STATE OF FLORIDA
REEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE APPEALS COMMISSION

In the matter of:

Claimant/Appellee

R.A.A.C. Order No. 13-09166

vs.

Referee Decision No. 0003722484-03U

Employer/Appellant

ORDER OF REEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE APPEALS COMMISSION

I.
Introduction

This case comes before the Commission for disposition, pursuant to Section 443.151(4)(c), Florida Statutes, of an appeal of the decision of a reemployment assistance appeals referee.

By law, the Commission's review is limited to those matters that were presented to the referee and are contained in the official record. A decision of an appeals referee cannot be overturned by the Commission if the referee's material findings are supported by competent, substantial evidence and the decision comports with the legal standards established by the Florida Legislature. The Commission cannot reweigh the evidence or consider additional evidence that a party could have reasonably been expected to present to the referee during the hearing. Additionally, it is the responsibility of the appeals referee to judge the credibility of the witnesses and to resolve conflicts in evidence, including testimonial evidence. Absent extraordinary circumstances, the Commission cannot substitute its judgment and overturn a referee's conflict resolution.

II.
The Proceedings Below

The employer has appealed a decision on the merits entered on November 5, 2013, in which the appeals referee held the claimant not disqualified from receipt of benefits because she was discharged, but misconduct was not proven. *See* §443.101(1)(a), Fla. Stat. The referee conducted an evidentiary hearing on November 1, 2013. The claimant appeared pro se and presented no witnesses. The employer was represented by a third-party representative and presented its operations unit manager as a witness.

Based on the evidence presented at the hearing, the referee made the following findings of fact:

> The claimant worked for the employer from August 1, 2011, until August 9, 2013, as a senior lead operations specialist. The employer has a policy requiring employees to meet certain production goals. Employees are required to process 6.13 loans per hour. The claimant was aware of the requirements. On March 4, 2013, the employer gave the claimant a written warning for failing to meet her production goals. The claimant's results for 2012 were as follows:
>
> - January 2012: 4.55
> - February 2012: 4.65
> - March 2012: 3.60
> - April 2012: 5.17
> - May 2012: 5.22
> - June 2012: 4.45
> - July 2012: 5.19
> - August 2012: not included – all employees were having problems meeting their production goals during this month, so the employer did not count this month against the claimant or any employee.
> - September 2012: 4.62
> - October 2012: 3.11
> - November 2012: 4.36
> - December 2012: 5.35

> The claimant was having difficulty moving fast and being accurate. The claimant's supervisor took away some components in the claimant's loans to assist the claimant in meeting her goals. The claimant also requested additional training, which the claimant's supervisor provided for the claimant. The claimant's results in 2013 were as follows:
>
> - January 2013: 4.32
> - February 2013: 4.47
> - March 2013: 6.33
> - April 2013: 6.01
> - May 2013: 6.26
> - June 2013: 5.68
> - July 2013: 5.97
>
> The claimant met her goals in March 2013 and May 2013 because her supervisor gave her loans with no checks to process to help her meet her goals. The claimant was still unable to meet her goals when she was given loans with checks. The claimant performed her job to the best of her ability. On August 9, 2013, the employer discharged the claimant for failing to meet her required production goals.

The Commission has conducted a thorough review of the evidentiary record and finds that competent, substantial evidence supports the referee's findings of fact. Accordingly, the referee's findings are adopted in this order.

The referee also reached the following material conclusions of law:

> In cases of discharge, the burden is on the employer to establish the discharge was for misconduct connected with work. The employer did not meet the burden of proof. The employer did not show the claimant's performance was a conscious disregard of the employer's interests or a deliberate disregard of the reasonable standards of behavior which the employer expected of her. The claimant performed her job to the best of her ability. The employer also failed to show the claimant's performance was careless or negligent to a degree [or] recurrence that manifested culpability and wrongful intent and showed an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interest. While inefficiency or substandard performance due to inability is not misconduct, refusal to apply oneself, when able, can evidence an intentional

> and substantial disregard of the employer's interests. *Rycraft v. United Technologies*, 449 So. 2d 382 (Fla. 4th DCA 1984). The claimant did not refuse to apply herself and the claimant was not reckless in the performance of her job. Further, the employer showed the claimant was aware of the employer's rule regarding performance requirements; the claimant testified she was aware of the rule. However, the employer did not show the claimant [willfully] or deliberately violated the rule. Therefore, the behavior of the claimant, as described by the claimant, did not meet the statutory definition of misconduct. The claimant is thus not subject to disqualification.
>
> The employer contended the claimant skipped necessary steps when processing her loans. However, the employer did not show when or if the claimant actually skipped necessary steps. Also, the employer did not show if the claimant had skipped necessary steps, it was deliberate or willful. The employer also contended the claimant gave up because she could not meet her goals. However, the employer did not show the claimant gave up. In June 2013 and July 2013 the claimant's results were much higher than January 2013 and February 2013. If the claimant had given up, it is reasonable to assume her results would have been lower. Therefore, the employer's contentions are respectfully rejected.

