IOWA DEPARTMENT OF INSPECTIONS AND APPEALS ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS DIVISION, UI APPEALS BUREAU

CASSAUNDRA J NELSON

Claimant

APPEAL 22R-UI-14304-AR-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

AREA RESIDENTIAL CARE INC

Employer

OC: 02/13/22

Claimant: Appellant (2)

lowa Code § 96.5(2)a - Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

On March 17, 2022, the claimant filed an appeal from the March 14, 2022, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits based on the determination that claimant was discharged for failure to follow instructions in the performance of her job. After due notice was issued, a telephone hearing was held on April 25, 2022. Claimant participated. The employer did not participate because it did not receive the hearing notice. A decision in the claimant's favor was entered by the administrative law judge on May 3, 2022. See 22A-Ul-06682-ED-T.

The employer appealed to the Employment Appeal Board (EAB). On June 22, 2022, the EAB remanded the matter to the UI Appeals Bureau. After due notice was issued, a telephone hearing was held on August 4, 2022. Claimant, Cassaundra J. Nelson, participated personally. The employer, Area Residential Care Inc., participated through Catherine Kutka.

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 began working for employer on June 14, 2019. Claimant last worked as a full-time case manager. Claimant was separated from employment on February 23, 2022, when she was discharged.

Some months before claimant's discharge, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) imposed a vaccination requirement for facilities like this employer. It set a deadline of February 14, 2022, for implementation of the requirement. By February 14, 2022, employees were told that they would need to either receive at least one dose of the COVID-19 vaccine or submit a form for exemption from the requirement. The employer had a form that it was using for employees to request exemption from the requirement based on either medical reasons or religious beliefs. Its form complied with CMS's requirements.

Claimant submitted a form for vaccine exemption that she got from the lowa Department of Public Health (IDPH), which was typically used for school children and students in higher education. The employer notified her that she needed to complete its form. On February 15, 2022, Kutka and the Executive Director of the employer met with claimant to inform her that she would be given the opportunity to complete the employer's exemption form, get a dose of the vaccine, or her employment would be terminated. Claimant took exception to what she perceived as intrusive questions about her religious beliefs by the employer. The employer was asking for more information because claimant was applying for a religious exemption from the vaccine requirement. Claimant declined to complete the employer's form, asserting that the IDPH form was legally sufficient. When claimant declined to comply with the employer's policy to either get the vaccine or request exemption in the format required by the employer, her employment was terminated on February 23, 2022.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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

lowa Code chapter 96 was amended, with an effective date of July 1, 2022, to change and add more detail to the definition of disqualifying misconduct. However, the events that resulted in this separation from employment occurred well prior to the effective date of the amendments to chapter 96. Accordingly, the statute as it existed at the time of the separation is applied here.

lowa 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.

lowa 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 intention al 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 of misconduct has been accepted by the lowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. *Reigelsberger v. Empt Appeal Bd.*, 500 N.W.2d 64, 66 (lowa 1993); *accord Lee v. Empt Appeal Bd.*, 616 N.W.2d 661, 665 (lowa 2000). The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. *Cosper v. Iowa Dept of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (lowa 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 Dept of Job Serv.*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (lowa Ct. App. 1984). Misconduct must be "substantial" to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. *Newman v. Iowa Dept of Job Serv.*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (lowa Ct. App. 1984).

In an at-will employment environment an employer may discharge an employee for any number of reasons or no reason at all, provided the discharge is not contrary to public policy. However, if the employer fails to meet its burden of proof to establish job related misconduct as the reason for the separation, it incurs potential liability for unemployment insurance benefits related to that separation. A determination as to whether an employee's act is misconduct does not rest solely on the interpretation or application of the employer's policy or rule. A violation is not necessarily disqualifying misconduct even if the employer was fully within its rights to impose discipline up to or including discharge for the incident under its policy.

Inasmuch as employer had not previously warned 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 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. Training or general notice to staff about a policy is not considered a disciplinary warning.

Claimant was discharged for failing to adhere to the employer's policy in the manner in which the employer required. While claimant's refusal to use the employer's form to request religious exemption from the requirement may have seemed unreasonable to the employer, it does not rise to the level of disqualifying misconduct, particularly without previous disciplinary warnings. Claimant made steps to comply with the employer's policy, but the claimant and employer were at odds with respect to the manner in which claimant complied. Such a disagreement does not disqualify claimant from receiving unemployment insurance benefits because it is not evidence of intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's policies or interests. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

DECISION:

The March 14, 2022, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. Claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided she is otherwise eligible.

Alexis D. Rowe

Administrative Law Judge

AuDR

September 27, 2022
Decision Dated and Mailed

ar/mh

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:

Employment Appeal Board 4th Floor – Lucas Building Des Moines, Iowa 50319 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 low a Code §17A.19, w hich 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:

Employment Appeal Board 4th Floor – Lucas Building Des Moines, Iowa 50319 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 adquiera firmeza. Puede encontrar información adicional sobre cómo presentar una petición en el Código de low a §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.