

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

JESSICA L LAMOTTE
Claimant

BROADLAWNS MEDICAL CENTER
Employer

APPEAL 17A-UI-13218-JP-T
**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

OC: 11/26/17
Claimant: Respondent (2)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 – Employer/Representative Participation Fact-finding Interview

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed an appeal from the December 13, 2017, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on January 18, 2018. Claimant participated. Employer participated through vice-president of human resources Julie Kilgore, residential manager Denise Hoevelkamp, and administrator of behavioral health Steve Johnson. Employer Exhibit 1 was admitted into evidence with no objection. Official notice was taken of the administrative record, including claimant's benefit payment history, with no objection.

ISSUES:

Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct?

Has the claimant been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits, and if so, can the repayment of those benefits to the agency be waived?

Can charges to the employer's account be waived?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed full-time as a social worker from September 11, 2017, and was separated from employment on November 22, 2017, when she was discharged.

The employer has a written "Standards of Excellence and Code of Ethical Conduct" policy that prohibits employees from using "[p]ropane or angry language or yelling." Employer Exhibit 1. The employer also has a written "Disciplinary Policy" that provides the severity of the incident will determine what the discipline will be. Employer Exhibit 1. Claimant was aware of the employer's policies. Employer Exhibit 1.

On November 21, 2017, during claimant's shift, Ms. Hoevelkamp was training claimant in claimant's office. Employer Exhibit 1. Ms. Hoevelkamp is claimant's direct supervisor. Ms. Hoevelkamp and claimant were the only people in claimant's office. Employer Exhibit 1. Ms.

Hoewelkamp was training claimant on how to properly document in the system. Employer Exhibit 1. During the training, Ms. Hoewelkamp asked claimant three times if she understood. Employer Exhibit 1. After Ms. Hoewelkamp asked claimant a third time if she understood, claimant responded to Ms. Hoewelkamp you don't need to be so "f**king condescending." Employer Exhibit 1. Ms. Hoewelkamp was offended, appalled, and shocked by claimant's comment. Leading up to claimant's statement, Ms. Hoewelkamp thought the training was going ok and they were having a normal conversation. Ms. Hoewelkamp told claimant not to use profanity at her. Ms. Hoewelkamp told claimant she was not trying to be condescending, but wanted to make sure she understood how to properly document. Employer Exhibit 1. After Ms. Hoewelkamp told claimant to stop using profanity, they continued to discuss the training. Claimant told Ms. Hoewelkamp she was sorry. After Ms. Hoewelkamp left claimant's office, Ms. Hoewelkamp reported what happened to her supervisor Mr. Johnson. Mr. Johnson was appalled that a social worker would swear at a supervisor and stated she should be discharged. Mr. Johnson instructed Ms. Hoewelkamp to talk to human resources. Ms. Hoewelkamp then told Ms. Kilgore what happened. The employer decided to discharge claimant. After Ms. Hoewelkamp left, claimant sent a letter by e-mail to Mr. Johnson explaining what happened. Employer Exhibit 1. In the letter, claimant admitted to using profanity towards Ms. Hoewelkamp. Claimant did not hear from Mr. Johnson on November 21, 2017.

On November 22, 2017, Mr. Johnson and Ms. Hoewelkamp met with claimant. The employer told claimant she was discharged and provided her with a discharge letter. Employer Exhibit 1.

Claimant did not have any prior disciplinary warnings. Part of claimant's job duties was to teach patients appropriate coping mechanisms. Claimant admitted that her statement to Ms. Hoewelkamp was not an appropriate coping mechanism.

The administrative record reflects that claimant has received unemployment benefits in the amount of \$2,790.00, since filing a claim with an effective date of November 26, 2017, for the seven weeks-ending January 13, 2018. The administrative record also establishes that the employer did participate in the fact-finding interview.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are denied.

It is the duty of an administrative law judge and 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, as the finder of fact, 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. *State v. Holtz*, 548 N.W.2d 162, 163 (Iowa App. 1996). 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 evidence you believe; whether a witness has made inconsistent statements; the witness's conduct, age, intelligence, memory and knowledge of the facts; and the witness's interest in the trial, their motive, candor, bias and prejudice. *State v. Holtz*, 548 N.W.2d 162, 163 (Iowa App. 1996).

This administrative law judge assessed the credibility of the witnesses who testified during the hearing, considering the applicable factors listed above, and used my own common sense and experience. This administrative law judge reviewed the exhibit that was admitted into evidence. This administrative law judge finds the employer's version of events to be more credible than claimant's recollection of those events.

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.

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).

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). Misconduct must be "substantial" to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. *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). A warning weighs heavily toward a finding of intentional conduct. Willful misconduct can be established where an employee manifests an intent to disobey a future reasonable instruction of his employer. *Myers v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 373 N.W.2d 507 (Iowa Ct. App. 1985). "The use of profanity or offensive language in a confrontational, disrespectful, or name-calling context may be recognized as misconduct, even in the case of isolated incidents or situations in which the target of abusive name-calling is not present when the vulgar statements are initially made." *Myers v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 462 N.W.2d 734 (Iowa Ct. App. 1990).

The employer is entitled to establish reasonable work rules and expect employees to abide by them. The employer's policy that prohibits employees from using "[p]rofan or angry language or yelling" is reasonable. Employer Exhibit 1. As a social worker for the employer, claimant was responsible to working with residents and providing the residents with appropriate copying

mechanisms. On November 21, 2017, while claimant's direct supervisor (Ms. Hoevelkamp) was providing her training, Ms. Hoevelkamp asked her three times if she understood. After Ms. Hoevelkamp asked claimant the third time, claimant used profanity ("f**king condescending") towards her direct supervisor. Employer Exhibit 1. Claimant admitted her use of profanity was not professional. Employer Exhibit 1.

