It has been suggested by the Claimant who has called evidence by Miss Arnison to support the suggestion that the Respondents intended to close the Scottish Mirror immediately and therefore could have had no intention to consult."

"However, we prefer the evidence of Mr Milne, called by the Respondents, supported by contemporary documentation, to show that it was not management, but the workers in Scotland, who decided they would not work any longer."

The contemporary documentation which impressed the Tribunal was, of course, Milne's incorrect email to Eugene Duffy & Co on 12 December 2005.

The tribunal panel obviously didn't believe Steve Turner's evidence, either.

Turner pointed out that when the then HR Director Richard Boon told BAJ negotiators about the proposed redundancies on 8 December, Boon said that Glasgow staff had been allowed to go to the pub to let off their feelings.

Turner said BAJ negotiators were surprised that the Company was being so understanding about it, and asked what would happen the next day. Boon said the Glasgow staff would be back at work next day. If not, they risked losing their redundancy money for being in breach of contract. He said they would not want to do that.

What Boon said was obviously true. Why couldn't the tribunal panel see the obvious?

The tribunal's judgement was also wrong about the number of redundancies and the number of saved jobs. The written judgement said: "Consultation meetings resulted in a significant reduction in the

number of compulsory redundancies envisaged by the Respondent from 58 to 36. Of this reduction, 10 were volunteers."

There were 45 proposed compulsory redundancies, not 58. Nine jobs were saved, not 22. (Two reporting jobs were saved on the Scottish Daily Mirror, four Scottish staff relocated to London and three Scottish staff joined Trinity Mirror titles in Scotland. The number of volunteers was fewer than 10. No jobs were saved in England, Wales or Northern Ireland.

Where's the justice when the tribunal panel cannot grasp the basic facts?!

Wrong

The tribunal panel was also wrong over BAJ's proposals for keeping a scaled-down, but complete editorial team in Glasgow. The judgement said: "We have considered very carefully the proposals put forward by Mr Turner. In our judgement, the proposals were not realistic in the circumstances. Mr Turner maintained that there should be a unit of 15.5 jobs in Scotland throughout."

Not true. Turner's written statement said clearly that BAJ negotiators first proposed that a team of 15.5 journalists be retained in Glasgow. When Management rejected this, BAJ reduced the figure to 13.5. When this was rejected, BAJ reduced the figure to 10.

Couldn't the panel read?

MGN Group Managing Editor Eugene Duffy was intransigent. He told BAJ negotiators on 22 December when they called for a production unit to be retained in Scotland: "It isn't going to happen."

But Duffy told the tribunal hearing that although he had, indeed, said that, he was always receptive to the right arguments. BAJ just didn't put the right arguments forward. How convenient!

The tribunal panel said BAJ's proposals were all rejected for sound business reasons. They would be, wouldn't they?

SO BRILLIANT

A distressing situation at work leaves you feeling isolated and vulnerable, but throughout the two years it took for my case to be satisfactorily resolved, Steve (and his wife membership secretary Debbie) were always available to give their expert advice and support.

During this time I found out more about human nature than I might have wished, but some people showed great solidarity, most notably the ex-colleague

who, without hesitation, agreed to be a witness for me. I am sure his clear, unequivocal testimony contributed greatly to my success. He's a hero.

When the BAJ was seeking recognition at my newspaper, the Editor asked me why, as a senior manager, I felt the need to belong to a union. I think he has his answer now. **BAJ IS BRILLIANT!**

Sue Roberts

Financing redundancy has rights

redundancy.

If there is a selection pool, all employees in the pool should be asked in writing whether they wish to volunteer for redundancy and be given reasonable time to do so in order to try to avoid compulsory redundancies.

Everyone in the pool should be given a reasonable amount of time to decide if they wish to volunteer, and it is suggested that this should be at least a week. A longer period of time might be necessary for everyone if anyone is on holiday.

Employees at risk of redundancy in a selection pool should be asked to comment on the proposed selection criteria. The criteria should be objective. If there is no objective data available, then wherever

possible the selection process should be carried out by two executives who have a thorough knowledge of the work of the employees concerned.

