

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

LINDSAY M PFIFFNER  
2613½ UNIVERSITY  
DUBUQUE IA 52001

HEARTLAND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES  
TALX EMPLOYER SERVICES  
PO BOX 1160  
COLUMBUS OH 43216 1160

Appeal Number: 04A-UI-09820-H2T  
OC: 08-15-04 R: 04  
Claimant: Respondent (1)

**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/Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed a timely appeal from the September 2, 2004, reference 01, decision that allowed benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on October 18, 2004. The claimant did participate. The employer did participate through Jane Link, Human Resources Director, and Julie Paquette, Director of Nursing. Employer's Exhibit One was received.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed as a CNA full time beginning August 14, 2003 through August 10, 2004 when she was discharged. The claimant was discharged for failing to put lotion on residents and failing to give them bed baths for two days on July 30, 2004 and on August 8 or 9. The claimant denies that she ever failed to provide a bed bath for a resident who wanted one. A

resident has the right to refuse the bath and the claimant is not allowed to force the resident to have a bath. The resident the claimant supposedly failed to bathe refused the bath and the claimant properly documented the same in the employer's records. The claimant was also criticized for being unprofessional and for not being prepared when she came to work. The claimant was not ever told why she was being disciplined or what complaints were made against her before she was discharged. The claimant denied that she had failed to perform the duties expected of her, including changing, bathing or applying lotion to the residents.

#### 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.

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. Huntoon v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The employer discharged the claimant and has the burden of proof to show misconduct. Misconduct serious enough to

warrant discharge is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. Such misconduct must be "substantial." When based on carelessness, the carelessness must actually indicate a "wrongful intent" to be disqualifying in nature. Newman v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa App. 1984). Poor work performance is not misconduct in the absence of evidence of intent. Miller v. Employment Appeal Board, 423 N.W.2d 211 (Iowa App. 1988).

The employer's evidence does not establish that the claimant deliberately and intentionally acted in a manner she knew to be contrary to the employer's interests or standards. There was no wanton or willful disregard of the employer's standards. In short, substantial misconduct has not been established by the evidence. The employer has not established that the claimant committed the misconduct for which she was allegedly fired, that is failing to bathe or apply lotion to residents. The claimant provided reasonable consistent explanations about her actions, including her documentation of her activities. The witness statement, which is uncorroborated, is not persuasive to the administrative law judge. The claimant was entitled to fair warning that the employer was no longer going to tolerate her performance and conduct. Without fair warning the claimant had no way of knowing that there were changes she needed to make in order to preserve her employment. The employer has failed to establish that the claimant committed any kind of misconduct. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

DECISION:

The September 2, 2004, reference 01, decision is affirmed. The claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

tkh/b