

**EMPLOYMENT APPEALS BOARD DECISION**  
**2026-EAB-0235**

*Affirmed*  
*Disqualification*

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY:** On January 7, 2026, the Oregon Employment Department (the Department) served notice of an administrative decision concluding that claimant quit working for the employer without good cause and was disqualified from receiving benefits effective November 30, 2025 (decision # L0015016761).<sup>1</sup> Claimant filed a timely request for hearing. On February 26, 2026, ALJ Andersen conducted a hearing, and on March 5, 2026, issued Order No. 26-UI-322457, affirming decision # L0015016761. On March 10, 2026, claimant filed an application for review with the Employment Appeals Board (EAB).

**WRITTEN ARGUMENT:** Claimant submitted a written argument with her application for review. EAB did not consider claimant's written argument because she did not state that she provided a copy of her argument to the employer as required by OAR 471-041-0080(2)(a) (May 13, 2019).

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** (1) Bonaventure of Medford, LLC, employed claimant as a health and wellness director from December 17, 2024 until December 3, 2025. The employer operated an assisted living facility for seniors. During her employment, claimant reported to K, who was the administrator of the facility where claimant worked. K reported to a senior employee, D.

(2) To operate the assisted living facility, the employer was required to ensure that one of the employees who worked at the facility held an administrator's license. Although K acted as the administrator of the employer's facility, she did not hold an administrator's license. During claimant's employment, K took the classes needed to prepare for the license test, and the employer anticipated that K would eventually take the test and obtain the administrator's license.

(3) Claimant was hired to be, and worked as, a health and wellness director, not an administrator. However, when the employer hired claimant, they paid for claimant to obtain an administrator's license.

<sup>1</sup> Decision # L0015016761 stated that claimant was denied benefits from November 30, 2025 to December 5, 2026. However, decision # L0015016761 should have stated that claimant was disqualified from receiving benefits beginning November 30, 2025 and until she earned four times her weekly benefit amount. *See* ORS 657.176.

After claimant obtained the license, the employer used claimant's license to satisfy the administrator's license requirement at the facility at which claimant worked. From the outset of her employment, claimant understood that the employer planned to use her license in this way, but believed the employer would also use the license K would eventually obtain for the same purpose.

(4) At a point before November 2025, K told claimant that she did not intend to get an administrator's license because claimant was licensed already, and there were aspects of the employer's facility for which K did not want to be responsible.

(5) The health and wellness director position paid less than the administrator position held by K. Claimant felt she deserved a pay raise because the employer was using her administrator's license to satisfy the licensing requirement without providing compensation commensurate with that of an administrator.

(6) In the first week of November 2025, claimant asked K for a pay increase. K did not take immediate action, telling claimant that D was not responding to emails regarding the request. Claimant then emailed D directly about a pay increase. D told claimant that she would look into the matter with K, but did not take immediate action.

(7) On December 2, 2025, D emailed claimant asking for her administrator's license credentials. Rather than provide the credentials, claimant emailed back, "Have you reviewed my pay?" Audio Record at 7:59. D then called claimant, and in an angry tone, stated, "I'm your boss and you do what I am asking you to do." Audio Record at 9:18. Claimant found D's tone to be disrespectful and overbearing. After the call ended, claimant sent the employer an email advising of her intent to resign effective two weeks from December 2, 2025.

(8) After receiving claimant's email, the employer's human resources (HR) officer requested a meeting with claimant and D via a teleconferencing platform. In the meeting, the HR officer told claimant that she needed to provide her license credentials because the employer had paid for claimant to obtain the license, and that the employer intended to use claimant's license during her two-week notice period. Claimant stated that she felt she was being taken advantage of because the employer was using her license, but not paying her as well as an administrator. Claimant told D and the HR officer that K had mentioned to her that she did not intend to get an administrator's license. The two assured claimant that they understood that K intended to follow through with getting the license.

