

**IN THE IOWA ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS DIVISION
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

DIANNA L DICKEY
Claimant

HY-VEE INC
Employer

APPEAL 24A-UI-03095-PT-T
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION

OC: 02/18/24
Claimant: Appellant (2)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant, Dianna Dickey, filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated March 11, 2024, (reference 01) that held the claimant ineligible for unemployment insurance benefits after a separation from employment. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on April 10, 2024. The claimant participated personally. The employer, Hy-Vee Inc., participated through District Store Director Eric Kraciun and was represented by Experian Representative Barbera Buss. The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative record.

ISSUE:

Whether the claimant was discharged for disqualifying, job-related misconduct.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds: The claimant worked as a full-time baker/cake designer for Hy-Vee Inc. from January 28, 2006, until February 16, 2024, when she was discharged. As a baker/cake designer, the claimant was responsible for baking and designing all customer cake orders as well as preparing food for several product cases in the bakery. The claimant worked from 7:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. Wednesday through Monday.

The employer has an employee manual that contains a code of conduct policy. The code of conduct policy requires employees to behave professionally and to treat other employees and customers with respect. The claimant received a copy of the employee manual and was familiar with the employer's work rules.

In January 2024, the employer hired a new bakery manager to oversee the bakery. Once hired, the new manager changed several protocols and procedures, one of which was implementing a directive that employees in the bakery must first fill all display cases with products before working on customer orders. Because the claimant was responsible for preparing and designing all customer cake orders, the change in protocol made it difficult for the claimant to timely complete her orders and resulted in the claimant working late most days.

The claimant has always had an assertive, direct communication style and she openly expressed her frustration with the new protocol to her supervisor. However, despite the claimant's concerns, her supervisor declined to change the protocol. At various times throughout the claimant's employment, the employer met with the claimant and discussed how her communication style sometimes came across as brash or negative. However, the employer never issued the claimant any workplace discipline concerning her behavior in the workplace.

In early-February 2024, the claimant met with the district director to discuss her concerns about the bakery's new protocol. During their conversation, the director told the claimant that, as the cake designer, her top priority was to complete customers' cake orders. The claimant interpreted this to mean that, moving forward, she should prioritize completing customers' cake orders before assisting with filling the display cases.

On February 12, 2024, shortly after arriving at work, the claimant saw her supervisor and said, "Hey, I talked to [the director] and he told me my priority is to get orders done first." The claimant's supervisor walked away from the claimant without responding. After the brief encounter, the claimant's supervisor went to the director's office and told the director that she was going to quit because she felt undermined and could not work with the claimant. On February 16, 2024, the director called the claimant into a meeting and informed her that her employment was being terminated effective immediately due to creating a negative work environment and because the employer could not afford to lose a manager. Prior to her termination, the claimant felt she was performing her job to the best of her ability and she did not believe that her job was in jeopardy.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed.

Iowa Code section 96.5(2)a provides:

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

2. Discharge for misconduct. If the department finds that the individual has been discharged for misconduct in connection with the individual's employment:

a. The disqualification shall continue until the individual has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times the individual's weekly benefit amount, provided the individual is otherwise eligible.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(1)a provides:

Discharge for misconduct.

(1) Definition.

a. "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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(4) provides:

(4) *Report required.* The claimant's statement and employer's statement must give detailed facts as to the specific reason for the claimant's discharge. Allegations of misconduct or dishonesty without additional evidence shall not be sufficient to result in disqualification. If the employer is unwilling to furnish available evidence to corroborate the allegation, misconduct cannot be established. In cases where a suspension or disciplinary layoff exists, the claimant is considered as discharged, and the issue of misconduct shall be resolved.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(8) provides:

(8) *Past acts of misconduct.* While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of a current act of misconduct, a discharge for misconduct cannot be based on such past act or acts. The termination of employment must be based on a current act.

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job-related misconduct. *Cosper v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The issue is not whether the employer made a correct decision in separating claimant, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. *Infante v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). What constitutes misconduct justifying termination of an employee and what misconduct warrants denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two separate decisions. *Pierce v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa Ct. App. 1988). Misconduct serious enough to warrant discharge is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. Such misconduct must be "substantial." *Newman v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). The gravity of the incident, number of policy violations and prior warnings are factors considered when analyzing misconduct. The lack of a current warning may detract from a finding of an intentional policy violation.

