

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

---

**SAWAAM L HARRIS**  
Claimant

**SHEARERS FOODS BURLINGTON LLC**  
Employer

**APPEAL 17A-UI-04298-JP-T**  
**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**OC: 03/12/17**  
**Claimant: Appellant (2)**

---

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

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The claimant filed an appeal from the April 17, 2017, (reference 02) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on May 10, 2017. Claimant participated. Employer did not answer when contacted at the number provided and did not participate. Claimant Exhibit A was admitted into evidence with no objection. Official notice was taken of the administrative record, including claimant's benefit history, with no objection.

**ISSUES:**

Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related 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 packer from September 29, 2014, and was separated from employment on March 17, 2017, when she was discharged.

The employer has an attendance policy which applies point values to attendance infractions, including absences and tardies, regardless of reason for the infraction. The policy also provides that an employee will be warned as points are accumulated, and will be discharged upon receiving eight points in a rolling twelve month period. The employer requires employees contact the employer and report their absence at least an hour prior to the start of their shift. Claimant was aware of the employer's policy.

The final incident occurred when claimant was absent on March 2, 2017 from her scheduled shift. Claimant was absent because she was sick. Claimant contacted the employer and left a voicemail at least an hour before the start of her shift. Claimant reported to the employer that she was going to be absent because she was sick. Claimant received one point for this absence and resulted in her having a total of at least eight points. On March 16, 2017, claimant met with the employer and she was suspended due to her attendance points. The employer instructed claimant to call the employer the next day (March 17, 2017). On March 17, 2017, claimant called the employer and she was told she was discharged.

Claimant was last warned on July 28, 2016 regarding her attendance infractions. Claimant was warned that her job was in jeopardy. Claimant was also issued written warnings for her attendance infractions on June 20, 2016 and May 9, 2016. Claimant testified most of her attendance infractions were due to medical issues.

### **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*.

Excessive absences are not necessarily unexcused. Absences must be both excessive and unexcused to result in a finding of misconduct. An employer’s attendance policy is not dispositive of the issue of qualification for unemployment insurance benefits. Absences due to properly reported illness cannot constitute work-connected misconduct since they are not volitional, even if the employer was fully within its rights to assess points or impose discipline up to or including discharge for the absence under its attendance policy. Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(7); *Cosper, supra*; *Gaborit v. Emp’t Appeal Bd.*, 743 N.W.2d 554 (Iowa Ct. App. 2007). Medical documentation is not essential to a determination that an absence due to illness should be treated as excused. *Gaborit, supra*.

The employer has not established that claimant had excessive absences which would be considered unexcused for purposes of unemployment insurance eligibility. Because claimant’s last absence on March 2, 2017 was related to properly reported illness or other reasonable grounds, no final or current incident of unexcused absenteeism occurred which establishes work-connected misconduct. Since the employer has not established a current or final act of misconduct, and, without such, the history of other incidents need not be examined. Accordingly, benefits are allowed.

**DECISION:**

The April 17, 2017, (reference 02) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. Claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided claimant is otherwise eligible. Any benefits claimed and withheld on this basis shall be paid.

---

Jeremy Peterson  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

jp/rvs