

Human Resources Admin. v. McCaskill-Bourdeau

OATH Index No. 108/18 (July 26, 2018)

Respondent charged with excessive absence over a 15-month period. Charges sustained. Termination of employment recommended.

NEW YORK CITY OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE TRIALS AND HEARINGS

In the Matter of
HUMAN RESOURCES ADMINISTRATION
Petitioner
- against -
ELLADINE McCASKILL-BOURDEAU
Respondent

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

KARA J. MILLER, *Administrative Law Judge*

This employee disciplinary proceeding was referred by the Human Resources Administration (“HRA” or “petitioner”) pursuant to section 75 of the Civil Service Law. Respondent Elladine McCaskill-Bourdeau, an Eligibility Specialist II, was charged with being excessively absent between January 1, 2016 and March 28, 2017, for approximately 149 work days, which equates to an absenteeism rate of 61 percent.

Following a three-day trial, I find that petitioner established that respondent had been excessively absent between January 1, 2016 and March 28, 2017. I recommend that respondent be terminated from her position with HRA.

ANALYSIS

Respondent was charged with being absent from the workplace on 116 occasions as set forth in the attached Exhibit A (ALJ Ex. 1; Pet Ex. 4).

Toni McLaurin, an employee in the Office of Human Capital Management, works as an intermittent Family Medical Leave Act (“FMLA”) consultant, reviewing FMLA applications for short-term and long-term leaves (Tr. 8, 18). Intermittent FMLA is allotted to employees that have a chronic or catastrophic condition but would still like to come to work. The employee is

notified by e-mail and regular mail if her application is approved. If approved, the employee receives a maximum of 420 hours of intermittent FMLA leave, which equates to 12 weeks (Tr. 9).

Respondent's last approved leave request was on December 23, 2015, for the period of October 28, 2015 through October 28, 2016 (Pet. Ex. 1; Tr. 9). Ms. McLaurin, however, notified respondent by an e-mail dated September 9, 2016, that she had used her allotted 420 hours of intermittent FMLA as of September 1, 2016, and was no longer eligible for intermittent FMLA (Pet. Ex. 2; Tr. 11-12). Ms. McLaurin also spoke with respondent several times by telephone to discuss her time and leave situation. Shortly after her intermittent FMLA leave expired, respondent asked for Ms. McLaurin's assistance because respondent's work location suggested that she apply for FMLA leave again. Ms. McLaurin explained to respondent that she was ineligible for additional intermittent FMLA because she had not accrued enough work hours to reapply. As an alternative, Ms. McLaurin suggested that she apply for long-term leave (Tr. 13). Respondent also expressed that she was experiencing difficulty walking and getting to work so Ms. McLaurin proposed that she apply for Access-A-Ride to help her get to work (Tr. 14).

Despite her conversation with Ms. McLaurin, respondent applied for intermittent FMLA for the period of January 3, through December 31, 2017, anyway. Ms. McLaurin sent respondent a letter dated January 18, 2017, informing her that her application had been disapproved because she had not worked a sufficient number of hours during the prior 12-month period (Pet. Ex. 3; Tr. 15, 17, 22). Respondent contacted Ms. McLaurin several times after the 2017 FMLA application had been denied, asking what she should do. Ms. McLaurin again suggested she apply for a long-term leave (Tr. 18, 20).

Rhonda Whittingham-Grant, a section manager in the agency's Medicaid Division, supervises Craig Myrie, a section supervisor, who in turn, supervises respondent's supervisor, Cecilia Royal (Tr. 25, 49, 71-72). Respondent started in this unit in 2014 (Tr. 25-26, 139). Ms. Whittingham-Grant testified that since 2016, respondent has been "out sick a lot" (Tr. 27). She further testified that Ms. Royal and Mr. Myrie met with respondent on several occasions to discuss her excessive absences and the impact that it was having on the unit. Respondent also met with the Deputy Director of the Medicaid Division to discuss her time and leave issues (Tr. 48-50, 136). During each of these meetings, her supervisors suggested that respondent reapply

for FMLA and recommended that she speak to a counselor in the Employee Assistance Program (“EAP”) (Tr. 49).