Based on these findings and conclusions, the referee held the claimant not disqualified from receipt of benefits. The employer filed a timely request for review.

III.
Issues on Appeal

On appeal to the Commission, the employer has specified no particular error on the part of the referee. The referee's decision stated that a request for review should specify any and all allegations of error with respect to the referee's decision, and that allegations of error not specifically set forth in the request for review may be considered waived. However, the Commission reviews appealed decisions to ensure that the factual findings are supported and that the legal conclusions are correct applications of the law to the facts of the case. The primary issue presented by this appeal is whether subparagraph (e) of Section 443.036(30), Florida Statutes,

is applicable where an employee is discharged for nothing more than not meeting her employer's productivity goals. We also consider whether the referee properly concluded that the employer failed to establish a violation of subparagraph (a) of Section 443.036(30), Florida Statutes, due to alleged willful failure to perform.

IV.
Analysis

The referee found that the claimant performed her job to the best of her ability yet still fell short of the employer's productivity goals and, consequently, was discharged. The referee concluded that the claimant violated the employer's rule but, since her violation was not willful or deliberate, misconduct was not proven under Section 443.036(30)(e), Florida Statutes. Subparagraph (e) provides that misconduct includes:

> (e)1. A violation of an employer's rule, unless the claimant can demonstrate that:
> a. He or she did not know, and could not reasonably know, of the rule's requirements;
> b. The rule is not lawful or not reasonably related to the job environment and performance; or
> c. The rule is not fairly or consistently enforced.
> 2. Such conduct may include, but is not limited to, committing criminal assault or battery on another employee, or on a customer or invitee of the employer; or committing abuse or neglect of a patient, resident, disabled person, elderly person, or child in her or his professional care.

Contrary to the referee's conclusions of law, subparagraph (e) contains no requirement that an employee's violation of a rule be willful or deliberate. However, that error is harmless in light of the fact that the referee also erred in determining the claimant violated the employer's "rule."

The record reflects the employer discharged the claimant because she did not meet "departmental goals"; in particular, she did not meet the goal of processing 6.13 loans per production hour worked. The referee erred in characterizing the employer's performance goal as a "rule." Subparagraph (e) of the definition of misconduct was added to the reemployment assistance law in 2011. *See* Section 3, Chapter 2011-235, Laws of Florida. The word "rule" was not defined. The statutory

amendment was modeled after Mississippi Department of Employment Security Regulation 308.00.A.1.a., CMSR 38-000-06 (2010).[1] However, the word "rule" is also not defined in the Mississippi regulations. Thus, the Commission is left with the task of interpreting the meaning of the word "rule" in appropriate cases.

"Rule" is defined as "a prescribed guide for conduct or action." *See Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary*, http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/rule. The legislative analysis for the 2011 statutory amendment that created subparagraph (e), refers to the provision as one addressing "employee behavior." *See* Final Bill Analysis, Bill # CS/CS/HB 7005, p.10. A rule, therefore, directs an employee to act or behave in a particular manner or to refrain from acting or behaving in a particular manner. This definition is consistent with guidance from the United States Department of Labor, which establishes the guidelines within which state unemployment insurance programs operate, recognizing misconduct as "an intentional or controllable act or failure to take action, which shows a deliberate disregard of the employer's interests." *See When Can Benefits Be Denied*, http://ows.doleta.gov/unemploy/content/denialinformation.asp.

The legislative analysis of the word "rule" as relating to employee behavior is also consistent with the common understanding of "work rules" in labor and employment law. The term is often used to describe behavioral expectations such as disciplinary rules; attendance, leave and timekeeping policies; safety and security policies; policies for protection of finances or property; and other standards of importance and significance designed to direct employee behavior. Thus, some operational policies, such as work procedures, may not be "rules." *See*, *e.g.*, R.A.A.C. Order No. 13-05379 (November 5, 2013).

