

**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**

**COURTNEY YIN
2731 SE PARK AVE
DES MOINES IA 50320**

**ACCESS DIRECT TELEMARKETING INC
c/o JOHNSON & ASSOCIATES
PO BOX 6007
OMAHA NE 68106-0007**

**Appeal Number: 06A-UI-07796-ET
OC: 07-02-06 R: 02
Claimant: Respondent (2)**

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/Misconduct
871 IAC 24.32(7) – Excessive Unexcused Absenteeism

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed a timely appeal from the July 26, 2006, reference 01, decision that allowed benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call before Administrative Law Judge Julie Elder on August 17, 2006. The claimant participated in the hearing. Dennis Dorman, Program Manager, participated in the hearing on behalf of the employer with Attorney Lynn Corbeil. Employer's Exhibits One through Six were admitted into evidence.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed as a full-time telephone sales representative for Access Direct from January 20, 2006 to May 8, 2006. The employer's policy requires employees to give a two-week notice of any absence. If they fail to do so they are assigned occurrences. Four occurrences are cause for termination. On February 15, 2006, the claimant received a verbal counseling for leaving early on February 14, 2006 (Employer's Exhibit One). On March 14, 2006, the claimant received a verbal counseling for calling in to report she would not be at work on March 13, 2006 (Employer's Exhibit Two). On April 4, 2006, she received a verbal counseling for tardiness on April 3, 2006 (Employer's Exhibit Three). On April 21, 2006, the claimant was six minutes late; on April 24, 2006, she was 24 minutes late; on April 28, 2006, she was 50 minutes late; on May 1, 2006, she was three hours late; on May 2, 2006, she was four hours and 40 minutes late; on May 3, 2006, she was 14 minutes late; on May 4, 2006, she was two minutes late; and on May 5, 2006, she was 30 minutes late. On May 5, 2006, the claimant received a final warning for her absence on May 4, 2006. Most of her absences were due to transportation issues. Employees are allowed to make up any time lost during the week on Saturdays and can stay until 6:30 p.m. during the week. The claimant worked 45 minutes over her regularly scheduled shift May 5, 2006, but reported 15 minutes late Saturday, May 6, 2006, and left after two hours. The employer terminated the claimant's employment May 8, 2006, for exceeding the allowed number of attendance occurrences (Employer's Exhibit Six).

The claimant has claimed and received unemployment insurance benefits after the separation from this employer.

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 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).

871 IAC 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). The claimant was tardy nine times between April 21, 2006 and May 6, 2006, after having been warned about her attendance three times since February 15, 2006. She also received a final warning about her attendance May 5, 2006, and was aware her job was in jeopardy. The claimant had an opportunity to make up the time she missed during her last week of employment but failed to do so and was late for her Saturday make-up session before leaving after two hours. 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 absenteeism, is considered excessive. Benefits are denied.

Iowa Code section 96.3-7 provides:

7. Recovery of overpayment of benefits. If an individual receives benefits for which the individual is subsequently determined to be ineligible, even though the individual acts in good faith and is not otherwise at fault, the benefits shall be recovered. The department in its discretion may recover the overpayment of benefits either by having a sum equal to the overpayment deducted from any future benefits payable to the individual or by having the individual pay to the department a sum equal to the overpayment.

If the department determines that an overpayment has been made, the charge for the overpayment against the employer's account shall be removed and the account shall be credited with an amount equal to the overpayment from the unemployment compensation trust fund and this credit shall include both contributory and reimbursable employers, notwithstanding section 96.8, subsection 5.

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which the claimant was not entitled. Those benefits must be recovered in accordance with the provisions of Iowa law.

DECISION:

The July 26, 2006, reference 01, decision is reversed. The claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld until such time as she has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible. The claimant is overpaid benefits in the amount of \$905.00.

je/pjs