

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

---

**AUSTIN D YOUNG**  
Claimant

**ARCHER DANIELS MIDLAND CO**  
Employer

**APPEAL NO. 21A-UI-05607-B2-T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**OC: 11/08/20**  
**Claimant: Appellant (1)**

---

Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Claimant filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated January 19, 2021, reference 01, which held claimant ineligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a hearing was scheduled for and held on April 27, 2021. Claimant participated. Employer participated by Mark Mahmens.

**ISSUE:**

Whether claimant was discharged for 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 October 30, 2020. Employer discharged claimant on October 30, 2020 because claimant had excessive absenteeism after conversations about his absenteeism.

Claimant worked as a pipefitter for employer. Throughout claimant's time at work, he struggled with attendance as he was a sole parent and had difficulties with his teenage sons.

In 2019 claimant was given a written warning for violations of attendance policy. He received 5 points per the policy and termination was to occur at 8 points. This attendance policy was removed in early 2020 and replaced with a discussion-based warnings. Claimant received multiple discussions during 2020 prior to his termination. During these discussions, claimant would share difficulties he was having with a son.

On October 22 and 23, 2020 claimant missed work again for personal issues. Employer stated that claimant called in hours late one day and did not call in the other day. Claimant stated he called in a few hours late the first day, and tried to get vacation for the second day as claimant was concerned about losing his job.

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

Iowa Code section 96.5(2)a provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits, regardless of the source of the individual's wage credits:

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:

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 Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. *Huntoon v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

A claimant is not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits if an employer has discharged the claimant for reasons constituting work connected misconduct. Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a. Before a claimant can be denied unemployment insurance benefits, the employer has the burden to establish the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct. *Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982), Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a.

The gravity of the incident, number of policy violations and prior warnings are factors considered when analyzing misconduct. The lack of a current warning may detract from a finding of an intentional policy violation. Excessive absences are not misconduct unless unexcused. Absences due to properly reported illness can never constitute job misconduct since they are not volitional. 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). The Iowa Supreme Court has opined that one unexcused absence is not misconduct even when it followed nine other excused absences and was in violation of a direct order. *Sallis v. EAB*, 437 N.W.2d 895 (Iowa 1989). *Higgins v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 350 N.W.2d 187 (Iowa 1984), held that the absences must be both excessive and unexcused. The Iowa Supreme Court has held that excessive is more than one. Three incidents of tardiness or absenteeism after a warning has been held misconduct. *Clark v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 317 N.W.2d 517 (Iowa Ct.

App. 1982). While three is a reasonable interpretation of excessive based on current case law and Webster's Dictionary, the interpretation is best derived from the facts presented.

In this matter, the evidence established that claimant was discharged for an act of misconduct when claimant violated employer's policy concerning absenteeism. Claimant was warned concerning this policy.

The last incident, which brought about the discharge, constitutes misconduct because a child's difficulties are not deemed commensurate with an employee's illness. Claimant had repeatedly called off work because of problems with his children. Employer allowed claimant to have over 10 attendance instances over and above excused absences prior to a termination. This was after claimant had a written warning under the previous attendance policy. The administrative law judge holds that claimant was discharged for an act of misconduct and, as such, is disqualified for the receipt of unemployment insurance benefits.

**DECISION:**

The decision of the representative dated January 19, 2021, reference 01, is affirmed. Unemployment insurance benefits shall be withheld until claimant has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times claimant's weekly benefit amount, provided claimant is otherwise eligible.



---

Blair A. Bennett  
Administrative Law Judge

April 30, 2021  
Decision Dated and Mailed

bab/ol