# IOWA DEPARTMENT OF INSPECTIONS AND APPEALS ADMINISTRTIVE HEARINGS DIVISION, UI APPEALS BUREAU

**ANNEKE C JOHNSON** 

Claimant

APPEAL 22A-UI-17387-ED-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

**BRIARWOOD MANAGEMENT INC** 

**Employer** 

OC: 08/21/22

Claimant: Respondent (1)

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

lowa Code § 96.5(1) - Voluntary Quitting

lowa Code § 96.3(7) – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment

lowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 - Employer/Representative Participation Fact-finding Interview

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer/appellant filed an appeal from the September 15, 2022 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits based upon claimant's discharge from employment. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on October 19, 2022. The claimant, Anneke Johnson, did not participate. The employer, Briarwood Management Inc, participated through witness Alexa Saco. The administrative law judge took administrative notice of the claimant's unemployment insurance benefits records including the fact-finding documents.

### **ISSUES:**

Did claimant voluntarily quit the employment with good cause attributable to employer? Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct? Has the claimant been overpaid any unemployment insurance benefits, and if so, can the repayment of those benefits to the agency be waived? Can any 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: Claimant was employed beginning July 1, 2022 as a full-time Certified Nursing Assistant. The last day claimant worked was August 23, 2022. The claimant was discharged due to her inability to complete her duties correctly. Ms. Johnson testified that the claimant was not able to transfer residents correctly, serve residents meals on a timely basis, and unable to complete other duties in a timely manner. The claimant had been initially paired with a strong C.N.A. and assigned 13 training shifts and three hallways but when she was unable to complete the tasks, the director of nursing felt the claimant would be more motivated if she did not have a partner and worked on her own. The claimant agreed and wanted to try working without a C.N.A. partner. Once the claimant was moved on her own, she remained unable to complete her duties in a timely manner. Ms. Saco testified that the claimant was still not able to get the resident cares done properly without a partner. Ms. Saco testified that ultimately, when considering resident safety, staff morale, and resident complaints and satisfaction, the employer

came to the decision that the claimant needed to be terminated. Ms. Saco testified that despite being given training and opportunity to work with strong C.N.A.'s, the claimant was never able to complete her duties as expected. Ms. Saco testified that the claimant was a kind person who wanted to be involved in respite care but from an administrative and clinical standpoint, she was not a fit for patient care at the facility.

#### **REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed.

As a preliminary matter, I find that the Claimant did not quit. Claimant was discharged from employment.

lowa 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 lowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. *Huntoon v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (lowa 1979).

# 871 IAC 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.

# 871 IAC 24.32(8) provides:

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

Further, 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 (lowa 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 (lowa 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 (lowa Ct. App. 1988).

The employer did not present any witnesses or evidence that the claimant's failure to complete her work duties were intentional or were caused by claimant's carelessness which indicated a wrongful intent. The employer's testimony was that despite substantial training and effort, the claimant was never able to complete her work duties, which is indicative of an inability or incapacity rather than intentional failure to complete her duties.

Misconduct serious enough to warrant discharge is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. Such misconduct must be "substantial." *Newman v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (lowa Ct. App. 1984). When based on carelessness, the carelessness must actually indicate a "wrongful intent" to be disqualifying in nature. *Id.* Negligence does not constitute misconduct unless recurrent in nature; a single act is not disqualifying unless indicative of a deliberate disregard of the employer's interests. *Henry v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 391 N.W.2d 731 (lowa Ct. App. 1986). Further, poor work performance is not misconduct in the absence of evidence of intent. *Miller v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 423 N.W.2d 211 (lowa Ct. App. 1988).

This type of behavior does not rise to the level of misconduct. The law limits disqualifying misconduct to substantial and willful wrongdoing or repeated carelessness or negligence that equals willful misconduct in culpability. Lee v. Employment Appeal Bd., 616 N.W.2d 661 (Iowa 2000). There is no evidence that the claimant's actions had any wrongful intent.

Reoccurring acts of negligence by an employee would probably be described by most employers as in disregard of their interests. *Greenwell v Emp't Appeal Bd.*, No. 15-0154 (lowa Ct. App. March 23, 2016). The misconduct legal standard requires more than reoccurring acts of negligence in disregard of the employer's interests. *Id.* 

Further, a claimant's poor work performance does not disqualify her from receiving benefits. Failure in job performance due to inability or incapacity is not considered misconduct because the actions were not volitional. *Huntoon*, 275 N.W.2d at 448 (lowa 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 (lowa Ct. App. 1986).

