

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**KAREN K SCHELLE**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 10A-UI-13756-H2T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**OPPORTUNITY VILLAGE**  
Employer

**OC: 08-29-10**  
**Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge/Misconduct

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The employer filed a timely appeal from the September 30, 2010, reference 01, decision that allowed benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on November 8, 2010. The claimant did participate and was represented by Monty Fisher, Attorney at Law. The employer did participate through (representative) Kristin Baade, Community Support Services Coordinator; Linda Smith, Team Administrator and Tina Leonard; Personnel Specialist.

**ISSUE:**

Was the claimant discharged due to job related misconduct?

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed as an outcome specialist full time beginning September 1, 2007 through August 24, 2010 when she was discharged. As part of her job duties the claimant was required to put together the medication pill container for the clients she served. She took care of one particular client who took approximately eight different medications per day, some more than one time per day. She set up the weekly medication for the client for the week of July 18, through July 24 and inadvertently left one of the claimant's psychiatric medications out of his pill container. The claimant was on vacation that week and the client ended up going without one of his medications for one week. The missing medication was eventually found in another client's medication bag, locked in the medications cupboard. The written records accurately indicate that she did not include one of the client's psychiatric medications in his weekly medication set-up. The client was upset that the claimant was going to be on vacation and distracted the claimant while she was setting up his weekly medications. The parties all agree that the claimant did not intentionally set out to deprive the client of his medication, nor did she in any way intentionally leave it out of his medication set up. The claimant was disciplined in December 2007 for leaving a medication in the vehicle when she had to go to the hospital for treatment for her own illness.

## REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason.

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.

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.

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). The issue is not whether the employer made a correct decision in separating claimant, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. *Infante v. IDJS*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa App. 1984). What constitutes misconduct justifying termination of an employee and what misconduct warrants denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two separate decisions. *Pierce v. IDJS*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa App. 1988). Misconduct serious enough to warrant discharge is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. Such misconduct must be "substantial." When based on carelessness, the carelessness must actually indicate a "wrongful intent" to be disqualifying in nature. *Newman v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa App. 1984). 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).

In an at-will employment environment an employer may discharge an employee for any number of reasons or no reason at all if it is not contrary to public policy, but if it fails to meet its burden of proof to establish job related misconduct as the reason for the separation, employer incurs

potential liability for unemployment insurance benefits related to that separation. The conduct for which claimant was discharged was merely an isolated incident and inasmuch as employer had not previously warned claimant about any of the issues leading to the separation, it has not met the burden of proof to establish that claimant acted deliberately or with recurrent negligence in violation of company policy, procedure, or prior warning. An employee is entitled to fair warning that the employer will no longer tolerate certain performance and conduct. Without fair warning, an employee has no reasonable way of knowing that there are changes that need be made in order to preserve the employment. If an employer expects an employee to conform to certain expectations or face discharge, appropriate (preferably written), detailed, and reasonable notice should be given. Benefits are allowed.

**DECISION:**

The September 30, 2010 (reference 01) decision is affirmed. Claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

---

Teresa K. Hillary  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

tkh/pjs