The claimant in this case failed to meet production goals. A goal is the end toward which effort is directed. *See Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary,* http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/goal. While certain acts or behaviors may make the realization of a goal more likely, the goal itself does not dictate those acts or behaviors, thus distinguishing it from a rule. A performance goal or standard such as the one in this case ultimately measures the quality or quantity of performance, rather than the failure of an employee to abide by behavioral expectations. Holding such a goal or standard to be equivalent to a rule would have

---

[1] *See Unemployment Insurance Regulations*, The Mississippi Department of Employment Security, p. 16, available at http://mdes.ms.gov/media/9837/RegulationsDecember2010.pdf. This regulation provides that "misconduct shall be defined as including but not limited to: 1. The failure to obey orders, rules or instructions, or failure to discharge the duties for which an individual was employed; a. An individual found guilty of employee misconduct for the violation of an employer rule only under the following conditions: i. the employee knew or should have known of the rule; ii. the rule was lawful and reasonably related to the job environment and performance; and iii. the rule is fairly and consistently enforced."

the effect of abrogating the longstanding doctrine under Florida law that the failure of an employee to meet an employer's performance expectations, despite good faith efforts to do so, is not misconduct. *See*, *e.g.*, *Pereira v. Unemployment Appeals Commission*, 745 So. 2d 573 (Fla. 5th DCA 1999); *Doyle v. Unemployment Appeals Commission*, 635 So. 2d 1028, 1031 (Fla. 2d DCA 1994). Our review of the legislative history of the 2011 amendments, as well as the Mississippi regulations it derives from, gives us no reason to believe the Florida Legislature intended such a sweeping change in the law. Furthermore, such a change would have made irrelevant, at least in some cases, the retained language of Section 443.131(3)(a)2., Florida Statutes, which reflects that benefits will be paid, but the employer relieved of charges to its employment record, for an individual discharged for unsatisfactory performance within an initial employment probationary period.

For these reasons, we conclude that a performance/productivity standard of the type at issue in this case is not a "rule" within the meaning of the reemployment assistance law and, therefore, subparagraph (e) is not applicable in this case.

We recognize that the employer in this case also contended the claimant failed to act or behave as prescribed by skipping necessary steps in her work and giving up; however, the referee found the employer's evidence did not establish those contentions. We conclude that the referee's findings were based on a reasonable interpretation of the competent, substantial evidence. We specifically approve of the referee's conclusion that, given the claimant's *increased* production results towards the end of her employment, the evidence did not support a conclusion that the claimant had "given up," even if the increased results were aided by case selection. Thus, the referee properly held that the employer failed to establish misconduct under the "deliberate failure to perform" doctrine of *Rycraft v. United Technologies*, 449 So. 2d 382 (Fla. 4th DCA 1984).

V.
Conclusion

We find no error in the referee's ultimate conclusion in this case that the employer did not prove the claimant was discharged for misconduct as defined by statute and, therefore, she is not disqualified from receipt of benefits.

The referee's decision is affirmed.

REEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE APPEALS COMMISSION

Frank E. Brown, Chairman
Thomas D. Epsky, Member
Joseph D. Finnegan, Member

This is to certify that on

7/24/2014 ,

the above Order was filed in the office of the Clerk of the Reemployment Assistance Appeals Commission, and a copy mailed to the last known address of each interested party.

By: Juanita Williams
Deputy Clerk

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY
Reemployment Assistance Appeals
MSC 347 CALDWELL BUILDING
107 EAST MADISON STREET
TALLAHASSEE FL 32399-4143

IMPORTANT:	For free translation assistance, you may call 1-800-204-2418. Please do not delay, as there is a limited time to appeal.
IMPORTANTE:	Para recibir ayuda gratuita con traducciones, puede llamar al 1-800-204-2418. Por favor hágalo lo antes posible, ya que el tiempo para apelar es limitado.
ENPÒTAN:	Pou yon intèpret asisté ou gratis, nou gendwa rélé 1-800-204-2418. Sil vou plè pa pràn àmpil tàn, paské tàn limité pou ou ranpli apèl la.

Docket No. **0003722484-02** Jurisdiction: §443.151(4)(a)&(b) Florida Statutes

CLAIMANT/Appellee **EMPLOYER/Appellant**

APPEARANCES: CLAIMANT & EMPLOYER

DECISION OF APPEALS REFEREE

Important appeal rights are explained at the end of this decision.
Derechos de apelación importantes son explicados al final de esta decisión.
Yo eksplike kèk dwa dapèl enpòtan lan fen desizyon sa a.

