



DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY
Reemployment Assistance Appeals
MSC 350WD 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 asistè ou gratis, nou gendwa rélé 1-800-204-2418. Sil vou plè pa pràn àmpil tòn, paské tòn limité pou ou ranpli apèl la.

SSN: XXX-XX-2320
Docket No. 2013-17128U

Employer Account No.: 9975350
Jurisdiction: §443.151(4)(a)&(b) Florida Statutes

CLAIMANT/Appellee

NADIA RODRIGUEZ
1087 SW 150TH PL
MIAMI FL 33194

EMPLOYER/Appellant

MIAMI DADE COUNTY
CO MIAMI DADE COUNTY HUMAN RE
111 NW 1ST ST STE 2140
MIAMI FL 33128-1932

APPEARANCES: CLAIMANT & EMPLOYER

LOCAL OFFICE #: 3678-0

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.

Findings of Fact: The claimant was employed with the employer from June 4, 2012 through January 9, 2013. She was hired to work full time as an assistant site manager. Prior to beginning her full time permanent employment with the employer, the claimant worked for the business starting in July 2010, through a temporary employment agency. She was then hired to become a permanent employee. At the time that she became an employee of the employer, the claimant was advised that she would be on a one-year probationary period.

The claimant was responsible for handling the work orders and distributing the work orders to the employees. She was also required to fill out and complete a weekly maintenance log report. The claimant did not have direct training for the job and tried to perform the work to the best of her ability. The regional manager was dissatisfied with the quantity and quality of the claimant's work. They talked daily about the work and what was required. The regional manager told the claimant that she did not like the way that the claimant handled the work orders. The claimant advised the regional manager to teach her how she wanted her to do the work or to give her some written instructions. The regional manager did not train the claimant or provide written instructions. Throughout her employment, the regional manager sent the claimant numerous emails. Email was the main way that the regional manager communicated with the claimant. The claimant responded to the emails via email. On one occasion, the regional manager told the claimant to stop the email and to come to her office and talk with her. The claimant questioned this because email had always been used. The regional manager considered this disrespectful. On another occasion, the claimant was busy with the work orders. The regional manager told the claimant to make a delivery downtown. There was a courier that handled deliveries for the