

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

---

**ABBY R SWIFT**  
Claimant

**AMANA NORDSTROM INC**  
Employer

**APPEAL 16A-UI-07221-CL-T**  
**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**OC: 06/05/16**  
**Claimant: Respondent (1)**

---

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct  
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment  
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 – Employer/Representative Participation Fact-finding Interview

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The employer filed an appeal from the June 22, 2016, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on July 19, 2016. Claimant participated. Employer participated through assistant general manager Jeraica Brooks and Jamie Perkins. Employer's Exhibits 1 through 9 were received. Claimant's Exhibit A was received.

**ISSUES:**

Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct?  
Has the claimant been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits, and if so, can the repayment of those benefits to the agency be waived?  
Can charges to the employer's account be waived?

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant began working for employer as a housekeeper on September 1, 2015. She was terminated on June 4, 2016.

Claimant had a history of absenteeism.

On June 3, 2016, claimant told her supervisor she was having pain in her ear. Claimant's supervisor stated she could leave work, but must return with a doctor's note excusing her absence. Claimant saw the doctor. Her doctor diagnosed her with an ear infection and prescribed antibiotics and pain medicine. Claimant's doctor wrote her a note stating she was excused from work due to the doctor's visit on June 3, and could return to work at her discretion. Claimant informed her supervisor the doctor's note stated she could return to work at her discretion, and she was not returning to work that day.

Claimant was scheduled to work the next morning at 9:00 a.m. At approximately 5:30 a.m., claimant called her supervisor and informed her she was not coming to work that day. Claimant planned on visiting the doctor again. At 8:45 a.m., assistant manager Jeraica Brooks told claimant she needed to come to work or she would be terminated, regardless of whether she obtained a doctor's note. Claimant stated that she would not come to work, and Brooks terminated her employment.

### **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.

A claimant is disqualified from receiving unemployment benefits if the employer discharged the individual for misconduct in connection with the claimant's employment. Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a. 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).

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 term "absenteeism" also encompasses conduct that is more accurately referred to as "tardiness." *Higgins v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 350 N.W.2d 187, 190 (Iowa 1984).

In order to show misconduct due to absenteeism, the employer must establish the claimant had excessive absences that were unexcused. Thus, the first step in the analysis is to determine whether the absences were unexcused. 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. Absences due to properly reported illness are excused, 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 (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. 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).

The second step in the analysis is to determine whether the unexcused absences were excessive. The determination of whether unexcused absenteeism is excessive necessarily requires consideration of past acts and warnings. *Higgins* at 192.

The employer has not established that claimant had excessive absences which would be considered unexcused for purposes of unemployment insurance eligibility. Because her last absence 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, without such, the history of other incidents need not be examined. Accordingly, benefits are allowed.

Claimant is qualified to receive benefits. Thus, any issues regarding overpayment are moot and will not be discussed further in this decision.

**DECISION:**

The June 22, 2016, (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.

---

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

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

cal/pjs