Issues Involved:
SEPARATION: Whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct connected with work or voluntarily left work without good cause as defined in the statute, pursuant to Sections 443.101(1), (9), (10), (11); 443.036(30), Florida Statutes; Rule 73B-11.020, Florida Administrative Code.

CHARGES TO EMPLOYER'S EMPLOYMENT RECORD: Whether benefit payments made to the claimant will be charged to the employment record of the employer, pursuant to Sections 443.101(9); 443.131(3)(a), Florida Statutes; Rules 73B-10.026; 11.018, Florida Administrative Code. (If charges are not at issue on the current claim, the hearing may determine charges on a subsequent claim.)

Findings of Fact: The claimant worked for the employer from August 1, 2011, until August 9, 2013, as a senior lead operations specialist. The employer has a policy requiring employees to meet certain production goals. Employees are required to process 6.13 loans per hour. The claimant was aware of the requirements. On March 4, 2013, the employer gave the claimant a written warning for failing to meet her production goals. The claimant's results for 2012 were as follows:

- January 2012: 4.55
- February 2012: 4.65
- March 2012: 3.60
- April 2012: 5.17

- May 2012: 5.22
- June 2012: 4.45
- July 2012: 5.19
- August 2012: not included – all employees were having problems meeting their production goals during this month, so the employer did not count this month against the claimant or any employee.
- September 2012: 4.62
- October 2012: 3.11
- November 2012: 4.36
- December 2012: 5.35.

The claimant was having difficulty moving fast and being accurate. The claimant's supervisor took away some components in the claimant's loans to assist the claimant in meeting her goals. The claimant also requested additional training, which the claimant's supervisor provided for the claimant. The claimant's results in 2013 were as follows:

- January 2013: 4.32
- February 2013: 4.47
- March 2013: 6.33
- April 2013: 6.01
- May 2013: 6.26
- June 2013: 5.68
- July 2013: 5.97

The claimant met her goals in March 2013, and May 2013, because her supervisor gave her loans with no checks to process to help her meet her goals. The claimant was still unable to meet her goals when she was given loans with checks. The claimant performed her job to the best of her ability. On August 9, 2013, the employer discharged the claimant for failing to meet her required production goals.

Conclusions of Law: As of May 17, 2013, the Reemployment Assistance Law of Florida defines misconduct connected with work as, but is not

limited to, the following, which may not be construed in pari materia with each other:

(a) Conduct demonstrating conscious disregard of an employer's interests and found to be a deliberate violation or disregard of the reasonable standards of behavior which the employer expects of his or her employee. Such conduct may include, but is not limited to, willful damage to an employer's property that results in damage of more than $50; theft of employer property or property of a customer or invitee of the employer.

(b) Carelessness or negligence to a degree or recurrence that manifests culpability, or wrongful intent, or shows an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interest or of the employee's duties and obligations to his or her employer.

(c) Chronic absenteeism or tardiness in deliberate violation of a known policy of the employer or one or more unapproved absences following a written reprimand or warning relating to more than one unapproved absence.

(d) A willful and deliberate violation of a standard or regulation of this state by an employee of an employer licensed or certified by this state, which violation would cause the employer to be sanctioned or have its license or certification suspended by this state.

(e) 1. A violation of an employer's rule, unless the claimant can demonstrate that:

a. He or she did not know, and could not reasonably know, of the rule's requirements;
b The rule is not lawful or not reasonably related to the job environment and performance; or
c. The rule is not fairly or consistently enforced.

2. Such conduct may include, but is not limited to, committing criminal assault or battery on another employee, or on a customer or invitee of the employer; or committing abuse or neglect of a patient, resident, disabled person, elderly person, or child in her or his professional care.

In cases of discharge, the burden is on the employer to establish the discharge was for misconduct connected with work. The employer did not meet the burden of proof. The employer did not show the claimant's performance was a conscious disregard of the employer's interests or a deliberate disregard of the reasonable standards of behavior which the employer expected of her. The claimant performed her job to the best of her ability. The employer also failed to show the claimant's performance was careless or negligent to a degree and recurrence that manifested culpability and wrongful intent and showed an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interest. While inefficiency or substandard performance due to inability is not misconduct, refusal to apply oneself, when able, can evidence an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interests. Rycraft v. United Technologies, 449 So.2d 382 (Fla. 4th DCA 1984). The claimant did not refuse to apply herself and the claimant was not reckless in the performance of her job. Further, the employer showed the claimant was aware of the employer's rule regarding performance requirements; the claimant testified she was aware of the rule. However, the employer did not show the claimant wilfully or deliberately violated the rule. Therefore, the behavior of the claimant, as described by the claimant, did not meet the statutory definition of misconduct. The claimant is thus not subject to disqualification.

