

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**CHRIS GALINSKY**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 10A-UI-14341-H2T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**QWEST CORPORATION**  
Employer

**OC: 09-12-10**  
**Claimant: Appellant (2)**

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

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The claimant filed a timely appeal from the October 11, 2010, reference 01, decision that denied benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on December 2, 2010. The claimant did participate and was represented by Brent Beckwith, Attorney at Law. The employer did participate through Ryan Blackman, Site Business Manager and was represented by John O'Fallon of Barnett Associates.

**ISSUE:**

Was the claimant discharged due to job related misconduct?

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed as a call center productions and promotions coach full time beginning July 11, 2005 through September 15, 2010 when he was discharged. The claimant was discharged for his failure to meet the employer's expectations. The claimant had been failing to meet deadlines for some time prior to the end of his employment and was warned in March, June and July 2010 that he was not completing his assigned tasks in a timely manner. The claimant was missing paying out prizes to agents who were complaining to upper management. While the claimant's work load had increased, he also had been given additional help from another co-worker. During the month of August and September the claimant repeatedly failed to meet deadlines and to accomplish tasks he had assured his manager would be completed. The claimant was having personal problems in his marriage that were contributing to his lack of focus leading to uncompleted tasks and job duties. Other employees were covering for the claimant completing the job duties he was not completing. The claimant's supervisor, Ryan Blackman, believed that the claimant was performing to the best of his ability, but was simply unable to meet the employer's expectations due to his personal problems and his own organizational skills.

## 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.

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 he performed the job duties to employer's satisfaction and inasmuch as he did attempt to perform the job to the best of his 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 (Iowa 1982). Accordingly, no disqualification pursuant to Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a is imposed.

**DECISION:**

The October 11, 2010 (reference 01) decision is reversed. Claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

---

Teresa K. Hillary  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

tkh/pjs