Ms. Whittingham-Grant testified that respondent’s absences were creating a hardship for her unit (Tr. 49-50). In her opinion, 61% absenteeism rate is excessive. Since the agency deals directly with the public and there are timeframes in which the work needs to be completed, if an employee is chronically absent, the work needs to be distributed to other staff members, which doubles someone else’s workload (Tr. 130).

On November 18, 2016, following a meeting between respondent and Ms. Royal regarding her excessive absenteeism, respondent was given a memo summarizing their discussion. One of the bullet points in the memo noted that respondent’s absences were negatively impacting the unit because other employees needed to do her work (Pet. Ex. 6; Tr. 54).

Respondent testified that since January 2016 she has been very sick. She suffers from chronic arthritis and a respiratory problem. In addition, respondent testified that she has heart problems, high blood pressure, and asthma (Tr. 141). Respondent further testified that “her feet gave out” and she had a heel spur, which made it difficult for her to walk (Tr. 157). At times she was so sick, she could not go to work (Tr. 141, 157). Respondent testified that in December 2016, her sister became fatally sick and needed her because she has no other family. Before her sister’s death in April 2017, respondent spent “many days” with her at the hospital (Tr. 143-44). After her sister’s death, respondent suffered from depression (Tr. 167).

Respondent acknowledged that she had exhausted her FMLA leave balance (Tr. 159-60). Respondent further acknowledged that she was told that her absences were excessive and she understood that she needed to come to work (Tr. 145). She admitted that she had been warned that she needed to document her absences because her time and leave was unsatisfactory. Consequently, every time she went to the doctor she would get a note (Tr. 143, 157, 160).

Respondent testified that she enjoys her work (Tr. 161). She maintained that she could not resign or stop working because she has a son who is in school and depends on her (Tr. 142). Respondent admitted that she knew she was supposed to be at work, but contended that things happened that were beyond her control (Tr. 141-42, 145, 154-56). Respondent testified that since September 2016, when she exhausted her FMLA, she tried to go to work even if she was

sick. Despite this, every seven or eight days she would take off, but would make sure her absence was documented by going to the doctor (Tr. 162). She asserted that she is a good worker and she is feeling mostly better now (Tr. 157-58).

Respondent argued that HRA did not go through the required procedure or properly notify her that she was excessively absent and would be subject to disciplinary charges (Tr. 154). Respondent further contended that they were trying to make a case against her so they were “doing stuff fraudulent” and not following procedure (Tr. 156). She feels harassed because they “just want [her] to resign or quit or give up or something” (Tr. 158).

Respondent’s testimony that her supervisors did not provide her with notification that her absences were becoming excessive was disingenuous. She acknowledged that there were several meetings in which she was told that she needed to come to work and was warned that her absences were a problem. In addition, she testified repeatedly that she knew she needed to come to work. Respondent failed to supply any corroboration or evidence for her fraud allegation. To the contrary, the agency demonstrated that it did everything it could to assist respondent by recommending she apply for Access-A-Ride, contacting EAP, and explaining that she would only be eligible for a long-term leave of absence.

During trial, respondent argued that HRA’s evidence was insufficient to establish respondent’s absences and that it failed to follow the proper procedure to document her absences with M-301e forms. When an employee has an unplanned absence, the employee is supposed to contact a supervisor to inform him or her that she will not be coming into work that day. When the employee returns to work, she is required to fill out a M-301e form, providing an explanation and seeking approval for the absence (Pet. Ex. 7; Tr. 73). If the staff member refuses to fill out the M-301e form, then a supervisor fills it out and annotates the form explaining why the employee did not sign it (Tr. 131).

Respondent argued that a number of the M-301e forms in evidence that were filled out by a supervisor were not annotated (Resp. Ex. A). Nevertheless, Ms. Wittingham-Grant signed off on them. Ms. Wittingham-Grant acknowledged there were instances in which she signed some of the M-301e forms that were not signed by respondent nor annotated by a supervisor (Tr. 118-25). Although HRA does not require an employee to sign the M-301e form in order for Ms. Wittingham-Grant to sign off on it, she admitted that the better practice would have been to have

the forms annotated by the supervisor to explain that respondent had refused to sign (Tr. 131-32). Respondent's focus on the M-301e forms, however, was misplaced. Petitioner accurately tracked respondent's absences through CityTime, a computerized timekeeping system (Pet. Ex. 4). Respondent's CityTime records reflect that respondent was excessively absent between January 1, 2016 and March 28, 2017.

