

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

STEPHANIE ANDERSON
Claimant

APPEAL 18A-UI-07261-DB

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

**ACCURA HEALTHCARE OF
MARSHALLTOWN**
Employer

**OC: 06/03/18
Claimant: Appellant (2)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant/appellant filed an appeal from the June 26, 2018 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that found claimant was not eligible for benefits based upon claimant's discharge from employment. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. An in-person hearing was held on July 24, 2018. The claimant, Stephanie Anderson, participated personally. The employer, Accura Healthcare of Marshalltown, did not participate. Amanda Freeland and Sonya Perez participated as witnesses for claimant. Claimant's Exhibit A was admitted.

ISSUE:

Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds:

Claimant was employed full-time as an office manager from October 17, 2017 until her employment ended on June 7, 2018. Claimant's direct supervisor was Laura Coco. .

On June 6, 2018, claimant received written discipline regarding her job performance. Claimant disagreed that she had not been performing her job duties appropriately. Prior to the June 6, 2018 meeting, claimant had reported her direct supervisor, Ms. Coco, to management for incidents that had occurred in the workplace between the two. One example occurred when Ms. Coco blocked claimant from leaving her office.

Claimant had not received any discipline prior to the June 6, 2018 meeting. On June 7, 2018, Ms. Coco told claimant that she was discharged because of her poor job performance and her refusal to move past recent events, meaning claimant's complaints against Ms. Coco. No reference to any final incident of misconduct was given to claimant for her discharge.

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, provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits:

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 individual shall be disqualified for benefits 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.

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).

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.

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job 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). When based on carelessness, the carelessness must actually indicate a "wrongful intent" to be disqualifying in nature. *Id.* Negligence does not constitute misconduct unless recurrent in nature; a single act is not disqualifying unless indicative of a deliberate disregard of the employer's interests. *Henry v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 391 N.W.2d 731 (Iowa Ct. App. 1986).

In this case, the employer provided no details regarding any final incident of job-related misconduct that would cause the discharge. Further, a claimant cannot be discharged for a past act of misconduct.

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 purpose of this rule is to assure that an employer does not save up acts of misconduct and spring them on an employee when an independent desire to terminate arises. For example, an employer may not convert a lay off into a termination for misconduct by relying on past acts. *Milligan v. EAB*, 802 N.W.2d 238 (Table)(Iowa App. June 15, 2011).

The employer has failed to meet its burden of proof in establishing a current act of disqualifying job-related misconduct. As such, benefits are allowed, provided claimant is otherwise eligible. The employer's account may be charged for benefits paid.

DECISION:

The June 26, 2018 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. Claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

Dawn Boucher
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

db/rvs