IN THE IOWA ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS DIVISION UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

EUGENE J MANLEY

Claimant

APPEAL 24A-UI-04723-CS-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

BENDER FOUNDRY SERVICE INC

Employer

OC: 04/21/24

Claimant: Respondent (1)

Iowa Code §96.5(2)a-Discharge/Misconduct
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 – Employer/Representative Participation Fact-finding Interview

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

On May 15, 2024, the employer/appellant filed an appeal from the May 8, 2024, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefit based on the claimant being dismissed on February 19, 2024 for unsatisfactory work. The Iowa Workforce Development determined that not performing work to the employer's satisfaction is not misconduct. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on May 29, 2024. The claimant participated. The employer participated through general manager Amy Reames. Employer exhibits 1, 2, 3, and 4 were admitted into the record. Administrative notice was taken of the claimant's unemployment insurance benefits records, including DBRO.

ISSUES:

- I. Was the separation a layoff, discharge for misconduct, or voluntary quit without good cause?
- II. Is the claimant overpaid benefits?
- III. Should the claimant repay benefits?
- IV. Should the employer be charged due to employer participation in fact finding?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant began working for employer on April 25, 2022. The claimant was hired as a full-time Vice President of Production. The claimant had supervisor experience in his work experience. As part of his job duties he was responsible for supervising 3 Leads, 1 maintenance supervisor, and approximately 35 production operators.

During the first year of the claimant's employment the employer noticed deficiencies in the claimant's work performance as a supervisor. The employer gave the claimant time to adjust. It became apparent to the employer that the claimant was not improving on his performance.

On January 15, 2024, the employer met with the claimant to discuss the deficiencies in his work performance. The employer noted issues with the quality of the product that were sent to customers and multiple customer complaints regarding the products being incorrect. (Exhibit 3). The employer also noted that the claimant improperly handled a discriminatory investigation. (Exhibit 3). There were also issues with the claimant not disciplining employees, failing to provide method sheets (the packet that provided specific details regarding the product they were producing), failing to properly train Leads, and not efficiently changing out machines at the end of the day to reduce the lag time in production and keeping the operators producing. (Exhibit 3). The employer also noted issues with the claimant's mismanaging of inventory due to failing to restock a bolt bin and running out of sand or not having enough storage for sand when it was delivered. (Exhibit 3).

During the meeting the employer gave the claimant 30 working days to improve his performance. (Exhibit 2). Specifically the employer noted that the claimant needed to keep close supervision of the maintenance supervisor regarding maintenance inventory, organization, and ensuring that they are following up on the claimant's directions. (Exhibit 3). The claimant also needed to assist Leads in improving production levels, and doing quality checks. (Exhibit 3).

On January 24, 2024, the employer followed up and noted that issues were still going on where employees were not following the method sheets and the claimant did not notice they were not following the proper procedure. (Exhibit 2). The employer also noted there were more customer complaints about the products being incorrect. (Exhibit 2). The employer attributed it to the claimant failing to perform quality checks on the products before they were sent to the customer. (Exhibit 2). The employer attributed it to poor training, poor supervision, poor or no quality checks, and methods not being followed. (Exhibit 2).

The claimant attributes the issues the employer was having to the workforce and high turnover. 75% of the employees had less than a year of experience during the claimant's tenure. The claimant trained employees but due to the high turnover there was a lack of experience and knowledge so he would train and retrain employees. The claimant performed quality checks on the products but was not able to inspect every piece of product that left production because he was performing other duties. The claimant also walked the floor often and thought that it was improving. The claimant denies that he received a discrimination complaint and did speak with the employee that was causing issues with being "gruff" with other employees. The claimant attempted to do the job to the best of his ability.

On February 19, 2024, the employer determined that the claimant could either resign or be terminated. (Exhibit 1). The employer separated from the claimant due to the claimant's performance not improving. (Exhibit 1). Specifically the claimant did not notice issues that needed to be addressed. (Exhibit 1). The claimant was given eight weeks of severance and two weeks of vacation at his separation regardless of whether he resigned or was terminated. (Exhibit 1).

