

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**RAYMOND S CRAMER**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 06A-UI-11093-CT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**PELLA CORPORATION**  
Employer

**OC: 10/15/06 R: 01**  
**Claimant: Respondent (2)**

Section 96.5(1) – Voluntary Quit  
Section 96.3(7) – Recovery of Overpayments

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Pella Corporation filed an appeal from a representative's decision dated November 8, 2006, reference 01, which held that no disqualification would be imposed regarding Raymond Cramer's separation from employment. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone on December 4, 2006. The employer participated by Diane Carpenter, Human Resources Representative, and Mark Hunke, Engineering Manager. The employer was represented by Richard Carter of TALX Corporation. Mr. Cramer did not respond to the notice of hearing.

**ISSUE:**

At issue in this matter is whether Mr. Cramer was separated from employment for any disqualifying reason.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having heard the testimony of the witnesses and having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Mr. Cramer was employed by Pella Corporation from August 8, 2005 until October 17, 2006. He was employed full-time as paint project engineer. On the morning of October 17 he went to speak to his supervisor, Mark Hunke, but he was on the phone. When Mr. Hunke interrupted his call to ask what he needed, Mr. Cramer placed his badge and a piece of paper on the desk and announced he was quitting. The paper he left consisted of a picture of his desk with books open on the surface. Mr. Hunke was not able to talk to him at that time. After he completed his call, he paged Mr. Cramer but there was no response as Mr. Cramer had left the building. Mr. Hunke called him at home later that day and asked him to come in the following morning to discuss his decision to quit.

On October 18, the employer met with Mr. Cramer to determine why he left the employment. He indicated he felt there was a lack of efficiency on the paint line and a lack of accountability on the part of those who managed the paint line. He also indicated he was frustrated over attempts on his part to implement a scrap-handling system and the fact that the test booth project was taking over a year to complete. Mr. Cramer was also frustrated over what he felt

were constant changes in management. He had not previously discussed any of the above complaints with the employer. His decision to leave on October 17 was prompted by the fact that he again found his desk in disarray.

Mr. Cramer shared an office with one other individual, a quality technician. Each had their own desk. Others sometimes worked in the office performing quality audits. On the morning of October 17, Mr. Cramer found open books that were not his on his desk. He had complained about others using his desk on at least two prior occasions. The employer was in the process of locating a private office for him. Mr. Cramer had been made aware of this fact at least one week before his separation. At the conclusion of the meeting on October 18, the employer advised Mr. Cramer that his concerns would be considered and he would be contacted. The employer later notified him that his resignation was accepted. Continued work would have been available if he had not quit.

Mr. Cramer filed a claim for job insurance benefits effective October 15, 2006. He has received a total of \$1,670.00 in benefits since filing his claim.

#### **REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

Mr. Cramer voluntarily quit his employment with Pella Corporation. An individual who voluntarily quits employment is disqualified from receiving job insurance benefits unless the quit was for good cause attributable to the employer. Iowa Code section 96.5(1). Mr. Cramer quit on October 17 because others had again used his desk and left materials out. He knew the employer was addressing the issue by seeking a private office for him. Inasmuch as the employer was making a good-faith effort to resolve the issue of his work space, the fact that others were using his desk on October 17 did not constitute good cause attributable to the employer for quitting.

The remaining issues identified by Mr. Cramer on October 18 concerned how the employer's operation was managed. He did not participate in the hearing to explain how the management issues contributed to his decision to quit. The fact that he did not like the way the operation was managed did not, in and of itself, constitute good cause for quitting. He did not establish how his management concerns adversely effected his ability to work for Pella Corporation. Moreover, he never put the employer on notice that his concerns were such that he would quit if they were not resolved.

For the reasons stated herein, the administrative law judge concludes that Mr. Cramer voluntarily quit his employment for no good cause attributable to the employer. Accordingly, benefits are denied. Mr. Cramer has received benefits since filing his claim. Based on the decision herein, the benefits received now constitute an overpayment and must be repaid. Iowa Code section 96.3(7).

#### **DECISION:**

The representative's decision dated November 8, 2006, reference 01, is hereby reversed. Mr. Cramer voluntarily quit his employment for no good cause attributable to the employer.

Benefits are withheld until such time as he has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly job insurance benefit amount, provided he satisfies all other conditions of eligibility. Mr. Cramer has been overpaid \$1,670.00 in job insurance benefits.

---

Carolyn F. Coleman  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

cfc/css