If there are no acceptable volunteers, the selection criteria will be applied to all employees in the selection pool. The employee who comes bottom of the selection table will be provisionally selected for redundancy.

He/she must have the opportunity to put his/her case against the redundancy to the manager carrying out the selection, so that the latter may reach a fully informed decision.

The employee who is provisionally selected for redundancy must be shown his/her scores on the selection criteria and

told how the scores were reached. The selected person should be given a reasonable time to consider the information before consultations are concluded.

Discussions should include a consideration of whether alternative employment can be found within the organisation or, if it is a group, within the group.

The whole procedure should take approximately 30 days during which time the employee continues to receive his/her full pay even if he/she is sent on gardening leave.

As stated earlier, it is important to bear in mind that this timescale is not in fact guaranteed by statute. It is simply the case that for an employer to avoid raising the

spectre of an unfair dismissal claim, it would be difficult for the whole process to be much shorter than 30 days.

There must be a right of appeal against selection for redundancy and anyone contemplating legal action over the redundancy must go through the appeal procedure before instituting proceedings in the courts.

The employer can fix the appeal hearing after termination of employment. The former employee's pay will have been stopped at the termination date, but the pay will have to be reinstated back to the termination date if the appeal is successful.

This represents a reasonable process for any employer to be expected to comply with. However, the final judgment on whether a feature or omission of the consultation process renders the dismissal unfair in all the circumstances will be a question of fact for a tribunal to decide.

Freelance forum

By Jane Furnival

I HAVE taken a lodger, who works a 15-hour night shift as a film runner, and tells me that many of her colleagues are working for nothing.

I worry that this 'work for free' expectation is spreading to journalism. A prestigious glossy magazine recently asked me if I'd write a monthly column free in exchange for a book plug.

If you work for Hello! Magazine, agree your rates in writing first, including what happens if the piece doesn't run (I am trying to avoid the term 'kill-fee' as it makes all right-thinking BAJ members apoplectic with rage).

One member was commissioned to write a celebrity interview which was held over until it lost its relevance. The magazine eventually offered £200 for 1500 words (7.5p per word). That makes The Times' top rate of 50p a word look positively princely. We know it's not, and they have also joined the despicable 'pay on publication only' handwagon.

A journalist who reviews operas, complains that because she writes for websites, PRs refuse or downgrade Press tickets for her. I note that the Royal Horticultural Society also doesn't give Press tickets to e-journalists, but no one was available when I phoned to ask why. Websites are increasingly important sources of news and information. I should like to hear from others who work for websites about how they are treated.

Extra income

You can get a small extra income from your articles in press, magazine and journals, by registering, free, with ALCs, the Authors' Licensing and Copyright Society, who dish out money paid by organisations for photocopying rights. Even if you don't imagine that anyone has copied your piece, you may be pleasantly surprised.

ALCS is currently paying out for articles written from January 2004 - December 06 - the cut-off time for claims for that period is September. You have to get and fill out the form (ignore the bit about the publication's ISSN number - they will fill that out if you don't know it). ALCs, Freepost RRKC-HULL-LAZII, The Writers' House, 13 Haydon St, London EC3N 1DB, or download a form from www.alcs.co.uk.

FEEWATCH

Bella came up with £750 for a one-page feature about a celebrity. *Bevi* magazine paid £1,000 for two pages, but that includes a fee to the case study. (NB any fees paid to interviewees are tax-deductible. Receipts are desirable but not essential). *Chat* paid £700 for a one-page real-life story, including a fee to the case study.

Mail on Sunday: £1,000 for a page news story. A photographer did an eight-hour news and features shift for the *Mail on Sunday* for £145 plus a £25 equipment fee. *Daily Express* health, 900 words, £400. *Sunday Express* news, 900 words, £550.

The Sun paid £300 for a case study turned round quickly. *Derby Evening Telegraph* paid a rather meagre £33.40 for a 400-word news report. *Yorkshire Post*, £58.45 for a 600-word court report.

Bosses are new slave drivers

BAJ hasn't imagined after all that many newspaper bosses have become greedy.