The claimant filed for benefits with an effective date of April 21, 2024. The claimant's gross weekly benefit amount is \$626.00. (DBRO). The claimant began receiving benefits on April 21, 2024 and has received them through May 25, 2024. (DBRO). The claimant has received five weeks of benefits worth a gross total of \$3,130.00. (DBRO).

The employer participated in a fact-finding interview with Iowa Workforce Development.

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 and d provide:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits, regardless of the source of the individual's wage credits:

- 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 disqualification shall continue 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.
- d. For the purposes of this subsection, "misconduct" means a deliberate act or omission by an employee that constitutes a material breach of the duties and obligations arising out of the employee's contract of employment. Misconduct is 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. Misconduct by an individual includes but is not limited to all of the following:
- (1) Material falsification of the individual's employment application.
- (2) Knowing violation of a reasonable and uniformly enforced rule of an employer.
- (3) Intentional damage of an employer's property.
- (4) Consumption of alcohol, illegal or nonprescribed prescription drugs, or an impairing substance in a manner not directed by the manufacturer or a combination of such substances, on the employer's premises in violation of the employer's employment policies.
- (5) Reporting to work under the influence of alcohol, illegal or nonprescribed prescription drugs, or an impairing substance in an off-label manner, or a combination of such substances, on the employer's premises in violation of the employer's employment policies, unless the individual if compelled to work by the employer outside of scheduled or on-call working hours.
- (6) Conduct that substantially and unjustifiably endangers the personal safety of coworkers or the general public.

- (7) Incarceration for an act for which one could reasonably expect to be incarcerated that result in missing work.
- (8) Incarceration as a result of a misdemeanor or felony conviction by a court of competent jurisdiction.
- (9) Excessive unexcused tardiness or absenteeism.
- (10) Falsification of any work-related report, task, or job that could expose the employer or coworkers to legal liability or sanction for violation of health or safety laws.
- (11) Failure to maintain any licenses, registration, or certification that is reasonably required by the employer or by law, or that is a functional requirement to perform the individual's regular job duties, unless the failure is not within the control of the individual.
- (12) Conduct that is libelous or slanderous toward an employer or an employee of the employer if such conduct is not protected under state or federal law.
- (13) Theft of an employer or coworker's funds or property.
- (14) Intentional misrepresentation of time worked or work carried out that results in the individual receiving unearned wages or unearned benefits.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(4) provides:

(4) Report required. The claimant's statement and employer's statement must give detailed facts as to the specific reason for the claimant's discharge. Allegations of misconduct or dishonesty without additional evidence shall not be sufficient to result in disqualification. If the employer is unwilling to furnish available evidence to corroborate the allegation, misconduct cannot be established. In cases where a suspension or disciplinary layoff exists, the claimant is considered as discharged, and the issue of misconduct shall be resolved.

Iowa Admin. Code r.871-24.32(8) provides:

(8) Past acts of misconduct. While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of a current act of misconduct, a discharge for misconduct cannot be based on such past act or acts. The termination of employment must be based on a current act.

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. *Cosper v. lowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (lowa 1982). The issue is not whether the employer made a correct decision in separating the claimant, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. *Infante v. lowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (lowa Ct. App. 1984). Misconduct must be "substantial" to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. *Newman v. lowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (lowa Ct. App. 1984). "Misconduct serious enough to warrant the discharge of an employee is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of benefits." *Lee v. Employment Appeal Bd.*, 616 N.W.2d 661, 665 (lowa 2000).

In an at-will employment environment an employer may discharge an employee for any number of reasons or no reason at all if it is not contrary to public policy. However, if the employer fails to meet its burden of proof to establish job related misconduct as the reason for the separation it incurs potential liability for unemployment insurance benefits related to that separation. A determination as to whether an employee's act is misconduct does not rest solely on the interpretation or application of the employer's policy or rule. A violation is not necessarily disqualifying misconduct even if the employer was fully within its rights to impose discipline up to or including discharge for the incident under its policy.

