IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

MOHAMMED J KONNEH Claimant

APPEAL 15A-UI-05805-H2T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

MOSAIC

Employer

OC: 04/26/15 Claimant: Appellant (1)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge/Misconduct 871 IAC 24.32(7) – Excessive Unexcused Absenteeism

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed an appeal from the May 8, 2015, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on June 26, 2015. Claimant participated. Employer participated through Teresa Teakolste, Human Resources Manager and Michelle Swessinger, Direct Support Manager. Employer's Exhibit One was entered and received into the record.

ISSUE:

Was the claimant discharged due to job connected misconduct?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed full-time as a direct support associate beginning on January 13, 2014 through April 27, 2015 when he was discharged for excessive unexcused absenteeism. The claimant was repeatedly tardy and left early throughout his employment. He was given progressive warnings beginning on May 22, 2014, July 14, 2014, December 10, 2014, April 6, 2015, April 15, 2015 and a final written warning on April 23, 2015. That final written warning put the claimant on notice that he faced termination from employment if he had any other incidents of unexcused absenteeism or tardiness. The claimant was 12 minutes late for work on April 27, 2015. He was late due to getting stuck behind a train. The claimant knew his work schedule and was responsible for accessing the system to find his schedule. The claimant knew his attendance was placing his job in jeopardy.

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.

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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(7) provides:

(7) Excessive unexcused absenteeism. Excessive unexcused absenteeism is an intentional disregard of the duty owed by the claimant to the employer and shall be considered misconduct except for illness or other reasonable grounds for which the employee was absent and that were properly reported to the employer.

The determination of whether unexcused absenteeism is excessive necessarily requires consideration of past acts and warnings. The term "absenteeism" also encompasses conduct that is more accurately referred to as "tardiness." An absence is an extended tardiness, and an incident of tardiness is a limited absence. Absences related to issues of personal responsibility such as transportation, lack of childcare, and oversleeping are not considered excused. *Higgins v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 350 N.W.2d 187 (Iowa 1984). An employer's point system or no-fault absenteeism policy is not dispositive of the issue of qualification for benefits.

An employer is entitled to expect its employees to report to work as scheduled or to be notified as to when and why the employee is unable to report to work. The employer has established that the claimant was warned that further unexcused absences could result in termination of employment and the final absence was not excused. The final absence, in combination with the claimant's history of unexcused absenteeism, is considered excessive. Benefits are withheld.

DECISION:

The May 8, 2015 (reference 01) decision is affirmed. The claimant was discharged from employment due to excessive, unexcused absenteeism. Benefits are withheld until such time as he has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible.

Teresa K. Hillary Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

tkh/pjs