

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

RACHEL L MCCLIMON
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 10A-EUCU-00649-AT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

**IOWA WORKFORCE
DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

OC: 12/13/09
Claimant: Appellant (2)

Section 96.3-5-b – Training Extension Benefits

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Rachel L. McClimon filed a timely appeal from an unemployment insurance decision dated July 16, 2010, reference 04, that denied her request for training extension benefits upon a finding that the training was not for a high demand occupation. After due notice was issued, a telephone hearing was held August 30, 2010 with Ms. McClimon participating and being represented by David Pillars, Attorney at Law. Exhibits A and B were admitted into evidence.

ISSUE:

Is the claimant eligible for training extension benefits?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having heard the testimony of the witness and having examined all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Rachel L. McClimon filed a timely application for training extension benefits stating on the form her occupational goal was cosmetologist and licensed massage therapist. She is attending training at Capri College. Her training includes courses teaching business skills including specific courses on management, salon operations and finance classes. The claimant's specific occupational goal is to become a salon manager or owner.

The agency's list of high demand occupations includes standard occupational classification 39-1021, first line supervisor/managers of personal service workers. The definition of this classification includes individuals who directly supervise and coordinate the activities of personal service workers, such as hairdressers. SOC 39-1021 is a high demand occupation statewide.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The question is whether the claimant is eligible for training extension benefits. She is. Iowa Code section 96.3-5-b and agency regulations adopted pursuant to the statute require that individuals be in training for high demand occupations as listed on the agency's website. The

evidence in this record establishes that Ms. McClimon meets the requirement. Training extension benefits are allowed.

DECISION:

The unemployment insurance decision dated July 16, 2010, reference 04, is reversed. The claimant is eligible for training extension benefits.

Dan Anderson
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

pjs/pjs