Insubordination does not equal misconduct if it is reasonable under the circumstances. The question of whether the refusal to perform a specific task 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). An employee's failure to perform a specific task may not constitute misconduct if such failure is in good faith or for good cause. *Woods v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 327 N.W.2d 768, 771 (Iowa 1982). Generally, continued refusal to follow reasonable instructions constitutes misconduct. *Gilliam v. Atlantic Bottling Co.*, 453 N.W.2d 230 (Iowa Ct. App. 1990). The Iowa Court of Appeals found substantial evidence of misconduct in testimony that the claimant worked slower than he was capable of working and would temporarily and briefly improve following oral reprimands. *Sellers v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 531 N.W.2d 645 (Iowa Ct. App. 1995).

Every employer is entitled to expect civility and decency from its employees, and an employee's "use of profanity or offensive language in a confrontational, disrespectful, or name-calling context may be recognized as misconduct." *Henecke v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 533 N.W.2d 573, 576 (Iowa App. 1995). However, the use of profanity or offensive language is not automatically disqualifying for unemployment insurance benefits purposes. The "question of whether the use of improper language in the workplace is misconduct is nearly always a fact question... [and] must be considered with other relevant factors..." *Myers v. Employment Appeal Board*, 462 N.W.2d 734, 738 (Iowa App. 1990). An Employment Appeal Board decision set forth six aggravating factors to be considered when examining an employee's use of improper language: "(1) cursing in front of customers, vendors, or other third parties; (2) undermining a supervisor's authority; (3) threats of violence; (4) threats of future misbehavior or insubordination; (5) repeated incidents of vulgarity; and (6) discriminatory context." Emp. App. Bd. Hrg. No. 16B-UI-08787, at *3 (Emp. App. Bd. pub. Oct. 21, 2016) (citing cases). The Employment Appeal Board also suggests that the general work environment is a relevant consideration in analyzing profanity. *Id.*

It is the duty of the administrative law judge as the trier of fact in this case, to determine the credibility of witnesses, weigh the evidence and decide the facts in issue. *Arndt v. City of LeClaire*, 728 N.W.2d 389, 394-395 (Iowa 2007). The administrative law judge may believe all, part or none of any witness's testimony. *State v. Holtz*, 548 N.W.2d 162, 163 (Iowa App. 1996). In assessing the credibility of witnesses, the administrative law judge should consider the evidence using his or her own observations, common sense and experience. *Id.* In determining the facts, and deciding what testimony to believe, the fact finder may consider the following factors: whether the testimony is reasonable and consistent with other believable evidence; whether a witness has made inconsistent statements; the witness's appearance, conduct, age, intelligence, memory and knowledge of the facts; and the witness's interest in the trial, their motive, candor, bias and prejudice. *Id.*

The findings of fact show how I have resolved the disputed factual issues in this case. I assessed the credibility of the witnesses who testified during the hearing, considering the applicable factors listed above, and using my own common sense and experience. I find the claimant's version of events to be generally more credible than the employer's version of those events, as the claimant's testimony was clear, detailed, and internally consistent and as she had direct, first-hand knowledge of the conversations at issue.

While the claimant acknowledges that she expressed concerns to her supervisor about the bakery's new protocols and that she mentioned having received different directions from the district director, the claimant did not refuse to follow any instructions, nor did she yell or use any offensive language in a confrontational or disrespectful manner. While the claimant's conversation with her supervisor could perhaps have been perceived as "balky or argumentative," she was not insubordinate, and her conduct does not evince a willful or wanton disregard of the employer's instructions or the standards of behavior the employer had a right to expect of employees.

Moreover, as the employer had not previously warned the claimant about the issue leading to the separation, it has not met the burden of proof to establish that claimant acted deliberately or with recurrent negligence in violation of company policy, procedure, or prior warning. An employee is entitled to fair warning that the employer will no longer tolerate certain performance and conduct. Without fair warning, an employee has no reasonable way of knowing that there are changes that need to be made in order to preserve the employment. If an employer expects an employee to conform to certain expectations or face discharge, appropriate (preferably

written), detailed, and reasonable notice should be given. As such, benefits are allowed provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

DECISION:

The March 11, 2024 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. There was no disqualifying separation with this employer. The claimant is allowed benefits, provided she remains otherwise eligible.



