

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

MONETTE C ODEN
Claimant

GMT CORPORATION
Employer

APPEAL 18A-UI-07846-CL-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

**OC: 06/17/18
Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(7) – Absenteeism
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 July 19, 2018, (reference 04), unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits based upon a separation from employment. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on August 14, 2018. Claimant participated. Employer participated through human resource manager Jamie Kramer. Employer's Exhibit 1 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 on October 23, 2017. Claimant last worked as a full-time machinist. Claimant was separated from employment on June 20, 2018, when she was terminated.

Employer has a policy stating employees will be terminated after accruing 22 attendance points. The policy requires employees to report absences to a supervisor prior to the beginning of their scheduled shift. Claimant was aware of the policy.

Claimant worked third shift. Claimant was scheduled to work from 10:00 p.m. on June 19, 2018, until 6:00 a.m. on June 20, 2018. On June 19, 2018, claimant's six-year-old son fell off of a trampoline and hit his head. He was having difficulty breathing so claimant brought him to the emergency room. By 9:30 p.m., claimant still had not seen the doctor. Claimant called employer to report she would be absent. Claimant's son was not discharged until 1:00 a.m.

The medical provider instructed claimant to watch her son closely overnight to make sure he was able to breath. Claimant is a single mother and did not feel comfortable leaving her son home alone with her two teenage children who would potentially have to deal with an emergency situation. She did not have any other adult available to watch her child.

Claimant's absence caused her to exceed the allotted amount of attendance points. Claimant had been previously warned regarding her attendance issues.

Employer terminated claimant's employment on June 20, 2018.

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.

An employer's no-fault absenteeism policy or point system is not dispositive of the issue of qualification for unemployment insurance benefits.

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.

Because claimant's separation is not disqualifying the issues regarding overpayment of benefits are moot and will not be discussed further in this decision.

DECISION:

The July 19, 2018, (reference 04), 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/scn