

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

68-0157 (9-06) - 3091078 - EI

ALISON M FINCH
Claimant

APPEAL NO: 18A-UI-10281-JC-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

LUTHERAN SERVICES IN IOWA INC
Employer

OC: 09/16/18
Claimant: Respondent (2)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 – Employer/Representative Participation Fact-finding Interview

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed an appeal from the October 4, 2018, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on October 29, 2018. The claimant did not respond to the notice of hearing to furnish a phone number with the Appeals Bureau and did not participate in the hearing. The employer participated through Amber Suckow, residential manager.

The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative records including the fact-finding documents. Employer Exhibit 1 was admitted into evidence. Based on the evidence, the arguments presented, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

ISSUES:

Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct?
Has the claimant been overpaid any unemployment insurance benefits, and if so, can the repayment of those benefits to the agency be waived?
Can any charges to the employer's account be waived?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed full-time as a program supervisor and was separated from employment on September 17, 2018, when she was discharged (Employer Exhibit 1).

When the claimant was hired, she was trained on employer rules and procedures, including those related to confidentiality, HIPAA, and maintaining appropriate boundaries with the dependent persons who receive services through the employer (Employer Exhibit 1). The claimant also attended monthly in-service training for refreshers on policies and also was expected to enforce employer rules and policies amongst the employees she supervised.

Prior to discharge, the claimant had been placed on a performance improvement plan in response to her failure to report to her shifts as directed. In September, the employer

experienced an issue due to the claimant's failure to properly staff her unit, causing concern over licensure requirements.

On September 7, 2018, the employer received a report from the female client that a note had been passed to her through the claimant from a hospitalized client, who was to be discharged soon. The client had been hospitalized for mental health issues and when Ms. Suckow learned one of the claimant's direct reports wanted to independently visit the client, she sent an email to the employee, and included the claimant, directing her not to visit the client.

The final incident occurred when the claimant, while off-duty, visited the soon-to-be discharged client, against the directive of the employer, and then passed a note from him to another client. By passing the notes between clients, it violated confidentiality and privacy policies, and the claimant's conduct was also directly against a directive given by Ms. Suckow. The claimant was subsequently discharged.

The administrative record reflects that claimant has received unemployment benefits in the amount of \$2,175.00, since filing a claim with an effective date of September 16, 2018. The administrative record also establishes that the employer did participate in the fact-finding interview or make a witness with direct knowledge available for rebuttal. Amber Suckow attended.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct.

Iowa law disqualifies individuals who are discharged from employment for misconduct from receiving unemployment insurance benefits. Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a. They remain disqualified until such time as they requalify for benefits by working and earning insured wages ten times their weekly benefit amount. *Id.*

Iowa Administrative Code rule 871-24.32(1)a provides:

"Misconduct" is defined as a deliberate act or omission by a worker which constitutes a material breach of the duties and obligations arising out of such worker's contract of employment. Misconduct as the term is used in the disqualification provision as being limited to conduct evincing such willful or wanton disregard of an employer's interest as is found in deliberate violation or disregard of standards of behavior which the employer has the right to expect of employees, or in carelessness or negligence of such degree of recurrence as to manifest equal culpability, wrongful intent or evil design, or to show an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interests or of the employee's duties and obligations to the employer. On the other hand mere inefficiency, unsatisfactory conduct, failure in good performance as the result of inability or incapacity, inadvertencies or ordinary negligence in isolated instances, or good faith errors in judgment or discretion are not to be deemed misconduct within the meaning of the statute.

This definition has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. *Huntoon v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

Under the definition of misconduct for purposes of unemployment benefit disqualification, the conduct in question must be "work-connected." *Diggs v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 478 N.W.2d 432 (Iowa Ct. App. 1991). The court has concluded that some off-duty conduct can have the requisite element of work connection. *Kleidosty v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 482 N.W.2d 416, 418 (Iowa 1992). Under similar definitions of misconduct, for an employer to show that the employee's off-duty activities rise to the level of misconduct in connection with the employment,

the employer must show by a preponderance of the evidence that the employee's conduct (1) had some nexus with the work; (2) resulted in some harm to the employer's interest, and (3) was conduct which was (a) violative of some code of behavior impliedly contracted between employer and employee, and (b) done with intent or knowledge that the employer's interest would suffer. See also, *Dray v. Director*, 930 S.W.2d 390 (Ark. Ct. App. 1996); *In re Kotrba*, 418 N.W.2d 313 (SD 1988), quoting *Nelson v. Dept of Emp't Security*, 655 P.2d 242 (WA 1982); 76 *Am. Jur. 2d, Unemployment Compensation* §§ 77–78.

In this case, the claimant directly violated a directive given by management when she visited a client off-duty in a hospital. The administrative law judge is persuaded the claimant's conduct was directly tied to the employer inasmuch as she would not have known the client's whereabouts or hospitalization details but for her access to his personal information through her job. Further, she was a party to an email from management, which directed her subordinate to not visit the client when off-duty. This directive would reasonably be imputed to the claimant as well. Therefore, the administrative law judge is persuaded that her conduct, which occurred off duty, can be considered in the determination of whether misconduct has been established.

The question of whether the refusal to perform a specific task or directive constitutes misconduct must be determined by evaluating both the reasonableness of the employer's request in light of all circumstances and the employee's reason for noncompliance. *Endicott v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 367 N.W.2d 300 (Iowa Ct. App. 1985). Here, the employer directed employees not to visit the client off duty, in part because of "boundary" issues, and in part, due to confidentiality and privacy concerns.

