

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

RONALD PORTER
Claimant

WHIRLPOOL CORPORATION
Employer

APPEAL 17A-UI-00481-LJ-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

**OC: 12/18/16
Claimant: Appellant (2)**

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 January 11, 2017, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits based upon a determination that claimant was discharged from employment for excessive, unexcused absenteeism. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on February 1, 2017. The claimant, Ronald Porter, participated. The employer, Whirlpool Corporation, registered two participants for the hearing. However, neither person was available when called at the hearing time.

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 an assembler, from April 4, 2008, until December 9, 2016, when he was discharged for attendance reasons. Claimant testified that he missed December 6, 7, and 8, all due to transportation issues. The transmission in claimant's truck had gone out, and he did not know anyone on his shift so he could not ask a coworker for a ride to work. Claimant called in each day and reported that he would not be at work. Claimant did not believe these absences would lead to him being discharged from employment. Claimant testified that the employer has a progressive discipline policy, and he had no current write-ups or suspensions on his record. Claimant believes the employer follows the progressive discipline policy for all other employees. Claimant has filed a union grievance, and he stated that the union believes he was wrongfully discharged because the proper disciplinary steps were not applied.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed.

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.

While an employer's point system or no-fault absenteeism policy is not dispositive of the issue of qualification for benefits, the employer discharged claimant contrary to the terms of its own

policy. Claimant provided unrefuted testimony that he should have been issued a warning for his absences and he should not have been discharged. According to claimant, the employer follows its policy for all other employees but deviated from the policy to discharge him. Thus, since the consequence of discharge was more severe than other employees would receive for similar conduct by the terms of the policy, the disparate application of the policy cannot support a disqualification from benefits. Benefits are allowed, provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

DECISION:

The January 11, 2017, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. Claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided he is otherwise eligible. Any benefits claimed and withheld on this basis shall be paid.

Elizabeth A. Johnson
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

lj/