IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

PAIGE J ADKINS

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 10A-EUCU-01176-LT

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

IOWA WORKFORCE
DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

OC: 02/07/10

Claimant: Appellant (1)

Iowa Code§ 96.3(5)b - Training Extension Benefits

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Claimant appealed the December 14, 2010 (reference 06) representative's decision that denied training extension benefits (TEB). After due notice was issued, a telephone hearing was held on January 26, 2011. The claimant participated.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the claimant is eligible to receive training extension benefits (TEB).

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 involuntarily separated from a part-time, year-round manufacturing job with a fiberglass wind blade manufacturer for wind turbines. She was separated because of a discharge from employment, not related to a permanent reduction in force.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue is whether the claimant qualifies for training extension benefits. For the reasons that follow the administrative law judge concludes the claimant is not eligible to receive training extension benefits.

lowa Code § 96.3(5)b(1) provides that a person who has been separated from a declining occupation or who has been involuntarily separated from employment as a result of a permanent reduction of operations and who is in training with the approval of the director (DAT training) or in a job training program pursuant to the Workforce Investment Act of 1998, Pub. L. No. 105-220, (WIA training) at the time regular benefits are exhausted, may be eligible for training extension benefits.

There are specific requirements before a claimant may qualify for training extension benefits: 1) The claimant must meet the minimum requirements for unemployment benefits; 2) the

claimant's separation must have been from full time work in a declining occupation or the claimant must have been involuntarily separated from full time work due to a permanent reduction of operations; 3) the claimant must be in a job training program that has been approved by the Department; 4) the claimant must have exhausted all regular and emergency unemployment benefits; 5) the claimant must have been in the training program at the time regular benefits are exhausted; 6) the training must fall under one of the following three categories: a) it must be for a high demand or high technology occupation as defined by lowa Workforce Development; b) it must be for a high-tech occupation or training approved under the Workforce Investment Act (WIA); c) it must be an approved program for a GED; and 7) the claimant must be enrolled and making satisfactory progress towards completing the training. lowa Code § 96.3(5)b(5).

In the case herein, the claimant did not establish she met the second of the above criteria; thus, she does not qualify for training extension benefits.

DECISION:

The December 14, 2010 (reference 06) representative's decision is affirmed. The claimant is not eligible to receive training extension benefits. She remains eligible for department approved training (DAT) and may continue to apply for regular or extended benefits and should file for a new claim year the first full week of February 2011.

Dévon M. Lewis
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

dml/pjs