IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

LORI STEWARD Claimant

APPEAL NO. 08A-UI-04552-ET

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

BURLINGTON CARE CENTER INC

Employer

OC: 04-13-08 R: 04 Claimant: Respondent (2)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge/Misconduct Section 96.3-7 – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed a timely appeal from the May 7, 2008, reference 01, decision that allowed benefits to the claimant. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call before Administrative Law Judge Julie Elder on May 27, 2008. The claimant participated in the hearing. Teletha Guiter, Administrator; Roxanne Schnicker, RN Nurse Consultant; and Cathy Scott, DON, participated in the hearing on behalf of the employer. Employer's Exhibits One through Twenty-One were admitted into evidence.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the employer discharged the claimant for work-connected misconduct.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed as a full-time assistant DON for Burlington Care Center from December 20, 1988 to April 15, 2008. On April 10, 2008, the employer notified the claimant the insurance representative would be there April 16, 2008, and the wound care book needed to be up to date. On April 15, 2008, after repeated requests, the claimant gave the book to the employer and the employer discovered several individuals' skin wounds were not properly documented on individualized sheets and some were not listed at all (Employer's Exhibits Six through Fourteen). The employer had discussed the issue of the claimant's maintenance of the wound care book in a warning issued March 14, 2008 (Employer's Exhibit Two). The employer had to stop and start the records from scratch. Clinical records must be kept per state and federal regulations; and if they are not, the facility can be fined. After seeing the state of the wound care book April 15, 2008, the employer terminated the claimant's employer.

The claimant has claimed and received unemployment insurance benefits since his separation from this employer.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged from employment for disqualifying job misconduct.

Iowa Code section 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.

871 IAC 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.

The employer has the burden of proving disqualifying misconduct. <u>Cosper v. Iowa Department</u> of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The claimant testified she kept track of the skin conditions on the internal "cheat sheet" but did not enter the information into the wound care book as required by state and federal regulations. She had been warned on at least two prior occasions about keeping the book current but failed to do so. Under these circumstances, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant's conduct demonstrated a willful disregard of the standards of behavior the employer has the right to expect of employees and shows an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interests and the employee's duties and obligations to the employer. The employer has met its burden of proving disqualifying job misconduct. <u>Cosper v. IDJS</u>, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). Benefits are denied.

Iowa Code section 96.3-7 provides:

7. Recovery of overpayment of benefits. 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.

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 section 96.8, subsection 5.

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which the claimant was not entitled. Those benefits must be recovered in accordance with the provisions of Iowa law.

DECISION:

The May 7, 2008, 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 is overpaid benefits in the amount of \$1,440.00.

Julie Elder Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

je/kjw