Respondent further argued that several of the absences reflected in the M-301e forms were authorized absences. HRA's Code of Conduct, however, does not make a distinction between authorized or unauthorized absences (Tr. 135). The Code of Conduct states that employees must comply with departmental time and leave regulations and prohibits excessive lateness and/or absenteeism (Pet. Ex. 8; Tr. 134). Regardless of whether respondent's absences were authorized or documented by medical notes, they still count towards her total number of absences. Moreover, respondent was charged with excessive absenteeism, not unauthorized absences (ALJ Ex. 1).

Attendance has been found to be an "essential function" of most jobs. *Lyons v. Legal Aid Society*, 68 F.3d 1512, 1516 (2d Cir. 1995) ("It is clear that an essential aspect of many jobs is the ability to appear at work regularly and on time"); *Vandenbroek v. PSEG Power Ct LLC*, 356 Fed. Appx. 457, 460 (2d Cir. 2009) (quoting *Daddazio v. Katharine Gibbs School, Inc.*, 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 5408 at *14 (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 20, 1999), *aff'd*, 205 F.3d 1322 (2d Cir. 2000)) ("Regularly attending work' is an essential function of virtually every job."); *Scalera v. Electrograph Systems*, 848 F. Supp. 2d 352, 363 (E.D.N.Y. 2012) ("Indeed, one such essential function of an employee's job is showing up for work"); *Querry v. Messar*, 14 F. Supp. 2d 437, 445 (S.D.N.Y. 1998) (employee is not otherwise qualified when she could not achieve regular and predictable attendance).

Although excessive absence is prohibited by HRA Executive Order No. 726, section III(5), HRA's regulations do not define what constitutes excessive absence (Pet. Ex. 8). It has been held that whether an agency has a clearly defined rule regarding a maximum number of permitted absences is not determinative in making a finding of excessive absences. In prior cases where excessive absence has been charged but not specifically defined by agency rules, this tribunal has noted three circumstances which would give rise to sanctions: (i) absences which are so extensive in number that they are excessive per se; (ii) absences which are

excessive because of the disruption they cause to the workplace and the adverse impact they have on workplace efficiency and operations; and (iii) absences which are excessive based on circumstances surrounding the missed days of work. See *Triborough Bridge & Tunnel Auth. v. Beverley*, OATH Index No. 2238/15 at 8-9 (Nov. 30, 2015), *adopted*, Auth. Dec. (Dec. 28, 2015), *aff'd* NYC Civ. Serv. Comm'n Item No. 2016-0060 (May 2, 2016); *Dep't of Education v. Medina*, OATH Index No. 1865/11 at 3 (July 22, 2011), *adopted*, Chancellor's Dec. (Aug. 25, 2011); *Admin. for Children's Services v. Scipio*, OATH Index No. 2144/11 at 4 (June 21, 2011).

Relevant factors to consider when determining excessive absence include available leave balances, the cause for the absences, documentation, approval, the impact on office operations, and whether the employee received warnings about attendance. *Scipio*, OATH 2144/11 at 4-5; *Fire Dep't v. A.G.*, OATH Index No. 771/12 at 26 (July 5, 2012), *aff'd* NYC Civ. Serv. Comm'n Item No. CD 13-02-SA (Feb. 6, 2013) (unplanned absences of 129 out of 250 work days in 2010 and 165 out of 251 work days in in 2011 were deemed excessive); *Human Resources Admin. v. McCaskill-Bourdeau*, OATH Index No. 164/11 at 16-17 (Oct. 22, 2010) (20 absences in nine months were deemed excessive); *Transit Auth. v. Montgomery and Dunham*, OATH Index Nos. 1144/99 & 1145/99 at 8 (July 15, 1999), *aff'd*, *Transit Auth. v. Dunham*, NYC Civ. Serv. Comm'n Item No. CD 00-33-SA (Apr. 6, 2000) (127 absences in nine months deemed excessive).