The hearing officer was presented with conflicting testimony regarding material issues of fact and is charged with resolving these conflicts. The Reemployment Assistance Appeals Commission set forth factors to be considered in resolving credibility questions. These include the witness' opportunity and capacity to observe the event or act in question; any prior inconsistent statement by the witness; witness bias or lack of bias; the contradiction of the witness' version of events by other evidence or its

consistency with other evidence; the inherent improbability of the witness' version of events; and the witness' demeanor. Upon considering these factors, the hearing officer finds the testimony of the claimant to be more credible. Therefore, material conflicts in the evidence are resolved in favor of the claimant.

The employer contended the claimant skipped necessary steps when processing her loans. However, the employer did not show when or if the claimant actually skipped necessary steps. Also, the employer did not show if the claimant had skipped necessary steps, it was deliberate or willful. The employer also contended the claimant gave up because she could not meet her goals. However, the employer did not show the claimant gave up. In June 2013, and July 2013, the claimant's results were much higher than January 2013, and February 2013. If the claimant had given up, it is reasonable to assume her results would have been lower. Therefore, the employer's contentions are respectfully rejected.

The claimant contended the employer discharged her because of her FMLA issues. However, the claimant provided no proof whatsoever to show the employer discharged her for any other reason except performance. Therefore, the claimant's contention is respectfully rejected.

Decision: The determination dated September 9, 2013, qualifying the claimant and charging the employer's account is affirmed.

If this decision disqualifies and/or holds the claimant ineligible for benefits already received, the claimant will be required to repay those benefits. The specific amount of any overpayment will be calculated by the department and set forth in a separate overpayment determination, unless specified in this decision. However, the time to request review of this decision is as shown above and is not stopped, delayed or extended by any other determination, decision or order.

This is to certify that a copy of the above decision was mailed to the last

D JONES
Appeals Referee

known address of each interested party on November 5, 2013.

By: K. Martin
K MARTIN, Deputy Clerk

IMPORTANT - APPEAL RIGHTS: This decision will become final unless a written request for review or reopening is filed within 20 calendar days after the mailing date shown. If the 20th day is a Saturday, Sunday or holiday defined in F.A.C. 73B-21.004, filing may be made on the next day that is not a Saturday, Sunday or holiday. If this decision disqualifies and/or holds the claimant ineligible for benefits already received, the claimant will be required to repay those benefits. The specific amount of any overpayment will be calculated by the Department and set forth in a separate overpayment determination. However, the time to request review of this decision is as shown above and is not stopped, delayed or extended by any other determination, decision or order.

A party who did not attend the hearing for good cause may request reopening, including the reason for not attending, at www.connect.myflorida.com or by writing to the address at the top of this decision. The date the confirmation number is generated will be the filing date of a request for reopening on the Appeals Web Site.

A party who attended the hearing and received an adverse decision may file a request for review to the Reemployment Assistance Appeals Commission, Suite 101 Rhyne Building, 2740 Centerview Drive, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-4151; (Fax: 850-488-2123); **https://raaciap.floridajobs.org.** If mailed, the postmark date will be the filing date. If faxed, hand-delivered, delivered by courier service other than the United States Postal Service, or submitted via the Internet, the date of receipt will be the filing date. To avoid delay, include the docket number and claimant's social security number. A party requesting review should specify any and all allegations of error with respect to the referee's decision, and provide factual and/or legal support for these challenges. Allegations of error not specifically set forth in the request for review may be considered waived.

IMPORTANTE - DERECHOS DE APELACIÓN: Esta decisión pasará a ser final a menos que una solicitud por escrito para revisión o reapertura se registre dentro de 20 días de calendario después de la fecha marcada en que la decisión fue remitida por correo. Si el vigésimo (20) día es un sábado, un domingo o un feriado definidos en F.A.C. 73B-21.004, el registro de la solicitud se puede realizar en el día siguiente que no sea un sábado, un domingo o un feriado. Si esta decisión descalifica y/o declara al reclamante como inelegible para recibir beneficios que ya fueron recibidos por el reclamante, se le requerirá al reclamante rembolsar esos beneficios. La cantidad específica de cualquier sobrepago [*pago excesivo de beneficios*] será calculada por la Agencia y establecida en una determinación de pago excesivo de beneficios que será emitida por separado. Sin embargo, el límite de tiempo para solicitar la revisión de esta decisión es como se establece anteriormente y dicho límite no es detenido, demorado o extendido por ninguna otra determinación, decisión u orden.

