

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

TAMMY M FREEMAN
Claimant

HY-VEE INC
Employer

APPEAL 20A-UI-11936-AW-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

**OC: 06/28/20
Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 – Employer/Representative Participation Fact-finding Interview
PL 116-136, Sec. 2104 – Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Employer filed an appeal from the September 18, 2020 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on November 20, 2020, at 11:00 a.m. Claimant participated. Employer participated through Barbara Buss, Hearing Representative. Michelle Millang, Office Manager, and Mike Whitten, Director of Bakery Manufacturing, were witnesses for employer. Employer's Exhibit 1 was admitted. Official notice was taken of the administrative record.

ISSUES:

Whether claimant's separation was a discharge for disqualifying job-related misconduct.
Whether claimant was overpaid benefits.
Whether claimant should repay those benefits and/or whether employer should be charged based upon its participation in the fact-finding interview.
Whether claimant is eligible for Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed as a full-time Service Worker from December 17, 2013 until her employment with Hy-Vee ended on July 2, 2020. Claimant worked Monday through Thursday from 6:30 a.m. until 3:00 p.m. and Friday from 6:00 a.m. until 2:30 p.m. Claimant's direct supervisor was Dusty Graham, Production Manager.

Employer has an attendance policy that outlines progressive discipline for absences accrued during rolling 30 day periods. The attendance policy states that employees must notify employer of any absences prior to the beginning of their shift by telephone. Claimant received a copy of the attendance policy.

On June 29, 2019; August 12, 2019; and August 23, 2019, claimant was absent from work due to illness and notified employer of her absences prior to the beginning of her shifts. On

August 28, 2019, claimant was absent due to oversleeping. On October 4, 2020, claimant left work early due to illness and notified employer prior to leaving work. On October 14, 2019; October 28, 2019; June 9, 2020 and June 24, 2020, claimant was absent from work due to illness and notified employer of her absences prior to the beginning of her shifts. On July 2, 2020, claimant overslept and called employer at 7:00 a.m.; employer told claimant not to report to work because she was more than 10 minutes late for her shift.

On July 2, 2020, employer discharged claimant for violation of the attendance policy. Claimant received prior warnings regarding her attendance. The warnings stated that future absences may result in termination of employment.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant was discharged for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

Iowa Code section 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 disqualification shall continue 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(1)(a) provides:

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.

This definition of misconduct has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. *Reigelsberger v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 500 N.W.2d 64, 66 (Iowa 1993); accord *Lee v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 616 N.W.2d 661, 665 (Iowa 2000). Further, the employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. *Cosper v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982).

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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(8) provides:

(8) *Past acts of misconduct.* While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of a current act of misconduct, a discharge for misconduct cannot be based on such past act or acts. The termination of employment must be based on a current act.

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).

Excessive absences are not considered misconduct unless unexcused. The requirements for a finding of misconduct based on absences are therefore twofold. First, the absences must be excessive. *Sallis v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 437 N.W.2d 895 (Iowa 1989). The determination of whether unexcused absenteeism is excessive necessarily requires consideration of past acts and warnings. *Higgins v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 350 N.W.2d 187, 192 (Iowa 1984). Second, the absences must be unexcused. *Cosper*, 321 N.W.2d at 10. The requirement of "unexcused" can be satisfied in two ways. An absence can be unexcused either because it was not for "reasonable grounds," *Higgins*, 350 N.W.2d at 191, or because it was not "properly reported," holding excused absences are those "with appropriate notice." *Cosper*, 321 N.W.2d at 10.

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*, 321 N.W.2d at 9; *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. See *Gaborit*, 734 N.W.2d at 555-558. An employer's no-fault absenteeism policy or point system is not dispositive of the issue of qualification for unemployment insurance benefits. Absences related to issues of personal responsibility such as transportation, lack of childcare, and oversleeping are not considered excused. *Higgins*, 350 N.W.2d at 191. When claimant does not provide an excuse for an absence the absences is deemed unexcused. *Id.*; see also *Spragg v. Becker-Underwood, Inc.*, 672 N.W.2d 333, 2003 WL 22339237 (Iowa App. 2003). 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.

Excessive absenteeism has been found when there have been seven unexcused absences in five months; five unexcused absences and three instances of tardiness in eight months; three unexcused absences over an eight-month period; three unexcused absences over seven months; and missing three times after being warned. See *Higgins*, 350 N.W.2d at 192 (Iowa 1984); *Infante v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa App. 1984); *Armel v. EAB*, 2007 WL 3376929*3 (Iowa App. Nov. 15, 2007); *Hiland v. EAB*, No. 12-2300 (Iowa App. July 10, 2013); and *Clark v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 317 N.W.2d 517 (Iowa App. 1982).

Claimant's absences on June 24, 2020; June 9, 2020; October 28, 2019; October 14, 2019; October 4, 2019; August 23, 2019; August 12, 2019 and June 29, 2019 were for reasonable grounds and were properly reported. Therefore, the absences were excused and do not constitute misconduct.

Claimant's absences on July 2, 2020 and August 28, 2019 were not for reasonable grounds and were not properly reported. Therefore, these two absences are unexcused. Claimant accrued

two unexcused absences during one year of employment. Claimant's unexcused absenteeism is not excessive and, thus, does not constitute disqualifying job-related misconduct. Employer has not met its burden of proving claimant was discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct. Accordingly, benefits are allowed provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

Because claimant's separation was not disqualifying, the issues of overpayment, repayment and chargeability are moot. Because claimant is eligible for regular unemployment insurance benefits, claimant is also eligible for Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation. See PL 116-136 §2104(B).

DECISION:

The September 18, 2020 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. Claimant was discharged for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed provided claimant is otherwise eligible. The issues of overpayment, repayment and chargeability are moot. Claimant is eligible for Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation.



Adrienne C. Williamson
Administrative Law Judge
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau
Iowa Workforce Development
1000 East Grand Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209
Fax (515)478-3528

December 4, 2020
Decision Dated and Mailed

acw/mh