

**EMPLOYMENT APPEALS BOARD DECISION**  
**2026-EAB-0696**

*Affirmed*  
*Disqualification*

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY:** On June 2, 2026, the Oregon Employment Department (the Department) served notice of an administrative decision concluding that claimant quit working for the employer with good cause and therefore was not disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits based on the work separation (decision # L0017767024). The employer filed a timely request for hearing. On July 15, 2026, ALJ Bender conducted a hearing, and on July 22, 2026 issued Order No. 26-UI-335654, reversing decision # L0017767024 by concluding that claimant quit work without good cause and was disqualified from receiving benefits effective March 15, 2026. On August 4, 2026, claimant filed an application for review with the Employment Appeals Board (EAB).

**EVIDENTIARY MATTER:** EAB has considered additional evidence when reaching this decision under OAR 471-041-0090(1) (May 13, 2019). Claimant's argument contained documents that were not part of the hearing record, but the information in the documents is relevant and material, and factors or circumstances beyond claimant's reasonable control prevented him from offering the information during the hearing. See ORS 657.275(2) and OAR 471-041-0090(1). Claimant asserted that he received notice of the hearing, which had been requested by the employer, the day before the hearing, and that this prevented him from offering the 128 pages of documents accompanying his written argument during the hearing. This was a factor beyond claimant's reasonable control. The information has been marked and admitted as EAB Exhibit 1. Any party that objects to EAB admitting EAB Exhibit 1 must send their objection to EAB in writing, stating why they object, within ten days of EAB mailing this decision. OAR 471-041-0090(2). Unless EAB receives and agrees with the objection, the exhibit will remain in the record.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** (1) Masterbrand Cabinets, LLC employed claimant as a radiofrequency identification device (RFID) technician from October 2023 through March 20, 2026. As of March 2026, claimant was paid \$35.58 per hour.

(2) In 2024, the employer asked claimant if he could figure out a way to obtain certain data involving RFIDs. In response, claimant created software that the employer found useful in obtaining this data, although the employer had not necessarily expected claimant to create the software. Beginning in approximately November 2024, claimant frequently advocated for a different job title and pay rate that he felt would be commensurate with the value of the work he had demonstrated that he was capable of performing. The employer believed that they did not have need for another employee in a software development or design role and were pleased with claimant's work in his existing role, and therefore declined his promotion requests. Claimant alternatively asked that the employer reduce his hours to part time so that he could take on software development work for other companies, and the employer also declined that request. Claimant received modest pay increases over the course of his employment, largely consistent with what the employer's other staff received.

(3) Following claimant's creation of the software, the employer wanted their information technology (IT) department to be able to modify or enhance the software as needed, and asked claimant to provide information about the software's creation that would easily enable them to do this. Claimant believed that employees in software design or development roles should be able to modify or recreate the software without his help. For this reason, and because claimant believed that his creation of the software had been beyond the scope of his job description in the first place, he refused to provide the information to the IT department. The employer did not intend to discipline claimant for this refusal, but continued to make the request of him through the remainder of 2025, as claimant continued to advocate for a promotion.

(4) In December 2025, the employer offered claimant a \$1.00 per hour raise and an adjustment to his job title, contingent on claimant providing the requested information about the software's design or, at a minimum, creating an IT support ticket that provided sufficient guidance to allow IT staff to recreate the software on their own. Claimant declined this offer for the same reasons he had previously declined to cooperate with the employer's request. Moreover, claimant felt that he was "in a corner and had to go look for other opportunities" based on the employer having made this offer, as he "didn't see a path forward" to a position with the employer commensurate with his skills and abilities. Transcript at 39. Claimant felt that he could not devote sufficient time to searching for other work while still employed full time with the employer, and therefore by early March 2026, decided to quit work.

(5) On March 6, 2026, claimant gave notice to the employer that he intended to resign in approximately two weeks. The parties negotiated an effective date for the resignation of March 20, 2026, and claimant stopped working for the employer on that date. Despite claimant's continued refusal to provide the requested information about the software, the employer was willing to continue employing claimant in the RFID technician role at the \$35.58 hourly rate of pay.

**CONCLUSIONS AND REASONS:** Claimant quit 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 work because he believed the employer expected him to do work outside the scope of an RFID technician, and had come to realize that the employer likely would not promote him to a position with substantially higher pay in the near future, if at all. Claimant viewed the employer’s 2024 request that he come up with a way to obtain some RFID data, which resulted in claimant creating software for that purpose, as being outside the scope of his written job description because that description does not mention software design or development. Transcript at 36. The employer asserted at hearing that they had not intended this as a specific directive for claimant to create software, but when presented with the software they were pleased with this solution to their need to obtain the data. Transcript at 43-44. The employer further asserted that they “never asked [claimant] to do anything outside of his job description,” even though he “may have used some of his skills and abilities to get things done that were outside of his job description.” Transcript at 43. Claimant viewed the employer’s continuing requests to cooperate in enabling the IT department to essentially have control over future development of the software as similarly demanding work outside the scope of his job description, and the \$1.00 per hour raise offered in exchange for his cooperation as insufficient compensation for such work.

Even if the employer had directed claimant to complete some tasks outside of his written job description, which has not necessarily been shown by a preponderance of the evidence, it is generally within an employer’s discretion to decide what tasks to assign an employee, even if some tasks do not closely align with a written job description. The record does not suggest that in March 2026, the employer had assigned or intended to assign claimant any task that he was incapable of completing, or that endangered his health or wellbeing. The employer did not discipline claimant or suggest to him that his job was in jeopardy for refusing to engage in tasks that he believed were beyond the scope of his job description, from which it can reasonably be inferred that claimant likely could have continued performing the tasks associated with the RFID technician job description at his previously agreed upon rate of pay of \$35.58 per hour. It is understandable that claimant was frustrated by being denied a promotion to a significantly higher-paying position that he believed he had demonstrated to the employer he had the skills and abilities to perform. However, under these circumstances, a reasonable and prudent person of normal sensitivity, exercising ordinary common sense, would not leave work for this reason.

Furthermore, for a claimant to have good cause to voluntarily leave work, the claimant must derive some benefit for leaving work. *Oregon Public Utility Commission v. Employment Dep’t.*, 267 Or App 68, 340 P3d 136 (2014). Claimant’s solution to being denied a promotion to significantly higher-paying work, or to being expected to perform work he believed was outside the scope of his job description, was to reduce his earned income to nothing by quitting work. While resigning may have allowed him more time to search for other work, that was not a valid reason to quit because claimant did not face a situation of gravity that necessitated searching for a new job. Claimant therefore did not derive a benefit from foregoing full-time work that paid \$35.58 per hour in favor of earning nothing. Accordingly, claimant’s reasons for quitting work were not of such gravity that he had no reasonable alternative but to leave work, and he therefore quit without good cause.

For these reasons, claimant voluntarily quit work without good cause and is disqualified from receiving benefits effective March 15, 2026.

**DECISION:** Order No. 26-UI-335654 is affirmed.

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

**DATE of Service:** September 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 الاستئناف 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.