

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

JAY D KELLER
1109 W 8TH ST
CEDAR FALLS IA 50613-2443

HCM INC
c/o TALX UC EXPRESS
PO BOX 283
ST LOUIS MO 63166-0283

Appeal Number: 06A-UI-06159-SWT
OC: 05/14/06 R: 03
Claimant: Respondent (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

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated June 8, 2006, reference 04, that concluded the claimant's discharge was not for work-connected misconduct. A telephone hearing was held on July 6, 2006. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. The claimant participated in the hearing. Maggie Austin participated in the hearing on behalf of the employer with a witness, Sandy Davies. Exhibits One through Three were admitted into evidence at the hearing.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The claimant worked full-time for the employer as a registered nurse from January 13, 2006 to April 27, 2006. The claimant was informed and understood that under the employer's work rules, employees who failed to follow departmental procedures were subject to discipline.

The claimant was scheduled to work from 2:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. on April 11, 2006. Because of staffing problems, the claimant was required to work an additional shift from 10:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. During the course of the shift, the claimant neglected to administer medication to several of the residents as ordered on the residents' medication administration record. Fatigue and problems relating to an injured nursing assistant contributed to this incident. The claimant did not deliberately fail to administer the medication. On April 14, the employer suspended the claimant for three days as a result of this incident.

On April 26, 2006, the claimant was responsible for passing medication to residents. He carelessly gave the medication to the wrong resident. He was harried by a resident who insisted she receive one of her pills separately than the others and failed to stay in the dining room to receive her medication. He promptly recognized his medication error and properly reported the medication error to the doctor and the resident's family.

The employer discharged the claimant on April 27, 2006 for making a medication error on April 26, after he had been warned about similar conduct on April 14.

The employer's account is not presently chargeable for benefits paid to the claimant since it is not a base period employer on the claim.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue in this case is whether the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law.

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 to prove the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The propriety of a discharge is not at issue in an unemployment insurance case. An employer may be justified in discharging an employee, but the employee's conduct may not amount to misconduct precluding the payment of unemployment compensation. The law limits disqualifying misconduct to substantial and willful wrongdoing or repeated carelessness or negligence that equals willful misconduct in culpability. Lee v. Employment Appeal Board, 616 N.W.2d 661, 665 (Iowa 2000).

While the employer may have been justified in discharging the claimant, work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law has not been established. No willful or substantial misconduct has been proven in this case. The evidence falls short of proof of negligence so recurrent that it equals willful misconduct in culpability, which would require conduct amounting to recklessness, which has not been proven here.

The employer's account is not presently chargeable for benefits paid to the claimant since it is not a base period employer on the claim. If the employer becomes a base period employer in a future benefit year, its account may be chargeable for benefits paid to the claimant based on this separation from employment.

DECISION:

The unemployment insurance decision dated June 8, 2006, reference 04, is affirmed. The claimant is qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits, if he is otherwise eligible.

saw/cs