IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

68-0157 (9-06) - 3091078 - EI

MORGAN MAHER

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 13A-UI-06997-LT

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

APAC CUSTOMER SVCS INC

Employer

OC: 04/21/13

Claimant: Appellant (1)

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

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed an appeal from the June 3, 2013, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on July 17, 2013. Claimant participated with her mother, Kristina Maher. Employer participated through human resources generalist, Rochelle Jordan.

ISSUE:

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 customer service representative and was separated from employment on April 22, 2013. Her final absence on that date was because her mother, who provides childcare for her daughter, was ill. She did not have back up childcare. Her brother is developmentally disabled and her father works for the City of Cedar Rapids and did not stay home to care for his wife so claimant could go to work. She had been given a final written warning on April 7, 2013 about absences April 16 and 17 due to her mother's illness. On February 6 she received a written warning for missing March 5 and 6 due to her mother's illness. A March 4 verbal warning was for unknown absences.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct.

Iowa Code § 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(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 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). An employer's point system or no-fault absenteeism policy is not dispositive of the issue of qualification for benefits.

An employer is entitled to expect its employees to report to work as scheduled or to be notified in a timely manner as to when and why the employee is unable to report to work. The employer has credibly established that claimant was warned that further unexcused absences could result in termination of employment and the final absence was not excused. The final absence, in combination with claimant's history of unexcused absenteeism, is considered excessive. Benefits are withheld.

DECISION:

dml/css

The June 6, 2013 (reference 01) decision is affirmed. Claimant was discharged from employment due to excessive, unexcused absenteeism. Benefits are withheld until such time as she has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible.

Dévon M. Lewis Administrative Law Judge
Decision Dated and Mailed