BEFORE THE EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD Lucas State Office Building Fourth floor Des Moines, Iowa 50319

KEVIN R WILL	: : : HEADING NUMBER, OOR III 02574
Claimant,	: HEARING NUMBER: 09B-UI-03571 :
and	: EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD
EDGE TELESERVICES	: DECISION :
Employer	

⊨mployer.

NOTICE

THIS DECISION BECOMES FINAL unless (1) a request for a REHEARING is filed with the Employment Appeal Board within 20 days of the date of the Board's decision or, (2) a PETITION TO DISTRICT COURT IS FILED WITHIN 30 days of the date of the Board's decision.

A REHEARING REQUEST shall state the specific grounds and relief sought. If the rehearing request is denied, a petition may be filed in **DISTRICT COURT** within 30 days of the date of the denial.

SECTION: 96.5-2-a

DECISION

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS ARE ALLOWED IF OTHERWISE ELIGIBLE

The employer appealed this case to the Employment Appeal Board. The members of the Employment Appeal Board, one member dissenting, reviewed the entire record. The Appeal Board finds the administrative law judge's decision is correct. The administrative law judge's Findings of Fact and Reasoning and Conclusions of Law are adopted by the Board as its own. The administrative law judge's decision is **AFFIRMED**.

John A. Peno	

AMG/fnv

DISSENTING OPINION OF ELIZABETH L. SEISER:

I respectfully dissent from the majority decision of the Employment Appeal Board; I would reverse the decision of the administrative law judge. The claimant's use of the 'c-word' on the call floor was so egregiously contrary to the employer's interest and common understanding of appropriate conduct as to constitute misconduct in a single instance. The claimant's conduct was potentially harmful to sales and to co-workers who are entitled to work in a harassment-free environment. The claimant's slur is clearly a derogatory term towards women. The employer's policy apprises employees that immediate termination may result for profanity used on the call floor. For this reason, I would conclude that the employer satisfied their burden of proof and would deny benefits.

AMG/fnv	Elizabeth L. Seiser
A portion of the employer's appeal to the Employment which was not contained in the administrative file and while the appeal and additional evidence (document Board, in its discretion, finds that the admission of the attoday's decision.	hich was not submitted to the administrative law ments) were reviewed, the Employment Appeal
J	John A. Peno
Ē	Elizabeth L. Seiser
\overline{N}	Monique F. Kuester

AMG/fnv