In this case, the relevant factors demonstrate that respondent's absences were excessive. Many of respondent's absences were unplanned, she exhausted her leave balances, she received warnings about her attendance, and her absences had a negative impact on her unit. See *McCaskill-Bourdeau*, OATH 164/11 at 16-17 (20 absences over nine-month period were excessive where employee had a large number of unauthorized absences, rarely gave advance notice of her absences and her absences had a negative impact on the workplace); *Bd. of Education v. Anderson*, OATH Index No. 343/90 at 9 (Jan. 19, 1990), *aff'd*, NYC Civ. Serv. Comm'n Item No. CD 93-26 (May 20, 1993) (79 absences in 16-month period excessive where they far exceeded annual allocations for sick or annual leave and had a negative effect on office operations and morale).

Between December 6, 2016 and February 21, 2017, respondent had an absentee rate of 61% of the time, representing 149 days absent out of 243 potential work days. Respondent's absences qualify as excessive.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Petitioner established that respondent was excessively absent between January 1, 2016 and March 28, 2017.

RECOMMENDATION

Upon sustaining the charges, I obtained and reviewed an abstract of respondent's personnel record provided to me by petitioner. Respondent was appointed as an Eligibility Specialist I on October 24, 1994, and was promoted to Eligibility Specialist II on October 26, 2003. During her 24-year tenure with the Department, she has been formally disciplined on five occasions. She received a 15-day penalty pursuant to a settlement in 2003 for excessive lateness and two absences without authorization; a 35-day penalty pursuant to a settlement in 2006 for excessive lateness and disruptive behavior; a 40-day penalty pursuant to a settlement for failure to perform her work, reading a newspaper at her desk, two instances of abusive language towards a member of the public, and three instances of insubordination. In 2010, following a decision issued by Administrative Law Judge Tynia D. Richard, respondent was suspended for 60 days for insubordination, absence without authorization, excessive lateness, and excessive absence. Respondent received another 60-day penalty for insubordination on May 18, 2013.

Each of respondent's evaluations between 2010 and 2017, with the exception of December 2014, reflected that respondent's attendance and punctuality was "not satisfactory." The evaluators' comments regarding respondent's attendance all stress that respondent needs to come to work and her poor attendance has negatively impacted her productivity.

Under similar circumstances, excessive absenteeism routinely results in termination of employment. See *Dep't of Correction v. Peters*, OATH Index No. 1118/03 (Sept. 24, 2003) (termination of employment where employee used 69 sick days in 12 months); *Dep't of Correction v. Purcell*, OATH Index No. 1336/96 at 18 (July 8, 1996), *aff'd*, NYC Civ. Serv. Comm'n Item No. CD 97-106-SA (Nov. 21, 1997) (termination of employment deemed the "only appropriate penalty" where employee used 90 sick days in 12 months); *Bd. of Education v.*

Gomez, OATH Index No. 228/84 (Nov. 13, 1984), *modified on penalty*, Bd. Dec. (Jan. 10, 1985), *aff'd*, NYC Civ. Serv. Comm'n Item No. CD 88-64 (May 12, 1988), *aff'd sub nom. Gomez v. NYC Civ. Serv. Comm'n*, NYLJ, Dec. 29, 1988, at 26, col. 4 (Sup. Ct. N.Y. Co.) (employment terminated for time and leave violations, including 46 absences and 129 latenesses in one year, despite lack of prior disciplinary record); *see also Chaffer v. Bd. of Education of the City School Dist. of City of Long Beach*, 229 F.Supp.2d 185 (E.D.N.Y. 2002), *aff'd*, 75 Fed. Appx. 12 (2d Cir. 2003) (upholding termination of employment of school groundskeeper who was absent more than 87 times within 18 months).

