IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

JESSENIA ALVARADO Claimant **TYSON FRESH MEATS INC** Employer	**APPEAL 21A-UI-01596-DG-T** **ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION** **OC: 08/09/20** **Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge/Misconduct
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(7) – Absenteeism

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Employer filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated December 10, 2020, (reference 01) that held claimant eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a hearing was scheduled for and held on February 22, 2021. Claimant participated personally with the assistance of a Spanish Interpreter. Employer participated by Lori Direnzo, Human Resources Administrator. The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative record including the fact-finding documents.

ISSUE:

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 6, 2020. Employer discharged claimant on August 18, 2020, because claimant violated employer's attendance policy.

Claimant began working for employer as a full-time production worker on March 16, 2020. Claimant received a copy of employer's rules and polices at the time of hire. Employer has a no-fault point based attendance policy.

On July 6, 2020 claimant contracted COVID-19 and she was unable to come into work. Claimant informed employer that she had contracted COVID-19 and that she would be unable to work for an extended period of time.

On August 4, 2020 claimant was still not coming into work. Employer sent claimant a letter telling claimant that she needed to come into work or make other arrangements for an extended leave of absence or her employment would be terminated. Claimant was still sick and she did not respond to employer. Claimant's last absence on August 18, 2020 put claimant over employer's attendance points pursuant to its attendance policy. Claimant was still sick and unable to work on that date.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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

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(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 employer has the burden to prove the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law. *Cosper v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 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. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa Ct. 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. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa Ct. App. 1988). The law limits disqualifying misconduct to substantial and willful wrongdoing or repeated carelessness or negligence that equals willful misconduct in culpability. *Lee v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 616 N.W.2d 661 (Iowa 2000). 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. Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(7) (emphasis added); see *Higgins v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 350 N.W.2d 187, 190, n. 1 (Iowa 1984) holding "rule [2]4.32(7)…accurately states the law." The requirements for a finding of misconduct based on absences are therefore twofold. First, the absences must be excessive. *Sallis v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 437 N.W.2d 895 (Iowa 1989). The determination of whether unexcused absenteeism is excessive necessarily requires consideration of past acts and warnings. *Higgins* at 192. Second, the absences must be unexcused. *Cosper* at 10. The requirement of "unexcused" can be satisfied in two ways. An absence can be unexcused either because it was not for "reasonable grounds," *Higgins* at 191, or because it was not "properly reported," holding excused absences are those "with appropriate notice." *Cosper* at 10. 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, supra.* However, a good faith inability to obtain childcare for a sick infant may be excused. *McCourtney v. Imprimis Tech., Inc.*, 465 N.W.2d 721 (Minn. Ct. App. 1991). See, *Gimbel v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 489 N.W.2d 36 (Iowa Ct. App. 1992) where a claimant's late call to the employer was justified because the claimant, who was suffering from an asthma attack, was physically unable to call the employer until the condition sufficiently improved; and *Roberts v.*


Iowa Dep't of Job Serv., 356 N.W.2d 218 (Iowa 1984) where unreported absences are not misconduct if the failure to report is caused by mental incapacity. Where an employer is aware of the nature of the claimant's illness and has fair warning that he may be absent for an extended period of time due to that illness, failure of the employee to contact the employer is not misconduct as the absences are excused. This is so where the claimant had no telephone and was bedridden with scarlet fever. *Floyd v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 338 N.W.2d 536 (Iowa Ct. App. 1983).

An employer's attendance policy is not dispositive of the issue of qualification for unemployment insurance benefits. A properly reported absence related to illness or injury is excused for the purpose of the Iowa Employment Security Act. Excessive absences are not necessarily unexcused. Absences must be both excessive and unexcused to result in a finding of misconduct. A failure to report to work without notification to the employer is generally considered an unexcused absence. However, one unexcused absence is not disqualifying since it does not meet the excessiveness standard. Because her absences were otherwise related to properly reported illness or other reasonable grounds, no final or current incident of unexcused absenteeism occurred which establishes work-connected misconduct and no disqualification is imposed. Benefits are allowed.

***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 December 10, 2020, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. The claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.



Duane L. Golden
Administrative Law Judge

March 5, 2021
Decision Dated and Mailed

dlg/lj