

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Section
1000 East Grand—Des Moines, Iowa 50319
DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
68-0157 (7-97) – 3091078 - EI**

**LEROY J DIETZ
774 BARNABY PL
WHEELING IL 60090-2611**

**ELMWOOD COUNTRY CLUB
1734 COUNTRY CLUB LN
MARSHALLTOWN IA 50158-3878**

**Appeal Number: 06A-UI-02172-S2T
OC: 01/22/06 R: 02
Claimant: Appellant (1)**

This Decision Shall Become Final, unless within fifteen (15) days from the date below, you or any interested party appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by submitting either a signed letter or a signed written Notice of Appeal, directly to the **Employment Appeal Board, 4th Floor—Lucas Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319**.

The appeal period will be extended to the next business day if the last day to appeal falls on a weekend or a legal holiday.

STATE CLEARLY

1. The name, address and social security number of the claimant.
2. A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken.
3. That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.
4. The grounds upon which such appeal is based.

YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in this appeal or you may obtain a lawyer or other interested party to do so provided there is no expense to Workforce Development. If you wish to be represented by a lawyer, you may obtain the services of either a private attorney or one whose services are paid for with public funds. It is important that you file your claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

(Administrative Law Judge)

(Decision Dated & Mailed)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

LeRoy Dietz (claimant) appealed a representative's February 9, 2006 decision (reference 01) that concluded he was not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because he was discharged from work with Elmwood Country Club (employer) for failure to follow instructions in the performance of his job. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on March 13, 2006. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated by John Haney, Past President of Board of Directors, and Peter Bjorkman, Vice President of Board of Directors. The employer offered one exhibit which was marked for identification as Exhibit One. Exhibit One was received into evidence.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was hired on September 1, 2004, as a full-time club manager. Within a year after the claimant was hired the employer became aware that the claimant did not have an understanding of the employer's budget and available funds. On June 17, 2005, the employer placed the claimant on a probationary agreement which laid out specific tasks with which the claimant was to comply by September 17, 2005.

In September 2005, the employer discovered the claimant had not complied with the agreement. The employer agreed to extend the probationary agreement and evaluate on a monthly basis. The employer warned the claimant that further failure to comply could result in his termination from employment. On January 9, 2006, the claimant had completed only 2 of 15 tasks. The employer terminated the claimant on January 9, 2006.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue is whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct. For the following reasons the administrative law judge concludes he was.

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.

This definition has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. Huntoon v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

Poor work performance is not misconduct in the absence of evidence of intent. Miller v. Employment Appeal Board, 423 N.W.2d 211 (Iowa App. 1988). The employer discharged the claimant for poor work performance and has the burden of proof to show evidence of intent. The employer provided evidence of intent at the hearing. The claimant's poor work performance was a result of disagreement with the employer regarding management of the business. Consequently, the employer has met its burden of proof to show misconduct. Benefits are denied.

DECISION:

The representative's February 9, 2006 decision (reference 01) is affirmed. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because he was discharged from work for misconduct. Benefits are withheld until he has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible.

bas/kkf