

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

ANGELA M CRANE

Claimant

APPEAL NO: 10A-UI-17586-DT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

IA DEPT OF HUMAN SVCS / WOODWARD

Employer

OC: 12/17/10

Claimant: Appellant (2)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Angela M. Crane (claimant) appealed a representative's December 17, 2010 decision (reference 02) that concluded she was not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits after a separation from employment with the Iowa Department of Human Services/Woodward (employer). After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on March 14, 2011. This appeal was consolidated for hearing with one related appeal on a duplicate decision, 10A-UI-17585-DT. The claimant participated in the hearing and was represented by Sean Spellman, Attorney at Law. David Williams of TALX Employer Services appeared on the employer's behalf and presented testimony from one witness, Diane Stout. During the hearing, Employer's Exhibit One was entered into evidence. Based on the evidence, the arguments of the parties, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

ISSUE:

Was the claimant discharged for work-connected misconduct?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The claimant started working for the employer on February 2, 2005. She worked full time as a residential treatment worker in the employer's ICFMR (intermediate care facility for mentally retarded). Her last day of work was November 24, 2010. The employer discharged her as of that date. The reason asserted for the discharge failure to pass a record check evaluation under Iowa Code § 218.13.

On or about July 20, 2010 the claimant and a coworker were requested to make an off-campus visit to a client who had been outplaced in about April or May into a community living facility in Washington, Iowa. During the visit, the outplaced client began to attack the claimant. The claimant attempted to put the client in a "personal hold," which involved putting her arms around him to keep his arms down at his sides. She did not believe he would be safe if she simply left the room, as he could have injured himself as well as her if he was not physically restrained, as he had been breaking items in the room. As she had difficulty getting behind him, she put him on the bed, but the two then slid to the floor. The client suffered some scratches on his back as

result of the slide to the floor. Staff members at the independent facility did not believe the claimant handled the situation appropriately; however, the claimant's handling was consistent with the training she had received through the employer.

On July 21 the employer suspended the claimant pending investigation of the incident. That suspension was ended with the claimant being recalled to work on August 31. After August 31, 2010 the employer ran an internal record check evaluation which yielded an unfavorable result; as a consequence, she could no longer work at the facility. There was no further information provided as to the underlying substance of what additional facts, if anything, led to the negative record check result other than the July 20 personal hold incident. Because of receiving the unfavorable record check evaluation indicating that the claimant was no longer eligible for employment, the employer discharged the claimant.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

A claimant is not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits if an employer has discharged the claimant for reasons constituting work-connected misconduct. Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a. Before a claimant can be denied unemployment insurance benefits, the employer has the burden to establish the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct. Cosper v. IDJS, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The question is not whether the employer was right to terminate the claimant's employment, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. Infante v. IDJS, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa App. 1984). What constitutes misconduct justifying termination of an employee and what is misconduct that warrants denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two separate matters. Pierce v. IDJS, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa App. 1988).

In order to establish misconduct such as to disqualify a former employee from benefits an employer must establish the employee was responsible for a deliberate act or omission which was a material breach of the duties and obligations owed by the employee to the employer. 871 IAC 24.32(1)a; Huntoon v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 275 N.W.2d 445 (Iowa 1979); Henry v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 391 N.W.2d 731, 735 (Iowa App. 1986). The conduct must show a 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. 871 IAC 24.32(1)a; Huntoon, supra; Henry, supra. In contrast, 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. 871 IAC 24.32(1)a; Huntoon, supra; Newman v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa App. 1984).

The reason cited by the employer for discharging the claimant was the unfavorable record check evaluation under Iowa Code § 218.13, which concluded that the claimant was no longer eligible for employment. Where a loss of a criteria for employment results in loss of an individual's employment, the discharge is not for disqualifying misconduct unless there is a showing that the individual both knew that her job was in jeopardy and that she subsequently and intentionally committed infractions that led to the loss of her employability. Fairfield Toyota, Inc. v. Bruegge, 449 N.W.2d 395 (Iowa App. 1989). No willful and substantial misconduct has been proven in this case. Even if the claimant was negligent in how she handled the "personal hold" on July 20, 2010, the rules and the case law indicate that a single act of negligence is

insufficient to demonstrate “repeated negligence of such a degree of recurrence” that it equals willful misconduct in culpability. Here, the employer’s own review of the incident resulted in a conclusion that she had handled the matter as she had been instructed, and she was returned to work.

The employer asserts that the loss of employability due to an unfavorable record check evaluation under Iowa Code § 218.13 is comparable to the loss of a driver’s license by an employee required to have a driver’s license for the employee’s job. Assuming the parallel is apt, even the loss of a driver’s license by someone required to have a driver’s license does not per se result in a disqualification from unemployment insurance benefits; but, rather, again volition and a deliberate act of misconduct must be found. Cook v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 299 N.W.2d 698 (Iowa 1980), Fairfield Toyota, supra; Huntoon, supra. Although the administrative law judge can sympathize with the employer’s situation insofar as being required to follow the statutory directives to not allow the claimant to continue her employment while yet not having any further information beyond what it had when it issued the reprimand to the claimant, the employer has not provided any evidence the claimant is guilty of intentional acts leading to the loss of her employability.

Further, there is no current act of misconduct as required to establish work-connected misconduct. 871 IAC 24.32(8); Greene v. Employment Appeal Board, 426 N.W.2d 659 (Iowa App. 1988). The incident in question occurred several months prior to the employer’s discharge of the claimant. The unfavorable record check evaluation, which subsequently resulted from the same July 20, 2010 incident, does not create a new “act” of potential misconduct. While the employer had a good business reason for discharging the claimant, it has not met its burden to show disqualifying misconduct. Cosper, supra. Based upon the evidence provided, the claimant’s actions were not misconduct within the meaning of the statute, and the claimant is not disqualified from benefits.

DECISION:

The representative’s December 17, 2010 decision (reference 02) is reversed. The employer did discharge the claimant but not for disqualifying reasons. The claimant is qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits, if she is otherwise eligible.

Lynette A. F. Donner
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

ld/css