

SS-8 Determination—Determination for Public Inspection

Occupation 05ITE.46 Instructor/Teacher	Determination: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Contractor
UILC	Third Party Communication: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> 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 operates public charter schools. The worker was engaged to perform services as a substitute teacher. 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 her services as non-employee compensation.

The worker received paid preparatory hours during the work day, and a continuation of mentoring by the firm's department staff and administration. The worker's services were performed personally at the firm's location, during set hours of the school days when students had classes developed by the administration, and supplemental work deadlines via e-mail and or staff meetings. Work methods were determined under the firm's guidance . The firm's leadership was contacted regarding problems and complaints that needed resolution. The worker was required to provide the firm with weekly lesson plans, bi-monthly time sheets, daily student attendance, student progress/data reports, student test preparation, and daily student behavioral logs.

The firm provided the classroom facilities, substitute teaching plan, laptop, textbooks, and other classroom materials needed to perform the services. The worker did not provide anything. The worker did not incur work related expenses. The firm paid the worker a daily rate for her services. There was no information provided to evidence that the worker incurred economic loss or financial risk with regard to the services she performed for the firm.

There was no information provided to evidence that workers' compensation insurance was carried on the worker, or that employment benefits were made available to the worker. There was no information provided to evidence that the worker performed similar services for others as part of her own business operations. The work relationship was continuous as opposed to a one-time transaction.

Analysis

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, 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, and 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