(9) Claimant's workday then ended. The next day, December 3, 2025, K sent claimant a text asking her to reconsider her resignation. Claimant replied asking, "Are you guys going to fix my pay?" Audio Record at 18:40. K responded in the negative and explained that D did not want to give claimant a pay increase.

(10) After the December 3, 2025 text exchange with K, claimant decided not to work her two-week notice period, and did not work for the employer again. Claimant resigned because the employer used her license to satisfy their licensing requirement but did not increase her pay. Claimant also resigned because of D's tone when she called claimant on December 2, 2025.

**CONCLUSIONS AND REASONS:** Claimant voluntarily left work without good cause.

A claimant who leaves work voluntarily is disqualified from the receipt of benefits unless they prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, that they had good cause for leaving work when they did. ORS 657.176(2)(c); *Young v. Employment Dept.*, 170 Or App 752, 13 P3d 1027 (2000). “Good cause . . . is such that a reasonable and prudent person of normal sensitivity, exercising ordinary common sense, would leave work.” OAR 471-030-0038(4) (September 22, 2020). “[T]he reason must be of such gravity that the individual has no reasonable alternative but to leave work.” OAR 471-030-0038(4). The standard is objective. *McDowell v. Employment Dept.*, 348 Or 605, 612, 236 P3d 722 (2010).

Claimant quit working for the employer because the employer used her license to satisfy the administrator’s license requirement at the facility but did not increase her pay. Claimant also quit working for the employer because of D’s tone during the December 2, 2025 call. Claimant did not meet her burden to prove that she quit work with good cause for either of these reasons.

With respect to the pay increase issue, claimant was hired to be a health and wellness director, a position that paid less than the administrator position. Claimant understood from the outset that the employer would pay for her to obtain an administrator’s license and that they then planned to use her license to satisfy the requirement at the facility, although claimant thought the employer would also use the license K would eventually obtain for the same purpose. Upon learning that K did not plan to obtain a license, claimant may have felt that her pay was not commensurate with the value she was providing the employer.<sup>2</sup> However, for an individual to have good cause to voluntarily leave work, they must derive a benefit from leaving work. *See Oregon Public Utility Commission v. Employment Dep’t.*, 267 Or App 68, 340 P3d 136 (2014). By quitting work because the employer would not increase her pay, and thereby reducing her income to zero, claimant failed to receive a benefit from leaving work. Thus, claimant left work without good cause to extent she quit based on this reason.

With respect to D’s treatment of claimant during the December 2, 2025 call, claimant failed to show that she faced a situation of such gravity that she had no reasonable alternative but to quit when she did. At hearing, claimant explained that she found D’s angry tone to be disrespectful, and that she perceived D’s choice of words, “I’m your boss and you do what I’m asking you to do,” as overbearing. Audio Record at 9:18. However, the record fails to show that D raised her voice during the call, subjected claimant to any threats or name-calling, or that D routinely subjected claimant to treatment that claimant found to be disrespectful. Furthermore, a reasonable person might expect a senior employee like D to react with irritation or sternness given the context that D had just asked for claimant’s license credentials by email, and rather than provide them, claimant replied by asking, “Have you reviewed my pay?” Audio Record at 7:59. A reasonable and prudent person of normal sensitivity, exercising ordinary common sense, would not quit work based upon D’s treatment of claimant during the December 2, 2025 call. Therefore, as with the employer’s failure to increase her pay, claimant did not face a situation of such gravity that she had no reasonable alternative but to leave work, and therefore quit without good cause.

---

<sup>2</sup> At hearing, claimant offered some limited testimony that the reason K did not want to obtain the license was because the employer’s facility was “a mess” or because the facility had “open cases of residents with missing money.” Audio Record at 16:45; 8:39. To the extent this testimony was offered to suggest that claimant believed that, as the facility’s license holder, she may have incurred some risk of exposure to regulatory action, claimant failed to establish that any potential exposure to regulatory action presented her with a situation of such gravity that she had no reasonable alternative but to leave work when she did. Further, claimant testified that she would have continued working for the employer if they had raised her pay, which suggests that any potential for regulatory action against claimant was not why claimant quit, and the paramount issue was the employer’s failure to raise her pay. Audio Record at 21:45.

