#### IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

ALYSSA FRANCIS Claimant APPEAL NO: 12A-UI-00267-ET ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION AEROTEK INC Employer OC: 12-04-11

Claimant: Respondent (2/R)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge/Misconduct 871 IAC 24.32(7) – Excessive Unexcused Absenteeism Section 96.3-7 – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment

# STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed a timely appeal from the December 29, 2011, reference 01, decision that allowed benefits to the claimant. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call before Administrative Law Judge Julie Elder on February 6, 2012. The claimant did not respond to the hearing notice and did not participate in the hearing or request a postponement of the hearing as required by the hearing notice. Tyler Nations, recruiter, and Nicole Finley, customer support associate, participated in the hearing on behalf of the employer.

# **ISSUE:**

The issue is whether the employer discharged the claimant for work-connected misconduct.

# FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed as a full-time customer service representative for Aerotek last assigned to CDS from September 26, 2011 to December 1, 2011. She was discharged from employment due to a final incident of absenteeism that occurred November 30, 2011. The claimant was absent without providing a reason November 14 and absent due to having a medical appointment November 25, 2011. On November 29, 2011, she was scheduled to start work at 10:00 a.m. She called the employer at 2:00 p.m. and stated she was in the client's parking lot but was not sure if she was going to go into the building. The employer tried to call her back several times, but the claimant did not answer or respond to its messages. She later confirmed she did not call the client as required by the employer's policy and reiterated by the client in a flyer sent out the week before stating if an employee is going to be absent, she must call both the client and the employer. On November 30, 2011, the claimant was a no-call, no-show and her employment was terminated for excessive unexcused absenteeism. The claimant received verbal warnings November 25 and November 29, 2011, about her attendance and that she faced termination from employment upon another incident of unexcused absenteeism. There is no evidence that these absences were related to illness.

The claimant has not made a weekly claim or received unemployment insurance benefits since her separation from this employer.

#### **REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged from employment for disqualifying job misconduct.

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 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.

871 IAC 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 determination of whether unexcused absenteeism is excessive necessarily requires consideration of past acts and warnings. 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. Absences related to issues of personal responsibility such as transportation, lack of childcare, and oversleeping are not considered excused. Higgins v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 350 N.W.2d 187 (Iowa 1984). The claimant had four absences, including the final two which were no-call, no-show absences between November 14 and November 30, 2011. The employer has established that the claimant was warned that further unexcused absences could result in termination of employment and that the final absence was not excused. The final absence, in combination with the claimant's history of absenteeism within approximately the last two weeks of her employment, is considered excessive. Therefore, benefits are denied.

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 whether or not the overpayment is recovered. Iowa Code section 96.3-7. In this case, the claimant has received benefits but was not eligible for those benefits. The matter of determining the amount of the overpayment and whether the overpayment should be recovered under Iowa Code section 96.3-7-b is remanded to the Agency.

#### **DECISION:**

The December 29, 2011, reference 01, decision is reversed. The 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.

Julie Elder Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

je/kjw