

## SS-8 Determination—Determination for Public Inspection

Occupation

05CSI Adult Caregiver

Determination:

☒ Employee

☐ Contractor

UILC

Third Party Communication:

☒ None

☐ Yes

I have read Notice 441 and am requesting:

☐ Additional redactions based on categories listed in section entitled "Deletions We May Have Made to Your Original Determination Letter"

☐ Delay based on an on-going transaction

☐ 90 day delay

**For IRS Use Only:**

### Facts of Case

The firm is an adult foster care home service. The worker was engaged to perform services as a care giver. The firm treated the worker status as independent contractor, and issued to the worker a Form 1099-MISC at year-end to report the monies received for services performed as non-employee compensation.

The worker received training and instructions on how to perform the services. The firm assigned the worker to regular shifts of 24-hour days, five days per week. The worker was required to live on-site. Work methods were determined by the firm. The worker was required to report work related issues to the firm for resolution purposes. The worker was required to prepare daily charts for medication dispersement. She was required to track incident reports for the firm. The worker was required to perform her services personally, at the firm's location.

The firm provided the worker with all equipment, tools, and supplies needed to perform the services. The worker did not provide any items, and did not incur work related expenses. The worker's remuneration was salary based. Clients paid the firm for services rendered. The worker did not incur economic loss or financial risks related to the services she performed for the firm.

The firm did not carry workers' compensation insurance on the worker. Employment benefits were not made available to the worker. The worker did not perform similar services for others, and did not personally advertise her services to the public. The work relationship could have been terminated by either party at any time without incurring liabilities.

---

**Analysis**

---

The statement that the worker was an independent contractor pursuant to an agreement is without merit. For federal employment tax purposes, it is the actual working relationship that is controlling and not the terms of the contract (oral or written) between the parties.

The facts provided for this case do not evidence the worker's behavioral control of the work relationship. The worker followed the firm's instructions, training, work methods, schedule, and routine in the performance of her services. The worker's services were performed personally, at the firm's location. The worker used the firm's facilities, equipment, tools, and supplies to perform her services. The worker represented the firm's business operations in the performance of her services. As a result, the firm retained the right to direct and control the worker to the extent necessary to protect its investment, and the reputation of its business operations.

The facts provided for this case do not evidence the worker's financial control of the work relationship. The worker's remuneration was established by the firm. The worker had no opportunity for profit or loss as a result of the services performed for the firm. "Profit or loss" implies the use of capital by a person in an independent business of his or her own. The worker did not have a significant investment in the facilities, equipment, tools, or supplies used to perform her services for the firm. The term "significant investment" does not include tools, instruments, and clothing commonly provided by employees in their trade; nor does it include education, experience, or training. Also, if the firm has the right to control the equipment, it is unlikely the worker had an investment in facilities.

The worker performed services as requested by the firm, for an indefinite period of time, and both parties retained the right to terminate the work relationship at any time without incurring liabilities. The facts provided for this case do not evidence that the worker was engaged in an independent enterprise, but rather show that she performed her services as a necessary and integral part of the firm's business operations. Integration of the worker's services into the business operations generally shows that the worker is subject to direction and control. When the success or continuation of a business depends to an appreciable degree upon the performance of certain services, the workers who perform those services must necessarily be subject to a certain amount of control by the owner of the business.

Based on common law principles, the worker shall be found to be an employee for Federal employment tax purposes. For correction assistance, you may refer to Publication 4341, which can be obtained at [www.irs.gov](http://www.irs.gov)