Magazine tycoon Felix Dennis, legendary editor Harry Evans and eminent media commentator Ray Snoddy say so as well.

Dennis said in *Press Gazette*: "What has happened to newspapers is a tragedy there's no question of that."

"It is one thing for me to publish *Maxim* in Uzbekistan - that is just entertainment, stupidity and fun - but a newspaper is supposed to be more than just money-getting."

"Owning a newspaper and having that power comes with an element of public service, but any sense of that is decreasing by the day. Many newspapers have become nothing but ad-gets."

Ruined

Evans said in *Press Gazette*: "Too many of the British regional newspapers have succumbed to the accountants. They've really ruined the papers."

Even a great paper like the Philadelphia Inquirer in America was ruined by greed. The owner announced: "We have a great objective for next year."

"And I thought: 'What is it? Is it to enrich the cultural pages? Is it to open a new internet site? Is it to expose some appalling abuse?' No, the great objective was to go for 23% profit next year."

"Now, of course, some five years later, the paper is up for sale."

Snoddy said in *Press Gazette*: "There is still a great newspaper culture in this country, but management are doing their best to kill it off. Newspapers are becoming the new slave drivers."

"I'm really concerned about people of my children's generation. I see them going into journalism, I see them coming out again two or three years later disillusioned, disheartened, overworked, poorly paid, badly treated by moronic

management. And they walk and get other jobs.

"I think that is a really serious long-term crisis that has to be addressed. More and more asked of editorial resources, less and less distinguished and distinctive journalism, apart from a few highly paid columnists. That game

will not survive over a 20-year cycle, it just won't."

Steve Turner said: "With Dennis, Evans and Snoddy singing our tune, BAJ knows it is on the right track in urging newspaper bosses to invest more in editorial, pay better salaries and stop exploiting and sacking journalists."



Newell: Training already

Terry's run hardest yet

RUNNING maestro Terry Newell somehow survived the scorching sunshine to complete his 27th consecutive London Marathon in April.

The number of athletes who have finished every London marathon is down to 25 - and Terry is one of them.

Record temperatures made it a tough Sunday, writes Terry.

A drought of drinks of water between 16 to 21 miles encouraged me to consider stopping the first time I carried that thought for several miles in all 27 London efforts.

But running is shifting the body's weight from one leg to the other and while I worked on doing that all thoughts of stopping went away.

This run was the hardest London for me to finish. Now, next year ...

ELECTION TIME!

ELECTIONS are here again. Nominations are wanted for the five lay places on the BAJ National Executive Committee.

The period of office is two years from the biennial conference on September 19. Members can nominate colleagues or themselves. Candidates must have been journalists for at least five years. Closing date: August 31.

Send nominations to BAJ, 89 Fleet Street, London EC4Y 1DJ. If there are more than five candidates, elections will be held.

Under rule 5(u) known candidates have to disclose in BAJ NEWS in advance of the election the names of any organisation with which they have been associated over the past two years.

Four of the five present NEC members are seeking re-election:

Crawford McAfee (National Chairman): Ex-Daily Mirror and Mail on Sunday staffman and ex-Daily Mirror Chapel official, now Sunday Mirror part-time sub; YHA.

Bob Bayliss: Ex-Sunday Mirror staffman, Deputy FOC and Mirror Pensions Trustee, now retired; NPI, Inland Waterways Association, Catalina Society, RNLI.

Andrew Golden: Ex-Sunday Mirror staffman and former Sunday Mirror FOC and Group Convenor, now Mirror Pensions Trustee and freelance; National Trust, Performing Rights Association, Musicians Union.

James Hole: Ex-MGN Publicity staffman and FOC, now a government publications editor; NPE, National Trust, National Art Collections Fund and Friends of the Royal Academy.

Regrettably, Mail on Sunday staffman Dennis Rice, is standing down from the NEC because of pressure of work.

Jean Carr is standing for the NEC. Jean is ex-Sunday Mirror, ex-MOC Sunday Mirror, Manchester, ex-Chapel Clerk Sunday Mirror, London, ex-Sunday Express and now IPC Media. She belongs to NPE, Labour Party and RNLI.