While respondent may believe that her absences were medically justified, courts have repeatedly upheld the termination of employment due to poor attendance, stressing the unpredictable, disruptive, and burdensome impact of excessive absenteeism, even if the absences are approved. *See Cicero v. Triborough Bridge & Tunnel Auth.*, 264 A.D.2d 334, 336 (1st Dep't, Aug. 12, 1999) ("Petitioner's argument that his absences were approved and medically justified misperceives the nature of the charges. Petitioner was dismissed on the sole ground that his excessive absenteeism constituted incompetence under Civil Service Law § 75"); *Romano v. Town Bd. of the Town of Colonie*, 200 A.D.2d 934 (3d Dep't 1994) (in upholding termination of employee who was absent from work 41 days in five months, finding that "the fact that petitioner may have had a 'valid' reason for each one of the individual absences is irrelevant to . . . whether his unreliability and its disruptive and burdensome effect on the employer rendered him incompetent to continue his employment"). *See also, Truss v. Westchester County Health Care Corp.*, 301 A.D.2d 607 (2d Dep't 2003) (fact that appropriate leave balances were deducted to cover employee's absences and latenesses is irrelevant where there is proof of excessive and disruptive absences and other attendance violations).

Following respondent's 2010 trial, Judge Richard declined to recommend termination because she was "drawn to a statement repeated by respondent that these proceedings have been a 'wake-up call'" *McCaskill-Bourdeau*, OATH 164/11 at 20. Judge Richard, however, issued a clear warning that termination would likely result from any further misconduct. Respondent was offered one last opportunity to prove that she was capable of change and would abide by HRA's rules of conduct, especially its time and leave rules. Respondent did not heed Judge Richard's

warning. Instead, respondent has continued to demonstrate an inability to be present in the workplace on a regular basis.

Accordingly, I recommend that respondent be terminated from her position with HRA.

Kara J. Miller
Administrative Law Judge

July 26, 2018

SUBMITTED TO:

STEVEN BANKS
Commissioner

APPEARANCES:

GABRIELLE DESTEFANO, ESQ.
Attorney for Petitioner

LAW OFFICES OF LEONARD SHRIER
Attorneys for Respondent

BY: LEONARD SHRIER, ESQ.

EXHIBIT A

	Start Time	End Time	Duration	Leave Type	Leave Reason
1.	03/28/2017 10:00	03/28/2017 18:00	7:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
2.	03/27/2017 10:00	03/27/2017 18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
3.	03/22/2017 10:00	03/22/2017 18:00	7:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
4.	03/20/2017 10:00	03/20/2017 18:00	7:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
5.	03/17/2017 10:00	03/17/2017 18:00	7:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
6.	03/16/2017 10:00	03/16/2017 18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Absence Without Leave
7.	03/15/2017 10:00	03/15/2017 18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	LWOP Documented
8.	03/14/2017 10:00	03/14/2017 18:00	7:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
9.	03/13/2017 10:00	03/13/2017 18:00	7:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
10.	03/10/2017 10:00	03/10/2017 18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	LWOP for Undocumented Sick
11.	03/07/2017 10:00	03/07/2017 18:00	7:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
12.	03/02/2017 10:00	03/02/2017 18:00	7:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
13.	03/01/2017 10:00	03/01/2017 18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
14.	02/24/2017 10:00	02/24/2017 18:00	7:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
15.	02/23/2017 10:00	02/23/2017 11:54	2:00	Leave Without Pay	Absence Without Leave
16.	02/21/2017 10:00	02/21/2017 18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Absence Without Leave
17.	02/20/2017 10:00	02/20/2017 18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
18.	02/17/2017 10:00	02/17/2017 18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Absence Without Leave
19.	02/16/2017 10:00	02/16/2017 18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Absence Without Leave
20.	02/15/2017 10:00	02/15/2017 18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Absence Without Leave
21.	02/14/2017 10:00	02/14/2017 18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Absence Without Leave
22.	02/13/2017 10:00	02/13/2017 18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	LWOP for Undocumented Sick
23.	02/10/2017 10:00	02/10/2017 18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	LWOP for Undocumented Sick
24.	02/09/2017 10:00	02/09/2017 18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
25.	02/08/2017 10:00	02/08/2017 18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
26.	02/06/2017 10:00	02/07/2017 18:00	14:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
27.	02/03/2017 10:00	02/03/2017 18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Missing Time Entry
28.	02/02/2017 10:00	02/02/2017 18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
29.	02/01/2017 10:00	02/01/2017 18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
30.	01/31/2017 11:35	01/31/2017 18:00	6:00	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
31.	01/30/2017 10:00	01/30/2017 18:00	7:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
32.	01/24/2017 10:00	01/27/2017 18:00	28:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
33.	01/23/2017 10:00	01/23/2017 18:00	7:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
34.	01/20/2017 10:00	01/20/2017 18:00	7:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
35.	01/19/2017 10:00	01/19/2017 18:00	7:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
36.	01/18/2017 10:00	01/18/2017 17:00	7:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
37.	01/17/2017 10:00	01/17/2017 18:00	7:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
38.	01/16/2017 09:30	01/16/2017 17:30	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
39.	01/13/2017 10:00	01/13/2017 18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	LWOP for Undocumented Sick
40.	01/10/2017 10:00	01/10/2017 18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Absence Without Leave
41.	01/09/2017 10:00	01/09/2017 18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	LWOP for Undocumented Sick
42.	01/06/2017 10:00	01/06/2017 18:00	7:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
43.	01/03/2017 10:00	01/05/2017 18:00	21:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP

