

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Section  
1000 East Grand—Des Moines, Iowa 50319  
DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE**  
68-0157 (7-97) – 3091078 - EI

**CONNIE S JARVIS  
1924 JERSEY RIDGE RD  
DAVENPORT IA 52803**

**HEARTLAND EMPLOYMENT  
SERVICES LLC  
c/o ADP UC EXPRESS  
PO BOX 66744  
ST LOUIS MO 63166-6744**

**Appeal Number: 05A-UI-06598-JTT  
OC: 05/29/05 R: 04  
Claimant: Appellant (2)**

**This Decision Shall Become Final**, unless within fifteen (15) days from the date below, you or any interested party appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by submitting either a signed letter or a signed written Notice of Appeal, directly to the **Employment Appeal Board, 4th Floor—Lucas Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319**.

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.

**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.

YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in this appeal or you may 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. It is important that you file your claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

---

(Administrative Law Judge)

---

(Decision Dated & Mailed)

Section 96.5(2)(a) – Discharge for Misconduct

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Connie Jarvis filed a timely appeal from the June 15, 2005, reference 01, decision that denied benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on July 12, 2005. Ms. Jarvis participated. The employer contacted the Appeals Bureau in writing on July 5, 2005 and advised that it would not be participating in the hearing. Department Exhibit D-1 was received into evidence.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Connie Jarvis was employed as a full-time health care facility director from August 1, 2002 until May 16, 2005, when Human Resources Representative Brad Reed suspended her based on information gathered during a background check. Mr. Reed subsequently discharged Ms. Jarvis on

May 31, 2005. The background check indicated that Ms. Jarvis had previously been investigated for child abuse. At the time Mr. Reed brought the matter to Ms. Jarvis' attention on May 16, Mr. Reed advised Ms. Jarvis that the background check information came to the employer's attention at the time Ms. Jarvis was hired, but that the human resources representative and the director of nursing elected to take no action on the information.

#### REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The question is whether the evidence in the record establishes that Ms. Jarvis was discharged for misconduct in connection with her employment. It does not.

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.

This definition has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. Hunton v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

Since the claimant was discharged, the employer has the burden of proof in this matter. See Iowa Code section 96.6(2). Misconduct must be substantial in order to justify a denial of unemployment benefits. Misconduct serious enough to warrant the discharge of an employee is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of unemployment benefits. See Lee v. Employment Appeal Board, 616 N.W.2d 661 (Iowa 2000). The focus is on deliberate,

intentional, or culpable acts by the employee. See Gimbel v. Employment Appeal Board, 489 N.W.2d 36, 39 (Iowa Ct. App. 1992).

While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of the current act to misconduct, a discharge for misconduct cannot be based on such past act(s). The termination of employment must be based on a current act. See 871 IAC 24.32(8).

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. See 871 IAC 24.32(4).

The evidence in the record fails to establish misconduct on the part of Ms. Jarvis in connection with the employment. See 871 IAC 24.32(1)(a). Based on the evidence in the record and application of the appropriate law, the administrative law judge concludes that Ms. Jarvis was discharged for no disqualifying reason. Ms. Jarvis is eligible for benefits, provided she is otherwise eligible.

**DECISION:**

The Agency representative's decision dated June 15, 2005, reference 01, is reversed. The claimant was discharged for no disqualifying reason. The claimant is eligible for benefits, provided she is otherwise eligible.

jt/sc