IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

68-0157 (9-06) - 3091078 - EI

MELISSA A VESTAL

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 11A-UI-15411-LT

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

CALERIS INC

Employer

OC: 02/20/11

Claimant: Respondent (1)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed an appeal from the November 21, 2011 (reference 05) decision that allowed benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call on January 12, 2012. Claimant participated. Employer participated through VP Stacy Springer and director Bobbi Berry. Employer's Exhibits 1 and 2 were admitted to the record.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether claimant was discharged for reasons related to job misconduct sufficient to warrant a denial of benefits.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed full-time as a technical support representative from March 14, 2011 and was separated from employment on November 3, 2011. On November 1 a customer of the employer's client Liquid Space sent an e-mail for support and claimant replied with the Caleris e-mail address instead of Liquid Space so the client wanted her to be fired. She had been warned and coached about a variety of other issues with various other clients (Employer's Exhibit 2, fax pages 6 - 13) before but not been warned about this issue with this or any other client. She had a regular series of different employer concerns noted except for a two-week period in June 2011. (Employer's Exhibit 2, fax pages 2 - 5) She had asked for additional training but was referred to the help desk guide, even though she was also told occasionally that the guide was inaccurate. Employer's Exhibit 1 did not include copies of screens upon which errors were made but are reflective of screen instructions.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason.

Iowa Code § 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.

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The issue is not whether the employer made a correct decision in separating claimant, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. Infante v. IDJS, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa App. 1984). What constitutes misconduct justifying termination of an employee and what misconduct warrants denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two separate decisions. Pierce v. IDJS, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa App. 1988). Misconduct serious enough to warrant discharge is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. Such misconduct must be "substantial." Newman v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa App. 1984). Negligence does not constitute misconduct unless recurrent in nature; a single act is not disqualifying unless indicative of a deliberate disregard of the employer's interests. Henry v. IDJS, 391 N.W.2d 731 (Iowa App. 1986). Failure in job performance due to inability or incapacity is not considered misconduct because the actions were not volitional. Huntoon v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979). Where an individual is discharged due to a failure in job performance, proof of that individual's ability to do the job is required to justify disqualification, rather than accepting the employer's subjective view. To do so is to impermissibly shift the burden of proof to the claimant. Kelly v. IDJS, 386 N.W.2d 552 (Iowa App. 1986). Since employer agreed that claimant had never had a sustained period of time during which she performed her job duties to employer's satisfaction, except for a two-week period in June, the final incident for which she was discharged was novel, and

inasmuch as she did attempt to perform the job to the best of her ability but was unable to meet the employer's expectations, no intentional misconduct has been established, as is the employer's burden of proof. *Cosper v. IDJS*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (lowa 1982). Accordingly, no disqualification pursuant to lowa Code § 96.5(2)a is imposed.

DECISION:

The November 21, 2011 (reference 05)	decision is affirmed.	Claimant was	discharged from
employment for no disqualifying reason.	Benefits are allowed.		

Dévon M. Lewis Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

dml/pjs