IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

ANDREA A CLOUD Claimant

APPEAL 16A-UI-02961-LJ-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

COVENANT MEDICAL CENTER INC Employer

> OC: 02/14/16 Claimant: Appellant (2)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(7) – Excessive Unexcused Absenteeism

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed an appeal from the March 4, 2016 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits based upon a determination that claimant was discharged for excessive, unexcused absenteeism after being warned. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on March 4, 2016. The claimant, Andrea A. Cloud, participated. The employer, Covenant Medical Center, Inc., participated through Debbie Tyler, Senior Human Resources Representative, and Jackie VanKamen, Lab Supervisor. Claimant's Exhibit A and Employer's Exhibits One and Two were received and admitted into the record without objection.

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 part time (0.8 FTE) as a lab tech 2 from February 24, 2014 until this employment ended on February 17, 2016; when she was discharged.

Claimant was discharged for excessive, unexcused absenteeism. Claimant's final absence occurred on February 15, 2016. Claimant called in and reported that she would not be at work because she was ill. Claimant testified that she had food poisoning and her vomiting also caused an issue with a worker's compensation-related injury she sustained earlier in the year.

Claimant had been warned for absenteeism issues previously. She received a final written warning on April 13, 2015. She incurred one additional absence on November 17, 2015. The employer prepared a written document at that time informing claimant that this absence qualified her for termination (Employer's Exhibit Two). The document states that any future absences will result in termination and that claimant's job is in jeopardy due to absenteeism (Employer's Exhibit Two). Claimant, VanKamen, and George Vella (lab director) all signed this document (Employer's Exhibit Two).

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.

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.

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 employer has the burden to prove the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law. *Cosper v. lowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (lowa 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. lowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (lowa 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. lowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (lowa Ct. App. 1988). Excessive absences are not considered misconduct unless unexcused.

Absences due to properly reported illness cannot constitute work-connected misconduct since they are not volitional, 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.

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. Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(7) (emphasis added); see *Higgins v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 350 N.W.2d 187, 190, n. 1 (Iowa 1984) holding "rule [2]4.32(7)...accurately states the law."

The employer has not established that claimant had excessive absences which would be considered unexcused for purposes of unemployment insurance eligibility. Claimant was not at work due to illness on February 15; and she properly reported that absence to her employer. Because claimant's 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.

DECISION:

The March 4, 2016 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. The claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible. Benefits withheld based upon this separation shall be paid to claimant.

Elizabeth Johnson Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

lj/can