

IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Section
1000 East Grand—Des Moines, Iowa 50319
DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
68-0157 (7-97) – 3091078 - EI

ANGELA C MUSICK
18502 – 103RD ST
KESWICK IA 50137

ROCKWELL COLLINS INC
C/O TALX UCM SVCS NIC
PO BOX 283
ST LOUIS MO 63166

Appeal Number: 06A-UI-00471-JTT
OC: 12/04/05 R: 03
Claimant: Respondent (1)

This Decision Shall Become Final, unless within fifteen (15) days from the date below, you or any interested party appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by submitting either a signed letter or a signed written Notice of Appeal, directly to the **Employment Appeal Board, 4th Floor—Lucas Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319**.

The appeal period will be extended to the next business day if the last day to appeal falls on a weekend or a legal holiday.

STATE CLEARLY

1. The name, address and social security number of the claimant.
2. A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken.
3. That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.
4. The grounds upon which such appeal is based.

YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in this appeal or you may obtain a lawyer or other interested party to do so provided there is no expense to Workforce Development. If you wish to be represented by a lawyer, you may obtain the services of either a private attorney or one whose services are paid for with public funds. It is important that you file your claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

(Administrative Law Judge)

(Decision Dated & Mailed)

Section 96.5(2)(a) – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Rockwell Collins filed a timely appeal from the January 3, 2006, reference 01, decision that allowed benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on February 1, 2006. Ms. Musick participated. Human Resources Manager Dennis Kopf represented the employer.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Angela Musick was employed by Rockwell Collins as a full-time assembly operator from June 7, 2004 until December 2, 2005, when Human Resources Manager Dennis Kopf discharged her. Though Mr. Kopf made the decision to discharge Ms. Musick, Human Resources representative Tricia Rapp carried out the discharge.

The final incident that prompted the discharge occurred on November 30, 2005, when a salaried employee allegedly witnessed Ms. Musick take a 14-minute break. Pursuant to the employer's contract with the union, Ms. Musick's break was limited to 12 minutes, started the moment she left her workstation and ended when she returned to her workstation. The salaried employee who allegedly observed Ms. Musick take 2 extra minutes at break time did not testify at the hearing.

On September 22, 2005, the employer and Ms. Musick executed a "Last Chance Agreement." The agreement followed an incident wherein Ms. Musick took a 40-minute break during a production shutdown. The employer acknowledges there were no other break violations than the two referenced above. The employer did not consider any other conduct in making the decision to discharge Ms. Musick.

When Ms. Rapp notified Ms. Musick of the discharge, she indicated the discharged was based on an alleged instance of Ms. Musick selling candles on Rockwell Collins property and did not mention the alleged break violation. Ms. Musick had not solicited sales of candles on Rockwell Collins property.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The question is whether the evidence in the record establishes that Ms. Musick was discharged for misconduct in connection with the employment. It does not.

Iowa Code section 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.

This definition has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. Huntoon v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

The employer has the burden of proof in this matter. See Iowa Code section 96.6(2). Misconduct must be substantial in order to justify a denial of unemployment benefits. Misconduct serious enough to warrant the discharge of an employee is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of unemployment benefits. See Lee v. Employment Appeal Board, 616 N.W.2d 661 (Iowa 2000). The focus is on deliberate, intentional, or culpable acts by the employee. See Gimbel v. Employment Appeal Board, 489 N.W.2d 36, 39 (Iowa Ct. App. 1992).

While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of the current act to misconduct, a discharge for misconduct cannot be based on such past act(s). The termination of employment must be based on a current act. See 871 IAC 24.32(8).

Allegations of misconduct or dishonesty without additional evidence shall not be sufficient to result in disqualification. If the employer is unwilling to furnish available evidence to corroborate the allegation, misconduct cannot be established. See 871 IAC 24.32(4). When it is in a party's power to produce more direct and satisfactory evidence than is actually produced, it may fairly be inferred that the more direct evidence will expose deficiencies in that party's case. See Crosser v. Iowa Dept. of Public Safety, 240 N.W.2d 682 (Iowa 1976).

The evidence in the record fails to establish, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Ms. Musick violated the employer's 12-minute break policy. The employer presented no testimony from the salaried employee who allegedly witnessed the 14-minute break and presented no other meaningful evidence to prove the allegation. Thus, the evidence in the record fails to establish a current act of misconduct that might serve as a basis for disqualifying Ms. Musick for benefits. Accordingly, the administrative law judge concludes that Ms. Musick was discharged for no disqualifying reason. Ms. Musick is eligible for benefits, provided she is otherwise eligible. The employer's account may be charged for benefits paid to Ms. Musick.

Even if the evidence had established that a break violation occurred on November 30, this violation and the one prior break violation would be insufficient to establish substantial misconduct that would disqualify Ms. Musick for unemployment insurance benefits.

DECISION:

The Agency representative's decision dated January 3, 2006, reference 01, is affirmed. The claimant was discharged for no disqualifying reason. The claimant is eligible for benefits, provided she is otherwise eligible. The employer's account may be charged.

jt/pjs