

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

---

**JANA C KOVAR**  
Claimant

**PHYSICIANS' CLINIC OF IOWA PC**  
Employer

**APPEAL 20A-UI-11681-DG-T**  
**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**OC: 03/29/20**  
**Claimant: Appellant (1)**

---

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

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Claimant filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated September 14, 2020, (reference 03) that held claimant ineligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a hearing was scheduled for and held on November 10, 2020. Claimant participated personally. Employer participated by Amanda Frank, Human Resources Officer, and Dawn Baughman, Clinic Manager. The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative record.

**ISSUES:**

Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct?

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds: Claimant last worked for employer on July 13, 2020. Employer discharged claimant on July 13, 2020, because claimant made a medication error.

Claimant began working for employer on December 2, 2019 as a full-time phone triage clinical nurse. Claimant was given a copy of employer's rules and policies at the time of hire.

On July 10, 2020 claimant gave an incorrect medication order to a pharmacy. Claimant changed the medication order without consulting with the physician who drafted the order. Another employee noticed the change and reported the error to the employer.

Employer conducted an investigation beginning on July 11, 2020. Employer determined that claimant changed a doctor's medication order without the doctor's knowledge or approval which is against the employer's written policy.

Employer reviewed claimant's personnel file and noted that claimant had been warned for making medication and patient charting errors on prior occasions. Claimant received a verbal warning on June 29, 2020 for not properly documenting patient care. Claimant also received a written warning for documentation of patient care in the wrong patient charts on April 20, 2020.

Claimant was told that her employment was in jeopardy on that date. Claimant was also warned by employer for making multiple charting errors after she had recorded medical treatment for patients in the incorrect charts on January 10, 2020.

Claimant was informed that her employment was being terminated on July 13, 2020 for making medication and patient charting errors after being warned on multiple occasions.

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

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are denied.

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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(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 Dep't of Job Serv.*, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(4) provides:

(4) *Report required.* The claimant's statement and employer's statement must give detailed facts as to the specific reason for the claimant's discharge. Allegations of misconduct or dishonesty without additional evidence shall not be sufficient to result in disqualification. If the employer is unwilling to furnish available evidence to corroborate the allegation, misconduct cannot be established. In cases where a suspension or disciplinary layoff exists, the claimant is considered as discharged, and the issue of misconduct shall be resolved.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(8) provides:

(8) *Past acts of misconduct.* While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of a current act of misconduct, a discharge for misconduct cannot be based on such past act or acts. The termination of employment must be based on a current act.

The gravity of the incident, number of policy violations and prior warnings are factors considered when analyzing misconduct. The lack of a current warning may detract from a finding of an intentional policy violation. The Iowa Supreme Court has opined that one unexcused absence is not misconduct even when it followed nine other excused absences and was in violation of a direct order. *Sallis v. EAB*, 437 N.W.2d 895 (Iowa 1989). *Higgins v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 350 N.W.2d 187 (Iowa 1984), held that the absences must be both excessive and unexcused. The Iowa Supreme Court has held that the term “excessive” is more than one. Three incidents of tardiness or absenteeism after a warning has been held to be misconduct. *Clark v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 317 N.W.2d 517 (Iowa Ct. App. 1982). While three is a reasonable interpretation of “excessive” based on current case law and Webster’s Dictionary, the interpretation is best derived from the facts presented.

The Iowa Court of Appeals found substantial evidence of misconduct in testimony that the claimant worked slower than he was capable of working and would temporarily and briefly improve following oral reprimands. *Sellers v. Emp’t Appeal Bd.*, 531 N.W.2d 645 (Iowa Ct. App. 1995). Generally, continued refusal to follow reasonable instructions constitutes misconduct. *Gilliam v. Atlantic Bottling Co.*, 453 N.W.2d 230 (Iowa Ct. App. 1990). Failure to sign a written reprimand acknowledging receipt constitutes job misconduct as a matter of law. *Green v Iowa Dep’t of Job Serv.*, 299 N.W.2d 651 (Iowa 1980). Misconduct must be “substantial” to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. *Newman v. Iowa Dep’t of Job Serv.*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). Willful misconduct can be established where an employee manifests an intent to disobey a future reasonable instruction of his employer. *Myers v. Iowa Dep’t of Job Serv.*, 373 N.W.2d 507 (Iowa Ct. App. 1985). When based on carelessness, the carelessness must actually indicate a “wrongful intent” to be disqualifying in nature. *Id.* 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 Dep’t of Job Serv.*, 391 N.W.2d 731 (Iowa Ct. App. 1986). Poor work performance is not misconduct in the absence of evidence of intent. *Miller v. Emp’t Appeal Bd.*, 423 N.W.2d 211 (Iowa Ct. App. 1988).

The employer has presented substantial and credible evidence that claimant made a medication/patient care error after having been warned. This is evidence of deliberate conduct in violation of company policy, procedure, or prior warning. Benefits are denied.

**Note to Claimant:** If this decision determines you are not eligible for regular unemployment insurance benefits and you disagree with this decision, you may file an appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by following the instructions on the first page of this decision. Individuals who do not qualify for regular unemployment insurance benefits, but who are currently unemployed for reasons related to COVID-19 may qualify for Pandemic Unemployment Assistance (PUA). **You will need to apply for PUA to determine your eligibility under the program.** Additional information on how to apply for PUA can be found at <https://www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov/pua-information>. If this decision becomes final, or if you are not eligible for PUA, you may have an overpayment of benefits.

**DECISION:**

The September 14, 2020, (reference 03) decision is affirmed. The claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Unemployment insurance benefits shall be withheld until claimant has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times claimant's weekly benefit amount, provided claimant is otherwise eligible.



---

Duane L. Golden  
Administrative Law Judge

November 20, 2020  
Decision Dated and Mailed

dlg/mh