

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

TIFFANIE WEST-BENNETT
Claimant

**APPEAL 20A-UI-15867-AW-T
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

**ALCOHOL AND DRUG DEPENDENCY
SERVICES**
Employer

**OC: 07/12/20
Claimant: Respondent (2)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Quitting
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 – Employer/Representative Participation Fact-finding Interview
PL 116-136, Sec. 2104 – Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Employer filed an appeal from the November 18, 2020 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on January 28, 2021, at 1:00 p.m. Claimant participated. Employer participated through Toni Markiewicz, Hearing Representative, and Nickolas Fofs, Associate Director for Treatment Services. No exhibits were admitted. Official notice was taken of the administrative record.

ISSUES:

Whether claimant's separation was a voluntary quit without good cause attributable to employer.
Whether claimant was overpaid benefits.
Whether claimant should repay those benefits and/or whether employer should be charged based upon its participation in the fact-finding interview.
Whether claimant is eligible for Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed as a full-time Out-patient Counselor from May 24, 2016 until her employment with Alcohol and Drug Dependency Services ended on June 30, 2020. Claimant worked Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. until 5:00 p.m. Claimant's direct supervisor was Nickolas Fofs, Associate Director for Treatment Services.

On June 17, 2020 claimant gave employer written notice of her intention to quit effective June 30, 2020. Claimant quit because she found the work environment to be toxic and unhealthy. Claimant provided several examples that were focused on Fofs's management and communication.

In 2019, Fofs sent claimant an email when she had a "low" month; Fofs's emails would inquire and provide feedback about what claimant was or was not doing to increase her productivity.

Fofs also informed claimant that failure to increase productivity may result in her position being converted to part-time or termination of employment. In August 2019, claimant had what she describes as a “meltdown” with Fofs. Claimant and Fofs agreed that Fofs would stop sending claimant emails regarding productivity and they would try a different approach beginning January 2020. The parties followed this plan of action.

In October 2019, employer asked counselors whether they would be willing to obtain a Master’s Degree. Claimant asked Fofs what would happen if she did not get her Master’s Degree. Fofs replied that she may be terminated. Claimant found this threatening.

After the Covid-19 pandemic began, claimant came up with an idea to improve performance; claimant mentioned the idea in a staff meeting. Fofs told claimant that she should have shared the idea sooner instead of keeping it to herself. This upset claimant and ultimately led to her resignation.

Claimant brought her concerns to employer’s attention by addressing them with human resources. Employer had continuing work available for claimant if she had not quit. Claimant’s job was not in jeopardy.

The administrative record reflects that claimant filed for and has received regular unemployment insurance (UI) benefits in the gross amount of \$11,934.00 for the 26-week period between July 12, 2020 and January 9, 2021. In addition to regular unemployment insurance benefits, claimant also received Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation (FPUC) in the gross amount of \$1,800.00 for the two-week period between July 12, 2020 and July 25, 2020 and the one-week period ending January 9, 2021.

Employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant voluntarily quit without good cause attributable to employer. Benefits are denied.

Iowa Code § 96.5(1) provides: An individual shall be disqualified for benefits, if the individual has left work voluntarily without good cause attributable to the individual's employer, if so found by the department.

A voluntary quitting means discontinuing the employment because the employee no longer desires to remain in the relationship of an employee with the employer and requires an intention to terminate the employment. *Wills v. Emp’t Appeal Bd.*, 447 N.W.2d 137, 138 (Iowa 1989). A voluntary leaving of employment requires an intention to terminate the employment relationship accompanied by an overt act of carrying out that intention. *Local Lodge #1426 v. Wilson Trailer*, 289 N.W.2d 608, 612 (Iowa 1980); *Peck v. Emp’t Appeal Bd.*, 492 N.W.2d 438 (Iowa Ct. App. 1992).

Claimant has the burden of proving that the voluntary leaving was for good cause attributable to the employer. Iowa Code § 96.6(2). “Good cause” for leaving employment must be that which is reasonable to the average person, not the overly sensitive individual or the claimant in particular. *Uniweld Products v. Indus. Relations Comm’n*, 277 So.2d 827 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 1973). The standard of what a reasonable person would have believed under the circumstances is applied in determining whether a claimant left work voluntarily with good cause attributable to the employer. *O’Brien v. Employment Appeal Bd.*, 494 N.W.2d 660 (Iowa 1993).

