IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

MERLET LEAB Claimant

APPEAL 21A-UI-00222-S2-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

ARCHER DANIELS MIDLAND CO

Employer

OC: 08/23/20 Claimant: Appellant (2)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct Iowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Quit Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(7) – Excessive Unexcused Absenteeism

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed an appeal from the November 16, 2020, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits based upon his discharge from work for repeated tardiness. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on February 4, 2021. The claimant Merle T. Leab participated. The employer Archer Daniels Midland Co. registered a phone number for the hearing but did not answer when the administrative law judge called.

ISSUE:

Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

As claimant was the only witness, the administrative law judge makes the following findings of fact based solely upon claimant's evidence: Claimant was employed full time as a maintenance electrician from October 11, 2015, until this employment ended on August 29, 2020, when he was terminated.

Employer maintains an attendance policy which provides that an employee will receive a verbal warning after one absence or tardy, a written warning after the second absence or tardy, and the termination of employment after the third absence or tardy.

On August 20, 2020, claimant was tardy for work because he overslept. He was scheduled to clock in at 6:42 and did not arrive at work until 7:00. Claimant went straight to a meeting he was to be attending and did not clock in. He spoke to the supervisor at the meeting to notify him he was tardy and had not clocked in. The supervisor mistakenly clocked claimant in as being on time for his shift.

On August 28, 2020, employer terminated claimant's employment for reaching his third absence or tardy. In March 2020, claimant contracted COVID-19 and missed approximately three weeks of work. He provided a doctor's note to employer documenting his absence. In July 2020, claimant called into to work because he was ill. He received a written warning for this second absence.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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

lowa 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 lowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. *Huntoon v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (lowa 1979).

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.

Excessive absences are not considered misconduct unless unexcused. 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., 734 N.W.2d 554 (lowa Ct. App. 2007). Medical documentation is not essential to a determination that an absence due to illness should be treated as excused. Gaborit, supra. 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. lowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(7) (emphasis added); see Higgins v. lowa Dep't of Job Serv., 350 N.W.2d 187, 190, n. 1 (lowa 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 (lowa 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." Cosperat 10.

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 Dep't of Job Serv.*, 350 N.W.2d 187 (Iowa 1984). Absences due to illness or injury must be properly reported in order to be excused. *Cosper v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982).

The employer has not established that claimant had excessive absences which would be considered unexcused for purposes of unemployment insurance eligibility. A properly reported absence related to illness or injury is excused for the purpose of lowa Employment Security Law because it is not volitional. 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. Claimant's absences in March and July 2020 were reported and were for illness and are thus excused. Claimant's final tardy in August 2020 was due to oversleeping and is not excused. However, one unexcused absence is not disqualifying since it does not meet the excessiveness standard. Accordingly, benefits are allowed.

DECISION:

The November 16, 2020, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. Claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided he is otherwise eligible. Any benefits claimed and withheld on this basis shall be paid.

Stephaned alkesson

Stephanie Adkisson Administrative Law Judge Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau 1000 East Grand Avenue Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209 Fax (515)478-3528

February 17, 2021 Decision Dated and Mailed

sa/scn