IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

BAILEY M SLANGER Claimant

APPEAL 19A-UI-02560-CL-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

TPI IOWA LLC Employer

> OC: 02/24/19 Claimant: Appellant (4)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct Iowa Code § 96.4(3) – Ability to and Availability for Work Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.22(2) – Able & Available - Benefits Eligibility Conditions

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed an appeal from the March 18, 2019, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits based upon a separation from employment. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on April 11, 2019. Claimant participated. Employer participated through senior human resource coordinator Danielle Williams. Employer's Exhibit 1 was received.

ISSUES:

Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct? Is the claimant able to work and available for work effective February 24, 2019?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant began working for employer on August 24, 2015. Claimant last worked as a full-time production worker. Claimant was separated from employment on February 27, 2019, when she was terminated.

Employer has an attendance policy. The policy states that six occurrences results in termination. An employee is given one occurrence for missing an entire shift. Claimant was aware of the policy.

Claimant has been diagnosed with Meniere's disease, which causes vertigo. Claimant applied and was approved for Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) leave due to the medical condition. Claimant exhausted the FMLA on February 11, 2019. Claimant was then absent for the last two weeks of work due to the medical condition. The absences were properly reported. Claimant had accumulated more than six occurrences. Therefore, employer terminated her employment on February 27, 2019.

Claimant did not begin to regain her balance until March 7, 2019. Claimant did not visit her doctor during this time period, and therefore has not gotten a medical opinion on whether she is capable of working on a full-time basis.

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.

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, claimant's separation from employment does not disqualify her from receiving unemployment insurance benefits.

The next issue is whether claimant is able to and available for work.

Iowa Code section 96.4(3) provides:

An unemployed individual shall be eligible to receive benefits with respect to any week only if the department finds that:

3. The individual is able to work, is available for work, and is earnestly and actively seeking work. This subsection is waived if the individual is deemed partially unemployed, while employed at the individual's regular job, as defined in section 96.19, subsection 38, paragraph "b", unnumbered paragraph (1), or temporarily unemployed as defined in section 96.19, subsection 38, paragraph "c". The work search requirements of this subsection and the disqualification requirement for failure to apply for, or to accept suitable work of section 96.5, subsection 3 are waived if the individual is not disqualified for benefits under section 96.5, subsection 1, paragraph "h".

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.23(1) provides:

Availability disqualifications. The following are reasons for a claimant being disqualified for being unavailable for work.

(1) An individual who is ill and presently not able to perform work due to illness.

In this case, claimant experienced symptoms from a chronic medical condition to the point where she exhausted her FMLA and then could not work for an additional month afterward. Claimant has not seen a medical professional to obtain an opinion on whether she is able to work on a full-time basis at this time. Claimant has not established that she is able to and available for work effective February 24, 2019.

DECISION:

The March 18, 2019, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is modified in favor of claimant. The claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are not denied on that basis. Claimant is not able to and available for work effective February 24, 2019. Benefits are denied until claimant presents documentation from a medical professional to Iowa Workforce Development stating that she is able to work on a full-time basis.

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