IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

EDWARD M RIVERA

Claimant

APPEAL 17A-UI-09407-LJ-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

TYSON FRESH MEATS INC

Employer

OC: 08/20/17

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 September 6, 2017 (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 October 2, 2017. The claimant, Edward M. Rivera, participated. The employer, Tyson Fresh Meats, Inc., participated through Shannon Wehr, Human Resource Clerk. Claimant's Exhibits A through E 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 full time, most recently as a production worker, from March 28, 2016, until August 18, 2017, when he was discharged for attendance reasons. Claimant's final absence occurred on August 17, 2017, when he arrived nine minutes late to work. Claimant's schedule had been changing due to him being on light duty, and his start times were varying day to day. Claimant acknowledges that he knew he was scheduled to work at 6:00 a.m. on August 17.

Claimant left early from work on July 19, 2017, due to a medical appointment. Claimant was late on March 31, 2017, due to transportation issues. On March 16, 2017, claimant called in sick. On March 9, 2017, he was late for personal reasons. Claimant was absent on February 20, 2017, due to a medical appointment for his foot. Claimant was absent due to personal illness on January 18, January 19, and February 13, 2017. On January 14, 2017, claimant was late to work for personal reasons. On November 29, 2016, claimant was absent for personal reasons. On November 4 and 5, 2016, claimant was absent due to personal illness. Claimant was absent due to a lack of transportation on October 28, 2016. On February 13, 2017, claimant received a written warning letter for absenteeism. He was aware that his job was in jeopardy due to his attendance issues.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant was discharged from employment due to disqualifying misconduct. 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. 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 Dep't of Job Serv.*, 350 N.W.2d 187 (Iowa 1984). Absences due to illness or injury must be properly reported in order to be excused. *Cosper v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321

N.W.2d 6 (lowa 1982). When no excuse is given for an absence at the time of the absence and no reason is given in the record, an absence is deemed unexcused. *Higgins v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 350 N.W.2d 187, 191 (lowa 1984). See also Spragg v. Becker-Underwood, Inc., 672 N.W.2d 333, 2003 WL 22339237 (lowa App. 2003).

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 and the final absence was not properly reported or excused. The final absence, in combination with the claimant's history of unexcused absenteeism, is considered excessive. Benefits are withheld.

DECISION:

The September 6, 2017 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. Claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld until such time as he has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible.

Elizabeth A. Johnson
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

lj/scn