

**BEFORE THE
EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD
Lucas State Office Building
Fourth floor
Des Moines, Iowa 50319**

JENNY J MCCOLLUM

Claimant,

and

BRADFORD CHILD CARE SERVICES

Employer.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

HEARING NUMBER: 11B-UI-16539

**EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD
DECISION**

N O T I C E

THIS DECISION BECOMES FINAL unless (1) a **request for a REHEARING** is filed with the Employment Appeal Board within **20 days** of the date of the Board's decision or, (2) a **PETITION TO DISTRICT COURT** IS FILED WITHIN **30 days** of the date of the Board's decision.

A **REHEARING REQUEST** shall state the specific grounds and relief sought. If the rehearing request is denied, a petition may be filed in **DISTRICT COURT** within **30 days** of the date of the denial.

SECTION: 96.5-1

D E C I S I O N

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS ARE ALLOWED IF OTHERWISE ELIGIBLE

The Employer appealed this case to the Employment Appeal Board. The members of the Employment Appeal Board, one member dissenting, reviewed the entire record. The Appeal Board finds the administrative law judge's decision is correct. The administrative law judge's Findings of Fact and Reasoning and Conclusions of Law are adopted by the Board as its own. The administrative law judge's decision is **AFFIRMED**.

John A. Peno

Elizabeth L. Seiser

DISSENTING OPINION OF MONIQUE F. KUESTER:

I respectfully dissent from the majority decision of the Employment Appeal Board; I would reverse the decision of the administrative law judge. I would find that the record established the claimant received a prior warning for performance issues, which were beyond her apparent attendance issues. Although most of her absences were due to illness and excusable, she had numerous tardies that were attributable to personal problems (waking up late) that were unexcused. Her failure to return to work and failure to notify the employer of her intentions after the demotion were further examples of what I would consider to be a disregard for the employer's interests. Based on these reasons, I would conclude that the claimant should be denied benefits.

Monique F. Kuester

AMG/fnv