

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

MESSIE SAYLEE
Claimant

THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA
Employer

APPEAL 21A-UI-16707-AW-T
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION

OC: 05/23/21
Claimant: Appellant (2)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct
Iowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Quitting

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Claimant filed an appeal from the July 27, 2021 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. The hearing was consolidated with the hearing for appeal 21A-DUA-01746-AW-T. The telephone hearing was held on September 8, 2021, at 11:00 a.m. Claimant participated. Employer participated through Scott Coons, Human Resources Associate. No exhibits were admitted. Official notice was taken of the administrative record.

ISSUE:

Whether claimant's separation was a discharge for disqualifying job-related misconduct or a voluntary quit without good cause attributable to employer.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed as a full-time Nursing Assistant from November 30, 2020 until her employment with The University of Iowa ended on May 24, 2021.

Employer has an attendance policy, which states that three consecutive absences without notice is considered a voluntary resignation of employment. The attendance policy requires employees to call an attendance line two hours prior to the beginning of a shift to notify employer of an absence.

Claimant last performed work for employer on May 10, 2021. Claimant was scheduled to work three consecutive shifts on May 19, 2021, May 21, 2021 and May 24, 2021. Claimant was absent for each of the shifts due to illness. Claimant notified employer of her absences on May 19, 2021 and May 21, 2021 by calling employer's attendance line. Claimant called the attendance line on May 24, 2021 to notify employer of her absence but did not receive an answer. Claimant also tried to notify employer of her absence on May 24, 2021 by calling the floor on which she worked but was told to call the attendance line.

On May 24, 2021, employer notified claimant that her employment was terminated due to three consecutive no-call/no-show absences. Claimant had prior verbal warnings regarding her attendance, during which employer told claimant that her attendance must improve or additional disciplinary action would be taken.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant did not voluntarily quit but was discharged for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

Iowa unemployment insurance law disqualifies claimants who voluntarily quit employment without good cause attributable to the employer. Iowa Code §§ 96.5(1). A voluntary leaving of employment requires an intention to terminate the employment relationship accompanied by an overt act of carrying out that intention. *Local Lodge #1426 v. Wilson Trailer*, 289 N.W.2d 608, 612 (Iowa 1980). Where there is no expressed intention or act to sever the employment relationship, the case must be analyzed as a discharge from employment. *Peck v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 492 N.W.2d 438 (Iowa Ct. App. 1992).

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.25(4) provides:

Voluntary quit without good cause. In general, a voluntary quit means discontinuing the employment because the employee no longer desires to remain in the relationship of an employee with the employer from whom the employee has separated. The employer has the burden of proving that the claimant is disqualified for benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.5. However, the claimant has the initial burden to produce evidence that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving Iowa Code section 96.5, subsection (1), paragraphs "a" through "i," and subsection 10. The following reasons for a voluntary quit shall be presumed to be without good cause attributable to the employer:

(4) The claimant was absent for three days without giving notice to employer in violation of company rule.

In this case, claimant was not absent for three consecutive shifts without notice and had no intention of terminating her employment relationship with the University of Iowa. Because claimant did not voluntarily quit her job, claimant's separation from employment must be analyzed as a discharge.

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 disqualification shall continue 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(1)(a) provides:

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 of misconduct has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. *Reigelsberger v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 500 N.W.2d 64, 66 (Iowa 1993); *accord Lee v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 616 N.W.2d 661, 665 (Iowa 2000). Further, the employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. *Cosper v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982).

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(4) provides:

(4) Report required. The claimant's statement and employer's statement must give detailed facts as to the specific reason for the claimant's discharge. Allegations of misconduct or dishonesty without additional evidence shall not be sufficient to result in disqualification. If the employer is unwilling to furnish available evidence to corroborate the allegation, misconduct cannot be established. In cases where a suspension or disciplinary layoff exists, the claimant is considered as discharged, and the issue of misconduct shall be resolved.

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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(8) provides:

(8) *Past acts of misconduct.* While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of a current act of misconduct, a discharge for misconduct cannot be based on such past act or acts. The termination of employment must be based on a current act.

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).

Excessive absences are not considered misconduct unless unexcused. 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 v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 350 N.W.2d 187, 192 (Iowa 1984). Second,

the absences must be unexcused. *Cosper*, 321 N.W.2d 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*, 350 N.W.2d at 191, or because it was not “properly reported,” holding excused absences are those “with appropriate notice.” *Cosper*, 321 N.W.2d at 10.

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*, 321 N.W.2d at 9; *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. See *Gaborit*, 734 N.W.2d at 555-558. An employer’s no-fault absenteeism policy or point system is not dispositive of the issue of qualification for unemployment insurance benefits.

It is the duty of the administrative law judge, as the trier of fact, to determine the credibility of witnesses, weigh the evidence and decide the facts in issue. *Arndt v. City of LeClaire*, 728 N.W.2d 389, 394-395 (Iowa 2007). The administrative law judge may believe all, part or none of any witness’s testimony. *State v. Holtz*, 548 N.W.2d 162, 163 (Iowa App. 1996). In assessing the credibility of witnesses, the administrative law judge should consider the evidence using his or her own observations, common sense and experience. *Id.* In determining the facts, and deciding what testimony to believe, the fact finder may consider the following factors: whether the testimony is reasonable and consistent with other evidence you believe; whether a witness has made inconsistent statements; the witness’s appearance, conduct, age, intelligence, memory and knowledge of the facts; and the witness’s interest in the trial, their motive, candor, bias and prejudice. *Id.*

The findings of fact show how I have resolved the disputed factual issues in this case. I assessed the credibility of the witnesses who testified during the hearing, considering the applicable factors listed above, and using my own common sense and experience. I find the claimant’s testimony regarding calling the attendance line to be more credible than employer’s testimony because claimant provided specific information about her calls and employer provided no rebuttal testimony or evidence that claimant did not call the attendance line.

Claimant’s absences on May 19, 2021, May 21, 2021 and May 24, 2021 were for reasonable grounds and were properly reported. Therefore, the absences were excused and do not constitute misconduct. Without a current or final act of misconduct, the history of other absences need not be examined. Claimant was discharged for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed if claimant is otherwise eligible.

DECISION:

The July 27, 2021 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. Claimant did not voluntarily quit; claimant was discharged for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed provided claimant is otherwise eligible.



Adrienne C. Williamson
Administrative Law Judge
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau
Iowa Workforce Development
1000 East Grand Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209
Fax (515)478-3528

September 17, 2021
Decision Dated and Mailed

acw/scn