

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

TIMOTHY P MORSE
Claimant

PRK WILLIAMS INC
Employer

APPEAL 16A-UI-08627-DL-T
**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

OC: 07/10/16
Claimant: Appellant (2)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed an appeal from the August 2, 2016, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits based upon a discharge from employment. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on August 25, 2016. Claimant participated and was represented by James Kringlen, Attorney at Law. Employer participated through director of integrated services Ingrid Wenzel, human resource manager Lori Bryant and CFO Brian Roth. The employer's request for postponement was not granted. Employer's Exhibit 1 was received.

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 was employed as a full-time direct service provider for 24-hour SCL supported community living program for adults with intellectual disabilities from May 2014, through July 8, 2016. On July 2, claimant saw resident Jacob walk towards the television while playing a video game and holding a video game controller. Jacob took a step backwards and looked like he was going to sit down but fell without dropping the game controller. His eyes were open and he did not appear to be in distress. Jacob got up quickly and said he was okay but that he had a "baby seizure." Claimant's experience working with Jacob is that he is not always accurate in what he says. Claimant did not believe Jacob had a seizure so made a judgment call to make case notes but did not complete an incident report. He did attempt to notify management but was unable to reach someone to ask questions. On July 7 staff lead Samantha Meyer told claimant he should have done and reported the issue to the employer the same day. He filled out an incident report and put it in the book in the house office. The employer believes he should have completed an incident report within 24 hours. He handled the situation to the best of his ability that day.

Claimant repeated two grades and dropped out of school in 11th grade. He has a GED or High School Equivalency Diploma (HSED) without further formal education and learns more slowly than others. He told the hiring manager about his learning difficulty. The employer provided

some on-the-job training about incident reports for seizures. The employer had not previously warned claimant his job was in jeopardy for any similar reasons but had told him to improve his wording on case notes. He had filled out one incident report but has no recall of feedback. He has not fully met the employer's job expectations for any extended period of time and does not believe that was deliberate.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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

Iowa Code section 96.5(2)a provides:

Causes for disqualification.

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.

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. *Reigelsberger v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 500 N.W.2d 64, 66 (Iowa 1993); *accord Lee v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 616 N.W.2d 661, 665 (Iowa 2000).

Misconduct "must be substantial" to justify the denial of unemployment benefits. *Lee*, 616 N.W.2d at 665 (citation omitted). "Misconduct serious enough to warrant the discharge of an employee is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of benefits." *Id.* (citation omitted). ...the definition of misconduct requires more than a "disregard" it requires a "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." Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(1)(a) (emphasis added). 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).

Whether an employee violated an employer's policies is a different issue from whether the employee is disqualified for misconduct for purposes of unemployment insurance benefits. See *Lee v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 616 N.W.2d 661, 665 (Iowa 2000) ("Misconduct serious enough to warrant the discharge of an employee is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of benefits." (Quoting *Reigelsberger*, 500 N.W.2d at 66.)). 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).

Since the employer agreed that claimant had never had a sustained period of time during which he performed his job duties to employer's satisfaction and inasmuch as he did attempt to perform the job to the best of his ability but was unable to meet its 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). At most, the conduct for which claimant was discharged was merely an isolated incident of poor judgment and 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. A warning for inadequate wording on case notes is not similar to failure to file a required report and even under facts most favorable to the employer, the incident does not rise to the level of disqualifying job misconduct.

DECISION:

The August 2, 2016, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. Claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided he is otherwise eligible. Any benefits claimed and withheld on this basis shall be paid.

Dévon M. Lewis
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

dml/pjs