IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

MARY MCCUNE Claimant

APPEAL 21A-UI-24770-JC-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

CITY OF DES MOINES PAYROLL DEPT B Employer

> OC: 09/26/21 Claimant: Appellant (2)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct Iowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Quitting

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant/appellant, Mary McCune, filed an appeal from the October 25, 2021 (reference 01) lowa Workforce Development ("IWD") unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on January 5, 2021. The claimant participated. The employer/respondent, City of Des Moines Payroll Dept B, participated through Amanda Haugen, human resources business partner. The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative records. Based on the evidence, the arguments presented, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

ISSUES:

Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct? Did claimant voluntarily quit the employment with good cause attributable to employer?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant began her employment on July 6, 2021 and worked as a full-time senior public safety dispatcher until September 28, 2021 when the claimant was given the option to resign in lieu of termination. Continuing work was not available.

At the time of separation, claimant was still in training with the employer. Claimant had a meeting to discuss her performance with her major, after mishandling two recent calls. Claimant was trying to the job to the best of her ability. At the meeting, she was informed that she had the option to resign or the employer would recommend she be discharged. Employer supplied no further details to support the reasons for the recommendation and indicated it was not contesting benefits. Claimant elected to resign, rather than be discharged.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The first issue before the administrative law judge is whether the employer's agreement not to contest a claim for unemployment insurance benefits insures that the claimant will receive unemployment benefits. It does not. The decision about whether a claimant receives or is denied unemployment insurance benefits is not up to the employer or the claimant, but is determined by Iowa Workforce Development applying the facts of the claimant's job separation to the Unemployment Security Law as enacted by the state legislature. Whereupon the employer might agree not to contest a claim, that promise, in and of itself, does not guarantee that a claimant will receive unemployment insurance benefits, but only that the employer will not hinder any efforts on the part of the claimant to make a claim for unemployment benefits.

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant's separation is non-disqualifying.

lowa unemployment insurance law disqualifies claimants who voluntarily quit employment without good cause attributable to the employer or who are discharged for work-connected misconduct. Iowa Code §§ 96.5(1) and 96.5(2)a. They remain disqualified until such time as they requalify for benefits by working and earning insured wages ten times their weekly benefit amount. *Id.*

The record establishes that the Claimant chose to quit her employment, rather than be terminated when given the option. Such a choice is not volitional - the Claimant was forced to quit or risk the inevitability of being fired.

871 IAC 24.26 provides:

Voluntary quit with good cause attributable to the employer and separations not considered to be voluntary quits. The following are reasons for a claimant leaving employment with good cause attributable to the employer:

(21)The claimant was compelled to resign when given the choice of resigning or being discharged. This shall not be considered a voluntary leaving.

The claimant's separation is therefore analyzed as a discharge.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(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.

b.

This definition has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. *Huntoon v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job related misconduct. *Cosper v. lowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (lowa 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. lowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (lowa Ct. App. 1984). 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. lowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (lowa Ct. App. 1984). The focus of the administrative code definition of misconduct is on deliberate, intentional or culpable acts by the employee. *Id.*

Failure in job performance due to inability or incapacity is not considered misconduct because the actions were not volitional. *Huntoon v. lowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (lowa 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. lowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 386 N.W.2d 552 (lowa Ct. App. 1986). Since the employer agreed that claimant had never had a sustained period of time during which she performed her job duties to employer's satisfaction and inasmuch as she did attempt to perform the job to the best of her ability but was unable to meet its expectations, no intentional misconduct has been established, as is the employer's burden of proof. *Cosper v. lowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (lowa 1982). Accordingly, no disqualification pursuant to lowa Code § 96.5(2)a is imposed. Accordingly, benefits are allowed provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

Nothing in this decision should be interpreted as a condemnation of the employer's right to terminate the claimant for violating its policies and procedures. The employer had a right to follow its policies and procedures. The analysis of unemployment insurance eligibility, however, does not end there. This ruling simply holds that the employer did not meet its burden of proof to establish the claimant's conduct leading separation was misconduct under lowa law.

DECISION:

The October 25, 2021 (reference 01) initial decision is REVERSED. The claimant did not quit the employment. The claimant was discharged for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.



Jennifer L. Beckman Administrative Law Judge Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau Iowa Workforce Development 1000 East Grand Avenue Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209 Fax 515-478-3528

<u>January 31st,2022</u> Decision Dated and Mailed

jlb/rs