IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

ETHEL O BROWN
Claimant

THOMAS L CARDELLA & ASSOCIATES INC
Employer

APPEAL NO. 11A-UI-07221-MT

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

OC: 05/01/11
Claimant: Respondent (1)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Employer filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated May 24, 2011, reference 01, which held claimant eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a hearing was scheduled for and held on June 27, 2011. Claimant participated personally. Employer participated by Jeff Scheer, TALX hearing representative, with witnesses Armond Dawson, director of operations; Doug Lawson, floor manager, and Meri Sell, director of client services. Exhibit One was admitted into evidence.

ISSUE:

The issue in this matter is whether claimant was discharged for misconduct.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and having considered all of the evidence in the record, finds: Claimant last worked for employer on May 3, 2011.

Claimant was discharged on May 3, 2011 by employer because claimant failed to place a customer on the do no call list. Claimant logged the call and then was told that the caller's number should go to the do not call list. Claimant was having some anxiety problems that day and failed to properly disposition the call to a do not call list. Claimant had no final warnings on her record. Claimant did not intentionally improperly disposition the call. Claimant was informed that to improperly disposition do not calls could result in discharge.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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.

871 IAC 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.

871 IAC 24.32(4) provides:

(4) Report required. The claimant's statement and the 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.

The gravity of the incident, number of policy violations, and prior warnings are factors considered when analyzing misconduct. The lack of a current warning may detract from a finding of an intentional policy violation.

In this matter, the evidence fails to establish that claimant was discharged for an act of misconduct when claimant violated employer's policy concerning the do not call list. Claimant was not warned concerning this policy.

The last incident, which brought about the discharge, fails to constitute misconduct, because the failure to properly disposition a call was not intentional conduct on the part of claimant. This is a mistake that, at its worst, is negligence. This is neither an intentional act nor carelessness of a

high degree. Claimant's anxiety weights toward a finding of negligence. The administrative law judge holds that claimant was not discharged for an act of misconduct and, as such, is not disqualified for the receipt of unemployment insurance benefits.

DECISION:

The decision of the representative dated May 24, 2011, reference 01, is affirmed. Claimant is eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits, provided claimant meets all other eligibility requirements.

_____
Marlon Mormann
Administrative Law Judge

_____
Decision Dated and Mailed

mdm/kjw