

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

---

**RENEE L KLAUS**  
Claimant

**APPEAL 18A-UI-04505-SC-T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**PINNACLE HEALTH FACILITIES XVII L**  
Employer

**OC: 03/11/18**  
**Claimant: Respondent (1)**

---

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:**

Pinnacle Health Facilities XVII L (employer) filed an appeal from the April 6, 2018, reference 01, unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits based upon the determination Renee L. Klaus (claimant) was discharged for not performing work to the employer's satisfaction which is not misconduct. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on May 4, 2018. The claimant participated. Lead Case Manager Erin Watson, who works for a different employer, participated on the claimant's behalf. The claimant registered three other witnesses who did not answer the phone when contacted or elected not to participate. The employer participated through Administrator-in-Training Zacory Mason. Human Resources Director Katie McCleish was sworn in as an employer witness but did not testify. The Department's Exhibit D1 was admitted without 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: The claimant was employed full-time as an External Marketer beginning on April 15, 2014, and was separated from employment on March 14, 2018, when she was discharged.

On February 9, 2018, the claimant was placed on a 30-day Performance Improvement Plan (PIP). She was told that she needed to have 15 new admissions in a month, come up with two referral sources a month, complete the weekly sales plan and update it daily, only spend four

hours a week in the facility, and follow the Mahns protocol, which is a timeframe for sending out information about potential admissions and responding to the facility making the request.

During her PIP, the claimant found two new referral sources, followed the restrictions related to time allowed in the facility, and met the Mahns protocol with regard to new admissions. The claimant was working between ten and 17 new potential admissions each week of her PIP; however, she was not able to convert each of them to actual admissions due to the potential client's funding issues or prior behavioral issues. The claimant was not able to meet the requirement to have 15 admissions that month and only admitted eight new residents. The claimant attempted to fill out the weekly sales plan, but had trouble with the updated W-drive. On March 2, 2018, the employer met with the claimant to discuss her PIP, at which time she told them of her computer issues. She was told that she could text information to the Administrator; however, the claimant struggled with the employer's new phone system. The claimant was discharged for failing to meet the requirements of the PIP even though she was working to the best of her ability.

The administrative record reflects that claimant has received unemployment benefits in the amount of \$473.00, since filing a claim with an effective date of March 11, 2018, for the week ending April 14, 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 the claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed.

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:

(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).

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(4) provides:

(4) Report required. The claimant's statement and the employer's statement must give detailed facts as to the specific reason for the claimant's discharge. 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. In cases where a suspension or disciplinary layoff exists, the claimant is considered as discharged, and the issue of misconduct shall be resolved.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(5) provides:

(5) Trial period. A dismissal, because of being physically unable to do the work, being not capable of doing the work assigned, not meeting the employer's standards, or having been hired on a trial period of employment and not being able to do the work shall not be issues of misconduct.

In an at-will employment environment an employer may discharge an employee for any number of reasons or no reason at all if it is not contrary to public policy, but if it 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. 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).

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 Dep't of Job Serv.*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). What constitutes misconduct justifying termination of an employee and what misconduct warrants denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two separate decisions. *Pierce v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa Ct. App. 1988). Misconduct serious enough to warrant discharge is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. Such misconduct must be "substantial." Poor work performance is not misconduct in the absence of evidence of intent. *Miller v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 423 N.W.2d 211 (Iowa Ct. App. 1988).

It is the duty of the administrative law judge as 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 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. *Id.* 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 believable evidence; whether a witness has made inconsistent statements; the witness's appearance, conduct, age,

intelligence, memory and knowledge of the facts; and the witness's interest in the trial, their motive, candor, bias and prejudice. *Id.*

The findings of fact show how the disputed factual issues were resolved. After assessing the credibility of the witnesses who testified during the hearing, the reliability of the evidence submitted, considering the applicable factors listed above, and using her own common sense and experience, the administrative law judge attributes more weight to the claimant's version of events.

Failure in job performance due to inability or incapacity is not considered misconduct because the actions were not volitional. *Huntoon v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979). Where an individual is discharged due to a failure in job performance, proof of that individual's ability to do the job is required to justify disqualification, rather than accepting the employer's subjective view. To do so is to impermissibly shift the burden of proof to the claimant. *Kelly v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 386 N.W.2d 552 (Iowa Ct. App. 1986). As the claimant attempted to perform the job to the best of her ability but was unable to meet the employer's expectations, no intentional misconduct has been established, as is the employer's burden of proof. *Cosper v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). Accordingly, benefits are allowed.

As benefits are allowed, the issue of overpayment is moot and charges to the employer's account cannot be waived.

**DECISION:**

The April 6, 2018, reference 01, unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. The claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided she is otherwise eligible. As benefits are allowed, the issue of overpayment is moot and charges to the employer's account cannot be waived.

---

Stephanie R. Callahan  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

src/scn