

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

MOLLY M HOVELAND
2103 – 32ND ST
DES MOINES IA 50310

ACUTE CARE INC
PO BOX 515
ANKENY IA 50021

Appeal Number: 04A-UI-12012-SWT
OC: 10/10/04 R: 02
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

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated October 28, 2004, reference 01, that concluded the claimant's discharge was not for work-connected misconduct. A telephone hearing was held on December 2, 2004. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. The claimant participated in the hearing. Susan Core participated in the hearing on behalf of the employer with witnesses, Stephanie Franzwa and Ginger Wiebers. Exhibits One through Three were admitted into evidence at the hearing.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The claimant worked full time for the employer as a physician scheduler from December 23, 2002 to October 12, 2004. Her supervisor was the regional coordinator, Stephanie Franzwa. The employer's business recruits physicians for hospitals to work shifts in hospital emergency rooms. The claimant's job was to call and schedule doctors to fill open shifts in 12 hospital

emergency rooms. On July 12, 2004, the claimant received an evaluation that set forth certain aspects of her job performance that she needed to improve. The primary expectation identified was that the claimant was to fill all the open shifts by a deadline of one week prior to the week being scheduled.

Franzwa continued to be dissatisfied with the claimant's work performance in early September 2004. On September 2, 2004, the claimant was presented with a performance improvement plan containing a list of objectives that she was expected to achieve. They included (1) filling all of the open shifts by the deadline 90 percent of the time; (2) turning in updated calendars to Franzwa daily 100 percent of the time; (3) make 10 phone calls by 10:00 a.m. each morning 90 percent of the time; (4) communicating with Franzwa every day about her progress 100 percent of the time; (5) consulting with supervisor about credential notification worksheets 100 percent of the time; and (6) seeking approval from Franzwa for any bonuses paid to physicians 100 percent of the time.

As of October 12, 2004, Franzwa determined that the claimant had not satisfactorily completed the objectives in the performance improvement plan and discharged the claimant for that reason.

After receiving the performance improvement plan, the claimant performed her job to the best of her ability but not to Franzwa's standards. She never deliberately failed to perform her job duties or instructions given to her by the employer.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue in this case is whether the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law.

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 to prove the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The propriety of a discharge is not at issue in an unemployment insurance case. An employer may be justified in discharging an employee, but the employee's conduct may not amount to misconduct precluding the payment of unemployment compensation. 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 Board, 616 N.W.2d 661, 665 (Iowa 2000).

While the employer may have been justified in discharging the claimant, work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law has not been established in this case. No willful and substantial misconduct has been proven in this case.

DECISION:

The unemployment insurance decision dated October 28, 2004, reference 01, is affirmed. The claimant is qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits, if she is otherwise eligible.

saw/b