IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

 68-0157 (9-06) - 3091078 - El

 REBECCA TRAINER

 Claimant

 APPEAL NO: 07A-UI-10882-ET

 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

 DECISION

 K MART CORP

 Employer

 OC: 10-21-07

Claimant: Respondent (2)

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 November 15, 2007, 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 December 11, 2007. 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. Ari Crane, Store Manager; Linell Hesse, Personnel Manager; and Lisa Griffin, Receiving Manager, 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 part-time receiving associate for K Mart from May 17, 2006 to October 24, 2007. The employer's policy states that six infractions within a six-month period will result in termination. Employees are assigned one point for each unexcused absence and one-half point for each incident of tardiness. They must notify the employer 24 hours in advance of an absence unless it is a family emergency or an absence due to illness with a doctor's excuse. The claimant was absent June 10, July 15, August 1, September 11, 12 and 16, October 8, 12, 23 and 24, 2007, and was tardy August 30, September 7, October 15 and October 19, 2007. The employer was not aware of the reasons for the claimant's absences with the exception of June 15, 2007, when she provided a doctor's excuse and was not assessed an infraction. She was counseled about excessive absenteeism September 4, 2007, and received a final written warning September 14, 2007. The claimant called in to report she would not be in October 24, 2007, and the employer told her if she was absent that day her employment would be terminated and the claimant indicated she was aware of that fact. The employer terminated her employment October 24, 2007, for exceeding the allowed number of attendance infractions. There is no evidence that these absences were related to illness.

The claimant has claimed and 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 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 absenteeism, is considered excessive. Benefits are denied.

Iowa Code section 96.3-7 provides:

7. Recovery of overpayment of benefits. 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.

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.

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which the claimant was not entitled. Those benefits must be recovered in accordance with the provisions of Iowa law.

DECISION:

The November 15, 2007, 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. The claimant is overpaid benefits in the amount of \$656.00.

Julie Elder Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

je/pjs