

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**HOLLIE BANKES**

Claimant

**APPEAL NO: 13A-UI-02246-BT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**CARE INITIATIVES**

Employer

**OC: 01/27/13**

**Claimant: Respondent (2/R)**

Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a - Discharge for Misconduct  
871 IAC 24.32(7) - Excessive Unexcused Absenteeism  
Iowa Code § 96.3-7 - Overpayment

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Care Initiatives (employer) appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated February 20, 2013, reference 01, which held that Hollie Bankes (claimant) was eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on March 21, 2013. The claimant participated in the hearing. The employer participated through Jackie Garden, Director of Nursing and Toni Kerr, Employer Representatives. Employer's Exhibits One through Three were admitted into evidence. Based on the evidence, the arguments of the parties, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

**ISSUE:**

The issue is whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct sufficient to warrant a denial of unemployment benefits.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was employed as a full-time certified nurse's aide from October 30, 2011 through January 4, 2013. She was discharged from employment due to violation of the employer's attendance policy with a final incident on January 3, 2013 when she was absent due to her son's illness but failed to properly report her absence. Employees are required to report their absences two hours prior to the beginning of their shifts. The claimant's shift started at 5:30 a.m. and she reported her absence on January 3, 2013 at 4:50 a.m. The claimant was discharged after 27 absences with eight absences of those due to illness and three of those due to her son's illness. Out of the 11 absences due to illness, only two were properly reported.

Warnings for attendance were issued on December 2, 2011; February 13, 2012; and November 6, 2012. The claimant reported absences at 4:20 a.m. on December 26, at 4:50 a.m. on December 29, at 4:05 a.m. on December 30, and at 4:35 a.m. on December 31, 2012. She reported her absence for January 1, 2013 on the night before at 9:30 p.m. The absence on January 1, 2013 was due to lack of childcare. The claimant received a final warning for

attendance on January 2, 2013 and was supposed to meet with the employer on January 3, 2013 to schedule make-up days.

The claimant filed a claim for unemployment insurance benefits effective January 27, 2013 and has received benefits after the separation from employment.

#### **REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

The issue is whether the employer discharged the claimant for work-connected misconduct. 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.

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(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.

The employer has the burden to prove the discharged employee is disqualified for benefits for misconduct. *Sallis v. Employment Appeal Bd.*, 437 N.W.2d 895, 896 (Iowa 1989). The claimant was discharged on January 4, 2013 for 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. 871 IAC 24.32(7).

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 Department of Job Service*, 350 N.W.2d 187 (Iowa 1984).

Absences due to properly reported illness can never constitute job misconduct since they are not volitional. *Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The claimant's final absence was not properly reported. The employer has established that the 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 the claimant's history of absenteeism, is considered excessive. Benefits are denied.

Iowa Code § 96.3(7) provides that benefits must be recovered from a claimant who receives benefits and is later determined to be ineligible for benefits, even though the claimant acted in good faith and was not otherwise at fault. The overpayment recovery law was updated in 2008. See Iowa Code § 96.3(7)(b). Under the revised law, a claimant will not be required to repay an overpayment of benefits if all of the following factors are met. First, the prior award of benefits must have been made in connection with a decision regarding the claimant's separation from a particular employment. Second, the claimant must not have engaged in fraud or willful misrepresentation to obtain the benefits or in connection with the Agency's initial decision to award benefits. Third, the employer must not have participated at the initial fact-finding proceeding that resulted in the initial decision to award benefits. If Workforce Development determines there has been an overpayment of benefits, the employer will not be charged for the benefits, regardless of whether the claimant is required to repay the benefits.

Because the claimant has been deemed ineligible for benefits, any benefits the claimant has received could constitute an overpayment. Accordingly, the administrative law judge will remand the matter to the Claims Division for determination of whether there has been an overpayment, the amount of the overpayment, and whether the claimant will have to repay the benefits.

#### **DECISION:**

The unemployment insurance decision dated February 20, 2013, reference 01, is reversed. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because she was discharged from work for misconduct. Benefits are withheld until she has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible. The matter is remanded to the Claims Section for investigation and determination of the overpayment issue.

---

Susan D. Ackerman  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

sda/css