The employer presented substantial and credible evidence that claimant's use of profanity towards her direct supervisor on November 21, 2017 was a "deliberate violation or disregard of standards of behavior which the employer has the right to expect of employees[.]" Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(1)a. "The use of profanity or offensive language in a confrontational, disrespectful, or name-calling context may be recognized as misconduct, even in the case of isolated incidents or situations in which the target of abusive name-calling is not present when the vulgar statements are initially made." *Myers v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 462 N.W.2d 734 (Iowa Ct. App. 1990). This is disqualifying misconduct even without prior warning. Benefits are denied.

The administrative law judge further concludes that the claimant has been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits.

Iowa Code section 96.3(7)a, b, as amended in 2008, provides:

7. Recovery of overpayment of benefits.

a. 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.

b. (1) (a) 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. The employer shall not be relieved of charges if benefits are paid because the employer or an agent of the employer failed to respond timely or adequately to the department's request for information relating to the payment of benefits. This prohibition against relief of charges shall apply to both contributory and reimbursable employers.

(b) However, provided the benefits were not received as the result of fraud or willful misrepresentation by the individual, benefits shall not be recovered from an individual if the employer did not participate in the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to section 96.6, subsection 2, and an overpayment occurred because of a subsequent reversal on appeal regarding the issue of the individual's separation from employment.

(2) An accounting firm, agent, unemployment insurance accounting firm, or other entity that represents an employer in unemployment claim matters and demonstrates a continuous pattern of failing to participate in the initial determinations to award benefits, as determined and defined by rule by the department, shall be denied permission by the department to represent any employers in unemployment insurance matters. This subparagraph does not apply to attorneys or counselors admitted to practice in the courts of this state pursuant to section 602.10101.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 provides:

Employer and employer representative participation in fact-finding interviews.

(1) “Participate,” as the term is used for employers in the context of the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, means submitting detailed factual information of the quantity and quality that if unrebutted would be sufficient to result in a decision favorable to the employer. The most effective means to participate is to provide live testimony at the interview from a witness with firsthand knowledge of the events leading to the separation. If no live testimony is provided, the employer must provide the name and telephone number of an employee with firsthand information who may be contacted, if necessary, for rebuttal. A party may also participate by providing detailed written statements or documents that provide detailed factual information of the events leading to separation. At a minimum, the information provided by the employer or the employer’s representative must identify the dates and particular circumstances of the incident or incidents, including, in the case of discharge, the act or omissions of the claimant or, in the event of a voluntary separation, the stated reason for the quit. The specific rule or policy must be submitted if the claimant was discharged for violating such rule or policy. In the case of discharge for attendance violations, the information must include the circumstances of all incidents the employer or the employer’s representative contends meet the definition of unexcused absences as set forth in 871-subrule 24.32(7). On the other hand, written or oral statements or general conclusions without supporting detailed factual information and information submitted after the fact-finding decision has been issued are not considered participation within the meaning of the statute.

(2) “A continuous pattern of nonparticipation in the initial determination to award benefits,” pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, as the term is used for an entity representing employers, means on 25 or more occasions in a calendar quarter beginning with the first calendar quarter of 2009, the entity files appeals after failing to participate. Appeals filed but withdrawn before the day of the contested case hearing will not be considered in determining if a continuous pattern of nonparticipation exists. The division administrator shall notify the employer’s representative in writing after each such appeal.

(3) If the division administrator finds that an entity representing employers as defined in Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, has engaged in a continuous pattern of nonparticipation, the division administrator shall suspend said representative for a period of up to six months on the first occasion, up to one year on the second occasion and up to ten years on the third or subsequent occasion. Suspension by the division administrator constitutes final agency action and may be appealed pursuant to Iowa Code section 17A.19.

(4) “Fraud or willful misrepresentation by the individual,” as the term is used for claimants in the context of the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, means providing knowingly false statements or knowingly false denials of material facts for the purpose of obtaining unemployment insurance benefits. Statements or denials may be either oral or written by the claimant. Inadvertent misstatements or mistakes made in good faith are not considered fraud or willful misrepresentation.

This rule is intended to implement Iowa Code section 96.3(7)“b” as amended by 2008 Iowa Acts, Senate File 2160.

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which she was not entitled. The unemployment insurance law provides that benefits must be recovered from a claimant who receives benefits and is later determined to be ineligible for benefits, even though the claimant acted in good faith and was not otherwise at fault. However, the overpayment will not be recovered when it is based on a reversal on appeal of an initial determination to award benefits on an issue regarding the claimant's employment separation if: (1) the benefits were not received due to any fraud or willful misrepresentation by the claimant and (2) the employer did not participate in the initial proceeding to award benefits. The employer will not be charged for benefits if it is determined that they did participate in the fact-finding interview. Iowa Code § 96.3(7), Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10. In this case, the claimant has received benefits but was not eligible for those benefits. Since the employer did participate in the fact-finding interview the claimant is obligated to repay to the agency the benefits she received and the employer's account shall not be charged.

DECISION:

The December 13, 2017, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. Claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld until such time as claimant has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible.

Claimant has been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits in the amount of \$2,790.00 and is obligated to repay the agency those benefits. The employer did participate in the fact-finding interview and its account shall not be charged.

Jeremy Peterson
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

jp/rvs

NOTE TO EMPLOYER:

If you wish to change the address of record, please access your account at:

<https://www.myiowauui.org/UITIPTaxWeb/>.

Helpful information about using this site may be found at:

<http://www.iowaworkforce.org/ui/uiemployers.htm> and

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v= mpCM8FGQoY>