

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

ROBIN SMITH  
2912 E WALNUT ST  
DES MOINES IA 50317

QWEST CORPORATION  
c/o EMPLOYERS UNITY INC  
PO BOX 749  
ARVADA CO 80006-9000

Appeal Number: 06A-UI-01089-ET  
OC: 01-01-06 R: 02  
Claimant: Appellant (2)

**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, 4<sup>th</sup> 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/Misconduct  
Section 96.4-3 – Able and Available for Work

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed a timely appeal from the January 25, 2006, reference 01, decision that denied benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call before Administrative Law Judge Julie Elder on February 14, 2006. The claimant participated in the hearing with witness Don Dawson II, Union Workers of America Vice-President. The employer did not respond to the hearing notice and did not participate in the hearing.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed as a full-time sales and service representative for Qwest from April 1,

2002 to January 3, 2006. She received a written warning and was placed on probation in September 2005 due to her sales numbers but met the sales standards in October and was released from probation. On November 30, 2005, the claimant went on FMLA and was granted short-term disability. She was released to return to work with the restriction of no external phone contact January 2, 2006. On January 3, 2006, the employer terminated her employment because of her sales numbers. The claimant performed the work to the best of her ability.

#### REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason.

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 proving disqualifying job misconduct. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). 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). Inasmuch as the claimant did attempt to perform the job to the best of her ability but was unable to meet the employer's expectations, the employer has not established intentional misconduct on the part of the claimant. Cosper v. IDJS, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982).

The remaining issue is whether the claimant is able and available for work. For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant is able to work and available for work

Iowa Code section 96.4-3 provides:

An unemployed individual shall be eligible to receive benefits with respect to any week only if the department finds that:

3. The individual is able to work, is available for work, and is earnestly and actively seeking work. This subsection is waived if the individual is deemed partially unemployed, while employed at the individual's regular job, as defined in section 96.19, subsection 38, paragraph "b", unnumbered paragraph 1, or temporarily unemployed as defined in section 96.19, subsection 38, paragraph "c". The work search requirements of this subsection and the disqualification requirement for failure to apply for, or to accept suitable work of section 96.5, subsection 3 are waived if the individual is not disqualified for benefits under section 96.5, subsection 1, paragraph "h".

The claimant has been released with the restriction that she have no external phone contact. Because she is able to perform many other jobs that do not require phone contact, she is considered able and available for work.

Consequently, benefits are allowed.

#### DECISION:

The January 25, 2006, reference 01, decision is reversed. The claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason and is able and available for work. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

je/pjs