The employer failed to meet its burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. As such, benefits are allowed.

## **DECISION:**

The September 15, 2022, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. Claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided she is otherwise eligible. The benefits claimed and withheld shall be paid, provided she is otherwise eligible.

Emily Drenkow Carr

Administrative Law Judge

Emily Drenkow Can

October 21, 2022
Decision Dated and Mailed

ed/mh

**APPEAL RIGHTS.** If you disagree with the decision, you or any interested party may:

1. Appeal to the Employment Appeal Board within fifteen (15) days of the date under the judge's signature by submitting a written appeal via mail, fax, or online to:

Employment Appeal Board 4<sup>th</sup> Floor – Lucas Building Des Moines, Iowa 50319 Fax: (515)281-7191 Online: eab.iowa.gov

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.

### AN APPEAL TO THE BOARD SHALL 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.

An Employment Appeal Board decision is final agency action. If a party disagrees with the Employment Appeal Board decision, they may then file a petition for judicial review in district court.

2. If no one files an appeal of the judge's decision with the Employment Appeal Board within fifteen (15) days, the decision becomes final agency action, and you have the option to file a petition for judicial review in District Court within thirty (30) days after the decision becomes final. Additional information on how to file a petition can be found at low a Code §17A.19, which is online at <a href="https://www.iowacourts.gov/iowa-courts/court-directory/">https://www.iowacourts.gov/iowa-courts/court-directory/</a>.

**Note to Parties:** YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in the appeal or 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.

Note to Claimant: It is important that you file your weekly claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

#### SERVICE INFORMATION:

A true and correct copy of this decision was mailed to each of the parties listed.

DERECHOS DE APELACIÓN. Si no está de acuerdo con la decisión, usted o cualquier parte interesada puede:

1. Apelar a la Junta de Apelaciones de Empleo dentro de los quince (15) días de la fecha bajo la firma del juez presentando una apelación por escrito por correo, fax o en línea a:

Employment Appeal Board 4th Floor – Lucas Building Des Moines, Iowa 50319 Fax: (515)281-7191 En línea: eab.iowa.gov

El período de apelación se extenderá hasta el siguiente día hábil si el último día para apelar cae en fin de semana o día feriado legal.

## UNA APELACIÓN A LA JUNTA DEBE ESTABLECER CLARAMENTE:

- 1) El nombre, dirección y número de seguro social del reclamante.
- 2) Una referencia a la decisión de la que se toma la apelación.
- 3) Que se interponga recurso de apelación contra tal decisión y se firme dicho recurso.
- 4) Los fundamentos en que se funda dicho recurso.

Una decisión de la Junta de Apelaciones de Empleo es una acción final de la agencia. Si una de las partes no está de acuerdo con la decisión de la Junta de Apelación de Empleo, puede presentar una petición de revisión judicial en el tribunal de distrito.

2. Si nadie presenta una apelación de la decisión del juez ante la Junta de Apelaciones Laborales dentro de los quince (15) días, la decisión se convierte en acción final de la agencia y usted tiene la opción de presentar una petición de revisión judicial en el Tribunal de Distrito dentro de los treinta (30) días después de que la decisión adquiera firmeza. Puede encontrar información adicional sobre cómo presentar una petición en el Código de low a §17A.19, que se encuentra en línea en https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/17A.19.pdf o comunicándose con el Tribunal de Distrito Secretario del tribunal https://www.iowacourts.gov/iowa-courts/court-directory/.

**Nota para las partes:** USTED PUEDE REPRESENTARSE en la apelación u obtener un abogado u otra parte interesada para que lo haga, siempre que no haya gastos para Workforce Development. Si desea ser representado por un abogado, puede obtener los servicios de un abogado privado o uno cuyos servicios se paguen con fondos públicos.

Nota para el reclamante: es importante que presente su reclamo semanal según las instrucciones, mientras esta apelación está pendiente, para proteger su derecho continuo a los beneficios.

#### SERVICIO DE INFORMACIÓN:

Se envió por correo una copia fiel y correcta de esta decisión a cada una de las partes enumeradas.