

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

---

**DERECK G FISHER**  
Claimant

**DAVENPORT COUNTRY CLUB**  
Employer

**APPEAL NO. 14A-UI-06826-B2T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**OC: 06/01/14**  
**Claimant: Appellant (1)**

---

Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Claimant filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated June 25, 2014, reference 01, which held claimant ineligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a hearing was scheduled for and held on July 23, 2014. Claimant participated personally. Employer participated by Alex Foradori. Employer's Exhibits 1-2 were 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 considered all of the evidence in the record, finds: Claimant last worked for employer on June 4, 2014. Employer discharged claimant on June 4, 2014 because claimant was not willing to accept an action plan that was created for him by employer.

On or around May 3, 2014, claimant received a Performance Action Plan. Over the next month, claimant had stated that he had not looked at the nine-page document created for him. The action plan was created to try and line up restaurant manager duties with the tasks actually performed by claimant.

On June 3, 2014, claimant met with employer. Claimant stated that he had not read the action plan, would not read it, and was not going to follow that plan. Claimant stated that he knew what his job was, and he would continue to do what he believed his job was, to the best of his abilities. Employer saw claimant's refusal as insubordination and terminated claimant.

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

Iowa Code § 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.

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.

This definition has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. *Huntoon v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(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 established that claimant was discharged for an act of misconduct when claimant violated employer's policy concerning insubordination. Claimant was warned concerning this policy. Claimant was given the

opportunity to change his duties and responsibilities such that they lined up with the duties required of a restaurant manager.

The last incident, which brought about the discharge, constitutes misconduct because claimant stated that he had not read the action plan, and that he would not follow the guidance and procedures laid out by his superiors. The administrative law judge holds that claimant was discharged for an act of misconduct and, as such, is disqualified for the receipt of unemployment insurance benefits.

**DECISION:**

The decision of the representative dated June 25, 2014, reference 01, is affirmed. Unemployment insurance benefits shall be withheld until claimant has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times claimant's weekly benefit amount, provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

---

Blair A. Bennett  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

bab/css