Failure in job performance due to inability or incapacity is not considered misconduct because the actions were not volitional. *Huntoon v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 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. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 386 N.W.2d 552 (Iowa Ct. App. 1986). The employer agreed that claimant had never had a sustained period of time during which the claimant performed his job duties to employer's satisfaction. The claimant did attempt to perform the job to the best of his ability but was unable to meet the employer's expectations. As a result, no intentional misconduct has been established, as is the employer's burden of proof. *Cosper v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). Accordingly, no disqualification pursuant to Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a is imposed. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

Since the claimant is eligible for benefits the issue of whether the claimant is overpaid benefits and whether the employer participated in the fact-finding interview are moot.

DECISION:

The May 8, 2024 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is AFFIRMED. Claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.



Carly Smith
Administrative Law Judge

May 31, 2024 Decision Dated and Mailed

cs/scn

APPEAL RIGHTS. If you disagree with the decision, you or any interested party may:

1. Appeal to the Employment Appeal Board within fifteen (15) days of the date under the judge's signature by submitting a written appeal via mail, fax, or online to:

Employment Appeal Board 6200 Park Ave Suite 100 Des Moines, Iowa 50321 Fax: (515)281-7191 Online: eab.iowa.gov

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.

AN APPEAL TO THE BOARD SHALL 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.

An Employment Appeal Board decision is final agency action. If a party disagrees with the Employment Appeal Board decision, they may then file a petition for judicial review in district court.

2. If no one files an appeal of the judge's decision with the Employment Appeal Board within fifteen (15) days, the decision becomes final agency action, and you have the option to file a petition for judicial review in District Court within thirty (30) days after the decision becomes final. Additional information on how to file a petition can be found at lowa Code §17A.19, which is online at https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/17A.19.pdf or by contacting the District Court Clerk of Court https://www.iowacourts.gov/iowa-courts/court-directory/.

Note to Parties: YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in the appeal or 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.

Note to Claimant: It is important that you file your weekly claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

SERVICE INFORMATION:

A true and correct copy of this decision was mailed to each of the parties listed.

DERECHOS DE APELACIÓN. Si no está de acuerdo con la decisión, usted o cualquier parte interesada puede:

1. Apelar a la Junta de Apelaciones de Empleo dentro de los quince (15) días de la fecha bajo la firma del juez presentando una apelación por escrito por correo, fax o en línea a:

Employment Appeal Board 6200 Park Ave Suite 100 Des Moines, Iowa 50321 Fax: (515)281-7191 En línea: eab.iowa.gov

El período de apelación se extenderá hasta el siguiente día hábil si el último día para apelar cae en fin de semana o día feriado legal.

UNA APELACIÓN A LA JUNTA DEBE ESTABLECER CLARAMENTE:

- 1) El nombre, dirección y número de seguro social del reclamante.
- 2) Una referencia a la decisión de la que se toma la apelación.
- 3) Que se interponga recurso de apelación contra tal decisión y se firme dicho recurso.
- 4) Los fundamentos en que se funda dicho recurso.

Una decisión de la Junta de Apelaciones de Empleo es una acción final de la agencia. Si una de las partes no está de acuerdo con la decisión de la Junta de Apelación de Empleo, puede presentar una petición de revisión judicial en el tribunal de distrito.

2. Si nadie presenta una apelación de la decisión del juez ante la Junta de Apelaciones Laborales dentro de los quince (15) días, la decisión se convierte en acción final de la agencia y usted tiene la opción de presentar una petición de revisión judicial en el Tribunal de Distrito dentro de los treinta (30) días después de que la decisión adquiera firmeza. Puede encontrar información adicional sobre cómo presentar una petición en el Código de lowa §17A.19, que se encuentra en línea en https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/17A.19.pdf o comunicándose con el Tribunal de Distrito Secretario del tribunal https://www.iowacourts.gov/iowa-courts/court-directory/.

Nota para las partes: USTED PUEDE REPRESENTARSE en la apelación u obtener un abogado u otra parte interesada para que lo haga, siempre que no haya gastos para Workforce Development. Si desea ser representado por un abogado, puede obtener los servicios de un abogado privado o uno cuyos servicios se paguen con fondos públicos.

Nota para el reclamante: es importante que presente su reclamo semanal según las instrucciones, mientras esta apelación está pendiente, para proteger su derecho continuo a los beneficios.

SERVICIO DE INFORMACIÓN:

Se envió por correo una copia fiel y correcta de esta decisión a cada una de las partes enumeradas.