The claimant as a supervisor had not only been trained on employer rules and procedures but was also expected to enforce them amongst her direct reports. The claimant further violated employer rules and procedure related to confidentiality when she passed a note from the hospitalized client to another client. The claimant did not attend the hearing to dispute the employer's credible evidence or present evidence to mitigate her non-compliance with the employer's reasonable directive to not visit the client. Rather, the administrative law judge is persuaded the claimant knew or should have known her conduct was contrary to the best interests of the employer. Therefore, based on the evidence presented, the claimant was discharged for misconduct, even without prior warning. Benefits are denied.

The next issue is whether the claimant must repay the benefits she had received.

Iowa Code § 96.3(7)a-b provides:

7. Recovery of overpayment of benefits.

a. If an individual receives benefits for which the individual is subsequently determined to be ineligible, even though the individual acts in good faith and is not otherwise at fault, the benefits shall be recovered. The department in its discretion may recover the overpayment of benefits either by having a sum equal to the overpayment deducted from any future benefits payable to the individual or by having the individual pay to the department a sum equal to the overpayment.

b. (1) (a) If the department determines that an overpayment has been made, the charge for the overpayment against the employer's account shall be removed and the account shall be credited with an amount equal to the overpayment from the unemployment compensation trust fund and this credit shall include both contributory and reimbursable employers, notwithstanding § 96.8, subsection 5. The employer shall not be relieved of charges if benefits are paid because the employer or an agent of the employer failed to respond timely or adequately to the department's request for information relating to the payment of benefits. This prohibition against relief of charges shall apply to both contributory and reimbursable employers.

(b) However, provided the benefits were not received as the result of fraud or willful misrepresentation by the individual, benefits shall not be recovered from an individual if the employer did not participate in the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to § 96.6, subsection 2, and an overpayment occurred because of a subsequent reversal on appeal regarding the issue of the individual's separation from employment.

(2) An accounting firm, agent, unemployment insurance accounting firm, or other entity that represents an employer in unemployment claim matters and demonstrates a continuous pattern of failing to participate in the initial determinations to award benefits, as determined and defined by rule by the department, shall be denied permission by the department to represent any employers in unemployment insurance matters. This subparagraph does not apply to attorneys or counselors admitted to practice in the courts of this states pursuant to § 602.10101.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 provides:

Employer and employer representative participation in fact-finding interviews.

(1) "Participate," as the term is used for employers in the context of the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, means submitting detailed factual information of the quantity and quality that if unrebutted would be sufficient to result in a decision favorable to the employer. The most effective means to participate is to provide live testimony at the interview from a witness with firsthand knowledge of the events leading to the separation. If no live testimony is provided, the employer must provide the name and telephone number of an employee with firsthand information who may be contacted, if necessary, for rebuttal. A party may also participate by providing detailed written statements or documents that provide detailed factual information of the events leading to separation. At a minimum, the information provided by the employer or the employer's representative must identify the dates and particular circumstances of the incident or incidents, including, in the case of discharge, the act or omissions of the claimant or, in the event of a voluntary separation, the stated reason for the quit. The specific rule or policy must be submitted if the claimant was discharged for violating such rule or policy. In the case of discharge for attendance violations, the information must include the circumstances of all incidents the employer or the employer's representative contends meet the definition of unexcused absences as set forth in 871—subrule 24.32(7). On the other hand, written or oral statements or general conclusions without supporting detailed factual information and information submitted after the fact-finding decision has been issued are not considered participation within the meaning of the statute.

(2) "A continuous pattern of nonparticipation in the initial determination to award benefits," pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, as the term is used for an entity representing employers, means on 25 or more occasions in a calendar quarter beginning with the first calendar quarter of 2009, the entity files appeals after failing to participate. Appeals filed but withdrawn before the day of the contested case hearing will not be considered in determining if a continuous pattern of nonparticipation exists. The division administrator shall notify the employer's representative in writing after each such appeal.

(3) If the division administrator finds that an entity representing employers as defined in Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, has engaged in a continuous pattern of nonparticipation, the division administrator shall suspend said representative for a period of up to six months on the first occasion, up to one year on the second occasion and up to ten years on the third or subsequent occasion. Suspension by the division

administrator constitutes final agency action and may be appealed pursuant to Iowa Code section 17A.19.

(4) "Fraud or willful misrepresentation by the individual," as the term is used for claimants in the context of the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, means providing knowingly false statements or knowingly false denials of material facts for the purpose of obtaining unemployment insurance benefits. Statements or denials may be either oral or written by the claimant. Inadvertent misstatements or mistakes made in good faith are not considered fraud or willful misrepresentation.

This rule is intended to implement Iowa Code section 96.3(7)"b" as amended by 2008 Iowa Acts, Senate File 2160.

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which she was not entitled. The claimant has been overpaid benefits in the amount of \$2,175.00. The unemployment insurance law provides that benefits must be recovered from a claimant who receives benefits and is later determined to be ineligible for benefits, even though the claimant acted in good faith and was not otherwise at fault. However, the overpayment will not be recovered when it is based on a reversal on appeal of an initial determination to award benefits on an issue regarding the claimant's employment separation if: (1) the benefits were not received due to any fraud or willful misrepresentation by the claimant and (2) the employer did not participate in the initial proceeding to award benefits. The employer will not be charged for benefits if it is determined that it did participate in the fact-finding interview. Iowa Code § 96.3(7), Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10.

In this case, the claimant has received benefits but was not eligible for those benefits. The employer satisfactorily participated in the scheduled fact-finding interview by way of Amber Suckow. Since the employer did participate in the fact-finding interview, the claimant is obligated to repay the benefits she received and the employer's account shall not be charged.

DECISION:

The October 4, 2018, (reference 01) decision is reversed. The claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld until such time as she has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible. The claimant has been overpaid benefits in the amount of \$2,175.00 and must repay the benefits. The employer's account is relieved of charges.

Jennifer L. Beckman
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

jlb/scn