For these reasons, claimant voluntarily left work without good cause and is disqualified from receiving benefits effective November 30, 2025.

**DECISION:** Order No. 26-UI-322457 is affirmed.

D. Hettle and A. Steger-Bentz;  
S. Serres, not participating.

**DATE of Service:** April 21, 2026

**NOTE:** You may appeal this decision by filing a Petition for Judicial Review with the Oregon Court of Appeals **within 30 days of the date of service stated above**. See ORS 657.282. For forms and information, visit <https://www.courts.oregon.gov/courts/appellate/forms/Pages/appeal.aspx> and choose the appropriate form under “File a Petition for Judicial Review.” You may also contact the Court of Appeals by telephone at (503) 986-5555, by fax at (503) 986-5560, or by mail at 1163 State Street, Salem, Oregon 97301.

**Please help us improve our service by completing an online customer service survey.** To complete the survey, please go to <https://www.surveygizmo.com/s3/5552642/EAB-Customer-Service-Survey>. If you are unable to complete the survey online and wish to have a paper copy of the survey, please contact our office.



# Understanding Your Employment Appeals Board Decision

## English

Attention – This decision affects your unemployment benefits. If you do not understand this decision, contact the Employment Appeals Board immediately. If you do not agree with this decision, you may file a Petition for Judicial Review with the Oregon Court of Appeals following the instructions written at the end of the decision.

## Simplified Chinese

注意 – 本判決會影響您的失業救濟金。如果您不明白本判決，請立即聯繫就業上訴委員會。如果您不同意此判決，您可以按照該判決結尾所寫的說明，向俄勒岡州上訴法院提出司法複審申請。

## Traditional Chinese

注意 – 本判決會影響您的失業救濟金。如果您不明白本判決，請立即聯繫就業上訴委員會。如果您不同意此判決，您可以按照該判決結尾所寫的說明，向俄勒岡州上訴法院提出司法複審申請。

## Tagalog

Paalala – Nakakaapekto ang desisyong ito sa iyong mga benepisyo sa pagkawala ng trabaho. Kung hindi mo naiintindihan ang desisyong ito, makipag-ugnayan kaagad sa Lupon ng mga Apela sa Trabaho (Employment Appeals Board). Kung hindi ka sumasang-ayon sa desisyong ito, maaari kang maghain ng isang Petisyon sa Pagsusuri ng Hukuman (Petition for Judicial Review) sa Hukuman sa Paghahabol (Court of Appeals) ng Oregon na sinusunod ang mga tagubilin na nakasulat sa dulo ng desisyon.

## Vietnamese

Chú ý - Quyết định này ảnh hưởng đến trợ cấp thất nghiệp của quý vị. Nếu quý vị không hiểu quyết định này, hãy liên lạc với Ban Kháng Cáo Việc Làm ngay lập tức. Nếu quý vị không đồng ý với quyết định này, quý vị có thể nộp Đơn Xin Tái Xét Tư Pháp với Tòa Kháng Cáo Oregon theo các hướng dẫn được viết ra ở cuối quyết định này.

## Spanish

Atención – Esta decisión afecta sus beneficios de desempleo. Si no entiende esta decisión, comuníquese inmediatamente con la Junta de Apelaciones de Empleo. Si no está de acuerdo con esta decisión, puede presentar una Aplicación de Revisión Judicial ante el Tribunal de Apelaciones de Oregon siguiendo las instrucciones escritas al final de la decisión.

## Russian

Внимание – Данное решение влияет на ваше пособие по безработице. Если решение Вам непонятно – немедленно обратитесь в Апелляционный Комитет по Трудоустройству. Если Вы не согласны с принятым решением, вы можете подать Ходатайство о Пересмотре Судебного Решения в Апелляционный Суд штата Орегон, следуя инструкциям, описанным в конце решения.