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.25(22) provides:

Voluntary quit without good cause. In general, a voluntary quit means discontinuing the employment because the employee no longer desires to remain in the relationship of an employee with the employer from whom the employee has separated. The employer has the burden of proving that the claimant is disqualified for benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.5. However, the claimant has the initial burden to produce evidence that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving Iowa Code section 96.5, subsection (1), paragraphs "a" through "i," and subsection 10. The following reasons for a voluntary quit shall be presumed to be without good cause attributable to the employer:

(22) The claimant left because of a personality conflict with the supervisor.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.26(4) provides:

Voluntary quit with good cause attributable to the employer and separations not considered to be voluntary quits. The following are reasons for a claimant leaving employment with good cause attributable to the employer:

(4) The claimant left due to intolerable or detrimental working conditions.

Claimant's written resignation is both evidence of her intention to sever the employment relationship and an overt act of carrying out her intention. Claimant voluntarily quit her employment. Claimant quit her employment because of what she describes as a toxic and unhealthy work environment. The examples that claimant provided can best be described as issues with communication and management style between claimant and her supervisor. Claimant's supervisor addressed claimant's performance and outlined possible consequences for not meeting performance expectations. While claimant's supervisor's manner of communicating these expectations may have been perceived as threatening, they do not constitute an intolerable or detrimental work environment. The issues that led claimant to quit her employment can best be described as a personality conflict with her supervisor. Further, when claimant brought her concerns directly to her supervisor, he changed his approach and stopped sending claimant the performance emails that she perceived as threatening and caused her to have a "meltdown." Claimant has not met her burden of proving that she quit for good cause attributable to employer. Benefits are denied.

The next issues to be determined are whether claimant has been overpaid benefits, whether the claimant must repay those benefits, and whether the employer's account will be charged. For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant was overpaid benefits, but is not required to repay those benefits because employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview. Employer's account shall be charged.

Iowa Code § 96.3(7)(a)-(b) 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.

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.

Because claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which claimant was not entitled. The administrative law judge concludes that claimant has been overpaid UI in the gross amount of \$11,934.00 for the 26-week period between July 12, 2020 and January 9, 2021. However, employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview. Therefore, claimant is not obligated to repay to the agency the benefits received and employer's account shall be charged.

The next issues to be determined are whether claimant was eligible for FPUC and whether claimant has been overpaid FPUC. For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant was not eligible for FPUC and was overpaid FPUC, which must be repaid.

PL 116-136, Sec. 2104 provides, in pertinent part:

(b) Provisions of Agreement

(1) Federal pandemic unemployment compensation.--Any agreement under this section shall provide that the State agency of the State will make payments of regular compensation to individuals in amounts and to the extent that they would be determined if the State law of the State were applied, with respect to any week for which the individual is (disregarding this section) otherwise entitled under the State law to receive regular compensation, as if such State law had been modified in a manner such that the amount of regular compensation (including dependents' allowances) payable for any week shall be equal to

(A) the amount determined under the State law (before the application of this paragraph), plus

(B) an additional amount of \$600 (in this section referred to as "Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation").

....

(f) Fraud and Overpayments

(2) Repayment.--In the case of individuals who have received amounts of Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation to which they were not entitled, the State shall require such individuals to repay the amounts of such Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation to the State agency...

Because claimant is disqualified from receiving UI, claimant is also disqualified from receiving FPUC. While Iowa law does not require a claimant to repay regular unemployment insurance benefits when the employer does not participate in the fact-finding interview, the CARES Act makes no such exception for the repayment of FPUC. Therefore, the determination of whether the claimant must repay FPUC does not hinge on the employer's participation in the fact-finding interview. The administrative law judge concludes that claimant has been overpaid FPUC in the gross amount of \$1,800.00 for the two-week period between July 12, 2020 and July 25, 2020 and the one-week period ending January 9, 2021. Claimant must repay these benefits.

DECISION:

The November 18, 2020 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. Claimant voluntarily quit without good cause attributable to employer. Benefits are denied until claimant has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times claimant's weekly benefit amount, provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

Claimant has been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits in the amount of \$11,934.00 for the 26-week period between July 12, 2020 and January 9, 2021 and is not obligated to repay the agency those benefits. Employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview and its account shall be charged.

Claimant has been overpaid Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation in the gross amount of \$1,800.00 for the two-week period between July 12, 2020 and July 25, 2020 and the one-week period ending January 9, 2021, which must be repaid.



Adrienne C. Williamson
Administrative Law Judge

February 16, 2021
Decision Dated and Mailed