

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

CORISSA A COSTAS

Claimant

APPEAL 17A-UI-00414-LJ-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

GENERAL DYNAMICS INFO TECH

Employer

OC: 07/24/16

Claimant: Respondent (2)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(7) – Excessive Unexcused 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 January 4, 2017 (reference 03) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits based upon a determination that claimant was discharged for absences due to illness that were properly reported. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on February 2, 2017. The claimant, Corissa A. Costas, participated. The employer, General Dynamics Information Technology, participated through Diane Fountain, human resources business partner; and Kelly Leefers, manager. Claimant's Exhibits A and B and Employer's Exhibits 1 through 4 were received and admitted into the record.

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 was employed full time, most recently as a customer service representative, from August 1, 2016, until December 20, 2016, when she was discharged for absenteeism. Claimant's final absence occurred on December 20, 2016. She was scheduled to work from 8:30 a.m. until 5:00 p.m. Claimant did not call in to either the automated line or to a supervisor and report that she would be done that day. Claimant was also absent on Monday, December 19, and every day the prior week, December 12 through December 16. Claimant called the automated attendance line for her absences December 12 through 16, but she did not call in and speak with a supervisor. On December 13, claimant's supervisor, Tammy Allen, sent claimant an email and inquired about her absences. (Exhibit 1, pages 1-2) Allen reminds claimant that she needs to call into a supervisor each time she is absent, and she provides her telephone number and

Leefers' number as well. This email notifies claimant that she is officially on a written warning effective the date of the email. In the email, Allen also notifies claimant that the telephone number the employer has for her is not working. Claimant responded to Allen and told her that she was sick and had a doctor's note. (Exhibit 1, page 1) Claimant also provides her updated phone number.

Claimant testified that she was not making her daily calls to a supervisor to report her absences in December because she had strep throat and could not talk. Claimant's email to Allen does not mention this issue. Claimant testified that she accidentally deleted Allen's email and so she could not respond to it to report her absences after December 13. She testified that she did not have Allen's telephone number, as Allen recently became her supervisor, and she had lost the business card with her former supervisor's contact information.

The employer's attendance policy sets forth a number of circumstances in which an employee may have an approved absence ("ATO"). (Exhibit 4, page 7) These approved absences may include approved vacation, earned time off ("ETO"), unpaid personal leave approved in advance ("UPL"), and sick leave that is reported to both the automated line and a supervisor. Any unpaid time off that an employee takes that does not fall into one of the categories under approved absences is considered personal time off ("PTO") and is an unapproved absence. (Exhibit 4, page 8) As of the date of claimant's discharge, claimant had five "PTO" absences and seven no-call/no-show full absences, late arrivals, or early departures. She also had seventeen "UPTO" absences. Based on the testimony provided during the hearing, the difference between "PTO" absences and "UPTO" absences involves the amount of contact the employee makes with the employer about the absence. Claimant received a verbal warning on December 1, 2016, due to her attendance. She also received the above-mentioned written warning and reminder of the reporting policy on December 13, 2016, due to her attendance.

The administrative record reflects that claimant has received unemployment benefits in the amount of \$966.00, since filing a claim with an effective date of July 24, 2016 and an additional date of December 18, 2016, for the six weeks ending January 28, 2017. The administrative record also establishes that the employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview, make a first-hand witness available for rebuttal, or provide written documentation that, without rebuttal, would have resulted in disqualification.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant was discharged for excessive, unexcused absenteeism. Benefits are withheld.

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.

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 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* at 192. Second, the absences must be unexcused. *Cosper* 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* at 191, or because it was not "properly reported," holding excused absences are those "with appropriate notice." *Cosper* at 10. The determination of whether unexcused absenteeism is excessive necessarily requires consideration of past acts and warnings.

An employer's point system or no-fault absenteeism policy is not dispositive of the issue of qualification for benefits. However, an employer is entitled to expect its employees to report to work as scheduled or to be notified as to when and why the employee is unable to report to work. The employer has established that the claimant was warned that further improperly reported or unexcused absences could result in termination of employment. While claimant's absences between December 12 and the end of her employment may have been due to illness, she did not properly report these absences to the employer. Despite knowing that she was required to call both the automated line and a supervisor, claimant made no contact with a supervisor for these absences except for one email on December 13. Further, that email was only sent in response to the employer initiating contact with her. Claimant's final absence, in combination with the claimant's history of unexcused absenteeism, is considered excessive. Benefits are withheld.