**Khmer**

ចំណុចសំខាន់ – សេចក្តីសម្រេចនេះមានផលប៉ះពាល់ដល់អត្ថប្រយោជន៍គ្មានការងារធ្វើរបស់លោកអ្នក។ ប្រសិនបើលោកអ្នកមិនយល់អំពីសេចក្តីសម្រេចនេះ សូមទាក់ទងគណៈកម្មការឧទ្ធរណ៍ការងារភ្លាមៗ។ ប្រសិនបើលោកអ្នកមិនយល់ស្របចំពោះសេចក្តីសម្រេចនេះទេ លោកអ្នកអាចដាក់ពាក្យប្តឹងសុំឲ្យមានការពិនិត្យរឿងក្តីឡើងវិញជាមួយតុលាការឧទ្ធរណ៍រដ្ឋ Oregon ដោយអនុវត្តតាមសេចក្តីណែនាំដែលសរសេរនៅខាងចុងបញ្ចប់នៃសេចក្តីសម្រេចនេះ។

**Laotian**

ເອົາໃຈໃສ່ – ຄໍາຕັດສິນນີ້ມີຜົນກະທົບຕໍ່ກັບເງິນຊ່ວຍເຫຼືອການຫວ່າງງານຂອງທ່ານ. ຖ້າທ່ານບໍ່ເຂົ້າໃຈຄໍາຕັດສິນນີ້, ກະລຸນາຕິດຕໍ່ຫາຄະນະກຳມະການອຸທອນການຈ້າງງານໃນທັນທີ. ຖ້າທ່ານບໍ່ເຫັນດີນໍາຄໍາຕັດສິນນີ້, ທ່ານສາມາດຍື່ນຄໍາຮ້ອງຂໍການທົບທວນຄໍາຕັດສິນນໍາສານອຸທອນລັດ Oregon ໄດ້ໂດຍປະຕິບັດຕາມຄໍາແນະນໍາທີ່ບອກໄວ້ຢູ່ຕອນທ້າຍຂອງຄໍາຕັດສິນນີ້.

**Arabic**

هذا القرار قد يؤثر على منحة البطالة الخاصة بك، إذا لم تفهم هذا القرار، إتصل بمجلس منازعات العمل فوراً، و إذا كنت لا توافق على هذا القرار، يمكنك رفع شكوى للمراجعة القانونية بمحكمة الإستئناف بأوريغون و ذلك بإتباع الإرشادات المدرجة أسفل القرار.

**Farsi**

توجه - این حکم بر مزایای بیکاری شما تاثیر می گذارد. اگر با این تصمیم موافق نیستید، بلافاصله با هیأت فرجام خواهی استخدام تماس بگیرید. اگر از این حکم رضایت ندارید، می‌توانید با استفاده از دستور العمل موجود در پایان آن، از دادگاه تجدید نظر اورگان درخواست تجدید نظر کنید.

**Employment Appeals Board - 875 Union Street NE | Salem, OR 97311**  
 Phone: (503) 378-2077 | 1-800-734-6949 | Fax: (503) 378-2129 | TDD: 711  
 Email: [appealsboard@employ.oregon.gov](mailto:appealsboard@employ.oregon.gov)  
 Website: [www.Oregon.gov/employ/pages/employment-appeals-board.aspx](http://www.Oregon.gov/employ/pages/employment-appeals-board.aspx)

The Oregon Employment Department is an equal opportunity employer/program. Auxiliary aids and services are available upon request to individuals with disabilities. Language assistance is available to persons with limited English proficiency at no cost.

El Departamento de Empleo de Oregon es un programa que respeta la igualdad de oportunidades. Disponemos de servicios o ayudas auxiliares, formatos alternos y asistencia de idiomas para personas con discapacidades o conocimiento limitado del inglés, a pedido y sin costo.