

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

AMBER L ONKEN  
228 FOURTH AVE  
THOMPSON IA 50473

WINNEBAGO INDUSTRIES  
PO BOX 152  
FOREST CITY IA 50436-0152

Appeal Number: 04A-UI-10173-S2T  
OC: 12/21/03 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, 4<sup>th</sup> 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:

Amber Onken (claimant) appealed a representative's September 17, 2004 decision (reference 02) that concluded she was not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because she was discharged from work with Winnebago Industries (employer) for failure to follow instructions in the performance of her work. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on October 12, 2004. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated by Gary McCarthy, Personnel Supervisor; Bob Nordman, Plant Manager; and Jim Teachout, Production Supervisor. 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 November 18, 2004, as a full-time production assembler. The claimant received warnings for failure to follow instructions on May 21, July 11, 2003, and March 3, 2004. On August 23, 2004, the claimant returned to work after maternity leave. She told the employer she thought she knew how to perform the functions of her job. The claimant glanced at the operating procedure posted but did not follow the directions. She opened a large fill valve which brought too much fresh water into the system. The caustic liquid spilled out on the floor and came close to entering the city's sewer system. It cost the employer approximately \$10,000.00 to clean the spill. The employer placed the claimant on suspension on August 23, 2004, and terminated her on August 30, 2004.

#### REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). Repeated failure to follow an employer's instructions in the performance of duties is misconduct. Gilliam v. Atlantic Bottling Company, 453 N.W.2d 230 (Iowa App. 1990). Negligence does not constitute misconduct unless recurrent in nature; a single act is not disqualifying unless indicative of a deliberate disregard of the employer's interests. Henry v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 391 N.W.2d 731 (Iowa App. 1986). An employer has a right to expect employees to follow instructions in the performance of their work. The claimant disregarded the employer's right by failing to follow instructions after repeated warnings. The claimant's disregard of the employer's interests is misconduct. As such she is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits.

DECISION:

The representative's September 17, 2004 decision (reference 02) is affirmed. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because she was discharged from work for misconduct. Benefits are withheld until she has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount provided she is otherwise eligible.

bas/s