

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

LAURI A NORBY
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 13A-UI-10215-S2T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

NCS INC
NOLL COLLECTION SERVICE
Employer

OC: 07/21/13
Claimant: Appellant (1)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Noll Collection Service (employer) appealed a representative's August 28, 2013, decision (reference 01) that concluded Lauri Norby (claimant) was discharged and there was no evidence of willful or deliberate misconduct. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for October 3, 2013. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated by Mary Meadows, Director of Operations.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the claimant was separated from employment for any disqualifying reason.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was hired on January 2, 2013, as a full-time collections associate. The claimant signed for receipt of the employer's handbook on January 2, 2013. The claimant was supposed to meet a goal of collecting \$7,250.00 per month. She was never able to meet her goal but she tried each month. The employer talked to her a couple of times about needing to increase her collections but never warned her what would happen to her if she failed to meet her goal. The employer terminated her on July 26, 2013.

The claimant filed for unemployment insurance benefits with an effective date of July 21, 2013. The employer participated personally at the fact-finding interview on August 27, 2013, by Mary Meadows.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was not discharged for misconduct.

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.

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). Misconduct connotes volition. A failure in job performance which results from inability or incapacity is not volitional and therefore not misconduct. Huntoon v. Iowa Department of Job Services, 275 N.W.2d 445 (Iowa 1979). Poor work performance is not misconduct in the absence of evidence of intent. Miller v. Employment Appeal Board, 423 N.W.2d 211 (Iowa App. 1988). The employer discharged the claimant for poor work performance and has the burden of proof to show evidence of intent. The employer did not provide any evidence of intent at the hearing. Consequently the employer did not meet its burden of proof to show misconduct. Benefits are allowed.

DECISION:

The representative's August 28, 2013, decision (reference 01) is affirmed. The employer has not met its proof to establish job related misconduct. Benefits are allowed.

Beth A. Scheetz
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/pjs