IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

NAKISHA R THURMOND

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 11A-UI-09680-S2T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

CMT INC TACO JOHN'S Employer

OC: 06/19/11

Claimant: Appellant (1)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Nakisha Thurmond (claimant) appealed a representative's July 21, 2011 decision (reference 01) that concluded she was not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because she was discharged from work with Taco John's (employer) for excessive unexcused absenteeism after having been warned. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for August 16, 2011. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated by Mary Higgins, Manager, and Matthew Lavenz, Supervisor.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the claimant was separated from employment for any disqualifying reason.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was hired on May 11, 2009, as a part-time cashier. The claimant signed for receipt of the employer's handbook on May 11, 2009. The employer issued the claimant written warnings for attendance issues on or about February 16, March 25, and May 24, 2011. The warnings covered three absences due to lack of transportation. On June 18, 2011, the claimant notified the employer that she could not appear for work due to lack of transportation. The employer terminated the claimant on June 18, 2011.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged for misconduct.

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.

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. lowa Department of Job Service, 350 N.W.2d 187 (lowa 1984).

An employer is entitled to expect its employees to report to work as scheduled or to be notified when and why the employee is unable to report to work. 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 representative's July 21, 2011 decision (reference 01) is affirmed. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because the claimant was discharged from work for misconduct. Benefits are withheld until the claimant has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times the claimant's weekly benefit amount, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

Beth A. Scheetz Administrative Law Judge	_
Decision Dated and Mailed	
bas/pjs	