

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

---

**JENNIFER A SANTIAGO ESTRADA**  
Claimant

**JELD-WEN INC**  
Employer

**APPEAL 16A-UI-08283-LJ-T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**OC: 07/03/16**  
**Claimant: Appellant (1)**

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 July 22, 2016, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits based upon a determination that claimant was discharged from employment due to excessive, unexcused absenteeism. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on August 16, 2016. The claimant, Jennifer A. Santiago Estrada, participated. The employer, Jeld-Wen, Inc., participated through Cole Johnson, human resource associate. Employer's Exhibits 1 through 7 was received and admitted into the record.

**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 full time, most recently as a production laborer, from September 1, 2013, until July 6, 2016, when she was discharged for absenteeism. The employer maintains an attendance policy. (Exhibits 6 and 7) This policy states that any employee who accumulates six attendance points will be subject to discharge. (Exhibit 6) Claimant had 15.5 attendance points at the time she was discharged.

Claimant's final absence occurred on July 1, 2016. The employer maintains claimant was a no-call/no-show that day. Claimant testified that she notified her manager that she would not be in due to a lack of childcare for her nephew. On June 30, claimant called in and reported that she did not have a babysitter for her nephew so she would not be coming to work. In the three months prior to claimant's discharge, she was absent on thirteen occasions. Including July 1 and June 30, claimant testified that five of these absences were related to her nephew.

Claimant was warned on September 18, 2015 for reaching two attendance points. (Exhibit 3) Claimant was warned on May 2, 2016, for reaching nine attendance points. (Exhibit 2) Claimant admits she received both of these warnings. She denies she signed the May 2, 2016, warning, upon the advice of coworkers. However, her signature appears on the document. Claimant was aware her job was in jeopardy if she missed additional days of work.

## REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant was discharged from employment due to 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.

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).

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. 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).

It is the duty of the administrative law judge as the trier of fact in this case, to determine the credibility of witnesses, weigh the evidence and decide the facts in issue. *Arndt v. City of LeClaire*, 728 N.W.2d 389, 394-395 (Iowa 2007). The administrative law judge may believe all, part or none of any witness's testimony. *State v. Holtz*, 548 N.W.2d 162, 163 (Iowa App. 1996). In assessing the credibility of witnesses, the administrative law judge should consider the evidence using his or her own observations, common sense and experience. *Id.* In determining the facts, and deciding what testimony to believe, the fact finder may consider the following factors: whether the testimony is reasonable and consistent with other believable evidence; whether a witness has made inconsistent statements; the witness's appearance, conduct, age, intelligence, memory and knowledge of the facts; and the witness's interest in the trial, their motive, candor, bias and prejudice. *Id.*

After assessing the credibility of the witnesses who testified during the hearing, considering the applicable factors listed above, and using her own common sense and experience, the administrative law judge finds Johnson's testimony more credible than claimant's. Claimant's testimony included multiple inconsistencies, though it is unclear whether those were the product of intentionally false statements or accidental incorrect statements. However, the credibility of the witnesses does not change the outcome of this case, as claimant's final absence was not excused.

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. Claimant missed five days of work over a three-month period due to her nephew, caused either by the nephew's illness or a lack of alternative childcare. 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 unexcused absenteeism, is considered excessive. Benefits are withheld.

#### **DECISION:**

The July 22, 2016, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. Claimant was discharged from employment due to excessive, unexcused absenteeism. 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.

---

Elizabeth A. Johnson  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

lj/