Patrick B. Thomas
Administrative Law Judge

April 18, 2024
Decision Dated and Mailed

pbt/scn

APPEAL RIGHTS. If you disagree with the decision, you or any interested party may:

1. Appeal to the Employment Appeal Board within fifteen (15) days of the date under the judge's signature by submitting a written appeal via mail, fax, or online to:

**Iowa Employment Appeal Board
6200 Park Avenue Suite 100
Des Moines, Iowa 50321
Fax: (515)281-7191
Online: eab.iowa.gov**

The appeal period will be extended to the next business day if the last day to appeal falls on a weekend or a legal holiday.

AN APPEAL TO THE BOARD SHALL STATE CLEARLY:

- 1) The name, address, and social security number of the claimant.
- 2) A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken.
- 3) That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.
- 4) The grounds upon which such appeal is based.

An Employment Appeal Board decision is final agency action. If a party disagrees with the Employment Appeal Board decision, they may then file a petition for judicial review in district court.

2. If no one files an appeal of the judge's decision with the Employment Appeal Board within fifteen (15) days, the decision becomes final agency action, and you have the option to file a petition for judicial review in District Court within thirty (30) days after the decision becomes final. Additional information on how to file a petition can be found at Iowa Code §17A.19, which is online at <https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/17A.19.pdf> or by contacting the District Court Clerk of Court <https://www.iowacourts.gov/iowa-courts/court-directory/>.

Note to Parties: YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in the appeal or obtain a lawyer or other interested party to do so provided there is no expense to Workforce Development. If you wish to be represented by a lawyer, you may obtain the services of either a private attorney or one whose services are paid for with public funds.

Note to Claimant: It is important that you file your weekly claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

SERVICE INFORMATION:

A true and correct copy of this decision was mailed to each of the parties listed.

DERECHOS DE APELACIÓN. Si no está de acuerdo con la decisión, usted o cualquier parte interesada puede:

1. Apelar a la Junta de Apelaciones de Empleo dentro de los quince (15) días de la fecha bajo la firma del juez presentando una apelación por escrito por correo, fax o en línea a:

**Iowa Employment Appeal Board
6200 Park Avenue Suite 100
Des Moines, Iowa 50321
Fax: (515)281-7191
En línea: eab.iowa.gov**

El período de apelación se extenderá hasta el siguiente día hábil si el último día para apelar cae en fin de semana o día feriado legal.

UNA APELACIÓN A LA JUNTA DEBE ESTABLECER CLARAMENTE:

- 1) El nombre, dirección y número de seguro social del reclamante.
- 2) Una referencia a la decisión de la que se toma la apelación.
- 3) Que se interponga recurso de apelación contra tal decisión y se firme dicho recurso.
- 4) Los fundamentos en que se funda dicho recurso.

Una decisión de la Junta de Apelaciones de Empleo es una acción final de la agencia. Si una de las partes no está de acuerdo con la decisión de la Junta de Apelación de Empleo, puede presentar una petición de revisión judicial en el tribunal de distrito.

2. Si nadie presenta una apelación de la decisión del juez ante la Junta de Apelaciones Laborales dentro de los quince (15) días, la decisión se convierte en acción final de la agencia y usted tiene la opción de presentar una petición de revisión judicial en el Tribunal de Distrito dentro de los treinta (30) días después de que la decisión adquiriera firmeza. Puede encontrar información adicional sobre cómo presentar una petición en el Código de Iowa §17A.19, que se encuentra en línea en <https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/17A.19.pdf> o comunicándose con el Tribunal de Distrito Secretario del tribunal <https://www.iowacourts.gov/iowa-courts/court-directory/>.

Nota para las partes: USTED PUEDE REPRESENTARSE en la apelación u obtener un abogado u otra parte interesada para que lo haga, siempre que no haya gastos para Workforce Development. Si desea ser representado por un abogado, puede obtener los servicios de un abogado privado o uno cuyos servicios se paguen con fondos públicos.

Nota para el reclamante: es importante que presente su reclamo semanal según las instrucciones, mientras esta apelación está pendiente, para proteger su derecho continuo a los beneficios.

SERVICIO DE INFORMACIÓN:

Se envió por correo una copia fiel y correcta de esta decisión a cada una de las partes enumeradas.