Una parte que no asistió a la audiencia por una buena causa puede solicitar una reapertura, incluyendo la razón por no haber comparecido en la audiencia, en www.connect.myflorida.com o escribiendo a la dirección en la parte superior de esta decisión. La fecha en que se genera el número de confirmación será la fecha de registro de una solicitud de reapertura realizada en el Sitio Web de la Oficina de Apelaciones.

Una parte que asistió a la audiencia y recibió una decisión adversa puede registrar una solicitud de revisión con la Comisión de Apelaciones de Servicios de Reempleo; Reemployment Assistance Appeals Commission, Suite 101 Rhyne Building, 2740 Centerview Drive, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-4151; (Fax: 850-488-2123); **https://raaciap.floridajobs.org.** Si la solicitud es enviada por correo, la fecha del sello de la oficina de correos será la

fecha de registro de la solicitud. Si es enviada por telefax, entregada a mano, entregada por servicio de mensajería, con la excepción del Servicio Postal de Estados Unidos, o realizada vía el Internet, la fecha en la que se recibe la solicitud será la fecha de registro. Para evitar demora, incluya el número de expediente [*docket number*] y el número de seguro social del reclamante. Una parte que solicita una revisión debe especificar cualquiera y todos los alegatos de error con respecto a la decisión del árbitro, y proporcionar fundamentos reales y/o legales para substanciar éstos desafíos. Los alegatos de error que no se establezcan con especificidad en la solicitud de revisión pueden considerarse como renunciados.

ENPÒTAN – DWA DAPÈL: Desizyon sa a ap definitif sòf si ou depoze yon apèl nan yon delè 20 jou apre dat nou poste sa a ba ou. Si 20^{yèm} jou a se yon samdi, yon dimanch oswa yon jou konje, jan sa defini lan F.A.C. 73B-21.004, depo an kapab fèt jou aprè a, si se pa yon samdi, yon dimanch oswa yon jou konje. Si desizyon an diskalifye epi/oswa deklare moun k ap fè demann lan pa kalifye pou alokasyon li resevwa deja, moun k ap fè demann lan ap gen pou li remèt lajan li te resevwa a. Se Ajans lan k ap kalkile montan nenpòt ki peman anplis epi y ap detèmine sa lan yon desizyon separe. Sepandan, delè pou mande revizyon desizyon sa a se delè yo bay anwo a; Okenn lòt detèminasyon, desizyon oswa lòd pa ka rete, retade oubyen pwolonje dat sa a.

Yon pati ki te gen yon rezon valab pou li pat asiste seyans lan gen dwa mande pou yo ouvri ka a ankò; fòk yo bay rezon yo pat ka vini an epi fè demann nan sou sitwèb sa a, **www.connect.myflorida.com** oswa alekri nan adrès ki mansyone okomansman desizyon sa a. Dat yo pwodui nimewo konfimasyon an se va dat yo prezante demann nan pou reouvri kòz la sou Sitwèb Apèl la.

Yon pati ki te asiste odyans la epi li resevwa yon desizyon negatif kapab soumèt yon demann pou revizyon retounen travay Asistans Komisyon Apèl la, Suite 101 Rhyne Building, 2740 Centerview Drive, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-4151; (Faks: 850-488-2123); https://raaciap.floridajobs.org. Si poste a, dat tenm ap dat li ranpli aplikasyon. Si fakse, men yo-a delivre, lage pa sèvis mesaje lòt pase Etazini Sèvis nan Etazini Nimewo, oswa soumèt sou Entènèt la, dat yo te resevwa ap dat li ranpli aplikasyon. Pou evite reta, mete nimewo rejis la ak nimewo sosyal demandè a sekirite. Yon pati pou mande revizyon ta dwe presize nenpòt ak tout akizasyon nan erè ki gen rapò ak desizyon abit la, yo epi bay sipò reyèl ak / oswa legal pou defi sa yo. Alegasyon sou erè pa espesyalman tabli nan demann nan pou revizyon yo kapab konsidere yo egzante.