The next issues are whether claimant was overpaid benefits, whether claimant must repay benefits, and whether the employer may be charged. Iowa Code § 96.3(7)a-b, as amended in 2008, provides:

7. Recovery of overpayment of benefits.

a. If an individual receives benefits for which the individual is subsequently determined to be ineligible, even though the individual acts in good faith and is not otherwise at fault, the benefits shall be recovered. The department in its

discretion may recover the overpayment of benefits either by having a sum equal to the overpayment deducted from any future benefits payable to the individual or by having the individual pay to the department a sum equal to the overpayment.

b. (1) (a) If the department determines that an overpayment has been made, the charge for the overpayment against the employer's account shall be removed and the account shall be credited with an amount equal to the overpayment from the unemployment compensation trust fund and this credit shall include both contributory and reimbursable employers, notwithstanding section 96.8, subsection 5. The employer shall not be relieved of charges if benefits are paid because the employer or an agent of the employer failed to respond timely or adequately to the department's request for information relating to the payment of benefits. This prohibition against relief of charges shall apply to both contributory and reimbursable employers.

(b) However, provided the benefits were not received as the result of fraud or willful misrepresentation by the individual, benefits shall not be recovered from an individual if the employer did not participate in the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to section 96.6, subsection 2, and an overpayment occurred because of a subsequent reversal on appeal regarding the issue of the individual's separation from employment.

(2) An accounting firm, agent, unemployment insurance accounting firm, or other entity that represents an employer in unemployment claim matters and demonstrates a continuous pattern of failing to participate in the initial determinations to award benefits, as determined and defined by rule by the department, shall be denied permission by the department to represent any employers in unemployment insurance matters. This subparagraph does not apply to attorneys or counselors admitted to practice in the courts of this state pursuant to section 602.10101.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 provides:

Employer and employer representative participation in fact-finding interviews.

(1) "Participate," as the term is used for employers in the context of the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, means submitting detailed factual information of the quantity and quality that if un rebutted would be sufficient to result in a decision favorable to the employer. The most effective means to participate is to provide live testimony at the interview from a witness with firsthand knowledge of the events leading to the separation. If no live testimony is provided, the employer must provide the name and telephone number of an employee with firsthand information who may be contacted, if necessary, for rebuttal. A party may also participate by providing detailed written statements or documents that provide detailed factual information of the events leading to separation. At a minimum, the information provided by the employer or the employer's representative must identify the dates and particular circumstances of the incident or incidents, including, in the case of discharge, the act or omissions of the claimant or, in the event of a voluntary separation, the stated reason for the quit. The specific rule or policy must be submitted if the claimant was discharged for violating such rule or policy. In the case of discharge for attendance violations, the information must include the

circumstances of all incidents the employer or the employer's representative contends meet the definition of unexcused absences as set forth in 871—subrule 24.32(7). On the other hand, written or oral statements or general conclusions without supporting detailed factual information and information submitted after the fact-finding decision has been issued are not considered participation within the meaning of the statute.

(2) "A continuous pattern of nonparticipation in the initial determination to award benefits," pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, as the term is used for an entity representing employers, means on 25 or more occasions in a calendar quarter beginning with the first calendar quarter of 2009, the entity files appeals after failing to participate. Appeals filed but withdrawn before the day of the contested case hearing will not be considered in determining if a continuous pattern of nonparticipation exists. The division administrator shall notify the employer's representative in writing after each such appeal.

(3) If the division administrator finds that an entity representing employers as defined in Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, has engaged in a continuous pattern of nonparticipation, the division administrator shall suspend said representative for a period of up to six months on the first occasion, up to one year on the second occasion and up to ten years on the third or subsequent occasion. Suspension by the division administrator constitutes final agency action and may be appealed pursuant to Iowa Code section 17A.19.

(4) "Fraud or willful misrepresentation by the individual," as the term is used for claimants in the context of the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, means providing knowingly false statements or knowingly false denials of material facts for the purpose of obtaining unemployment insurance benefits. Statements or denials may be either oral or written by the claimant. Inadvertent misstatements or mistakes made in good faith are not considered fraud or willful misrepresentation.

This rule is intended to implement Iowa Code section 96.3(7)"b" as amended by 2008 Iowa Acts, Senate File 2160.

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which she was not entitled. The unemployment insurance law 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. However, the overpayment will not be recovered when it is based on a reversal on appeal of an initial determination to award benefits on an issue regarding the claimant's employment separation if: (1) the benefits were not received due to any fraud or willful misrepresentation by the claimant and (2) the employer did not participate in the initial proceeding to award benefits. The employer will not be charged for benefits if it is determined that they did participate in the fact-finding interview. Iowa Code § 96.3(7), Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10. In this case, the claimant has received benefits but was not eligible for those benefits. Since the employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview the claimant is not obligated to repay to the agency the benefits she received and the employer's account shall be charged.

DECISION:

The January 4, 2017, (reference 03) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. Claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld until such time as 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 claimant has been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits in the amount of \$966.00 and is not obligated to repay the agency those benefits. The employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview and its account shall be charged.

Elizabeth A. Johnson
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

lj/