IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

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

AMY L HOVICK

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 18A-UI-04008-S1-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

RANDSTAD US LLC

Employer

OC: 02/25/18

Claimant: Appellant (2)

Section 96.5-1-j – Separation from Temporary Employer

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Amy Hovick (claimant) appealed a representative's March 27, 2018, decision (reference 03) that concluded she was not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits due to her separation from work with Randstad US (employer). After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on April 24, 2018. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated by Danielle May, Marketing Manager.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the claimant was separated from employment for any disqualifying reason.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The employer is a temporary employment service. The claimant was assigned to perform services for Equifax from January 9, 2017, through October 24, 2017. She clicked submit that she acknowledged an electronic document on September 22, 2016. The employer does not know what language was in the electronic document. The claimant was not given a copy of the document. The claimant completed her last assignment on October 24, 2017. She sought reassignment within the week.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was not separated from employment for a disqualifying reason.

Iowa Code section 96.5(1)j provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits, regardless of the source of the individual's wage credits:

1. Voluntary quitting. If the individual has left work voluntarily without good cause attributable to the individual's employer, if so found by the department. But the individual shall not be disqualified if the department finds that:

- j. (1) The individual is a temporary employee of a temporary employment firm who notifies the temporary employment firm of completion of an employment assignment and who seeks reassignment. Failure of the individual to notify the temporary employment firm of completion of an employment assignment within three working days of the completion of each employment assignment under a contract of hire shall be deemed a voluntary quit unless the individual was not advised in writing of the duty to notify the temporary employment firm upon completion of an employment assignment or the individual had good cause for not contacting the temporary employment firm within three working days and notified the firm at the first reasonable opportunity thereafter.
- (2) To show that the employee was advised in writing of the notification requirement of this paragraph, the temporary employment firm shall advise the temporary employee by requiring the temporary employee, at the time of employment with the temporary employment firm, to read and sign a document that provides a clear and concise explanation of the notification requirement and the consequences of a failure to notify. The document shall be separate from any contract of employment and a copy of the signed document shall be provided to the temporary employee.
- (3) For the purposes of this paragraph:
- (a) "Temporary employee" means an individual who is employed by a temporary employment firm to provide services to clients to supplement their workforce during absences, seasonal workloads, temporary skill or labor market shortages, and for special assignments and projects.
- (b) "Temporary employment firm" means a person engaged in the business of employing temporary employees.

Under the lowa Code the employer must advise the claimant of the three working day notice requirement and give the claimant a copy of that requirement. The notice requirement must be separate from the contract for hire. The employer did not provide the claimant with the proper notice requirements and has, therefore, failed to satisfy the requirements of lowa Code Section 96.5-1-j. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

DECISION:

The representative's March 27, 2018, decision (reference 03) is reversed. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

Beth A. Scheetz Administrative Law Judge	
Decision Dated and Mailed	

bas/rvs