44.	12/30/2016	10:00	12/30/2016	11:36	1:30	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
45.	12/27/2016	10:00	12/29/2016	17:00	21:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
46.	12/26/2016	10:00	12/16/2016	18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
47.	12/22/2016	10:00	12/23/2016	18:00	14:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
48.	12/19/2016	10:00	12/21/2016	18:00	21:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
49.	12/16/2016	10:00	12/16/2016	18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Absence Without Leave
50.	12/15/2016	10:00	12/15/2016	18:00	7:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
51.	12/14/2016	10:00	12/14/2016	18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Absence Without Leave
52.	12/12/2016	10:00	12/13/2016	18:00	14:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
53.	12/09/2016	10:00	12/09/2016	18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
54.	12/06/2016	10:00	12/06/2016	11:00	1:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
55.	12/05/2016	10:00	12/05/2016	18:00	7:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
56.	12/01/2016	10:00	12/01/2016	18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
57.	11/23/2016	10:00	11/23/2016	17:00	7:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
58.	11/21/2016	10:00	11/21/2016	18:00	7:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
59.	11/17/2016	10:00	11/17/2016	18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	LWOP for Undocumented Sick
60.	11/15/2016	10:00	11/15/2016	18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
61.	11/14/2016	10:00	11/14/2016	17:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	LWOP for Undocumented Sick
62.	11/10/2016	14:32	11/10/2016	18:00	3:30	Leave Without Pay	Missing Time Entry
63.	11/09/2016	10:00	11/09/2016	18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
64.	10/31/2016	10:00	10/31/2016	18:00	7:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
65.	10/28/2016	10:00	10/28/2016	18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Missing Time Entry
66.	10/26/2016	17:00	10/26/2016	18:00	1:00	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
67.	10/25/2016	10:00	10/25/2016	18:00	7:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
68.	10/24/2016	10:00	10/24/2016	18:00	7:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
69.	10/21/2016	10:00	10/21/2016	18:00	7:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
70.	10/17/2016	10:00	10/17/2016	18:00	7:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
71.	10/11/2016	10:00	10/14/2016	18:00	28:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
72.	10/07/2016	10:00	10/07/2016	13:10	3:15	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
73.	10/04/2016	10:00	10/04/2016	18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
74.	09/28/2016	09:00	09/30/2016	17:00	21:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
75.	09/26/2016	09:00	09/27/2016	17:00	14:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
76.	09/19/2016	10:00	09/23/2016	18:00	35:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
77.	09/16/2016	10:00	09/16/2016	18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Missing Time Entry
78.	09/12/2016	10:00	09/13/2016	18:00	14:00	Leave Without Pay	Missing Time Entry
79.	09/08/2016	10:00	09/08/2016	18:00	7:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
80.	09/07/2016	10:00	09/07/2016	18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
81.	08/31/2016	10:00	08/31/2016	18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
82.	08/25/2016	10:00	08/26/2016	18:00	14:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
83.	08/16/2016	10:00	08/19/2016	18:00	28:00	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
84.	08/15/2016	10:00	08/15/2016	18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
85.	07/18/2016	10:00	07/18/2016	11:10	1:15	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
86.	05/17/2016	10:00	05/17/2016	18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
87.	05/13/2016	10:00	05/13/2016	18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
88.	05/11/2016	10:00	05/12/2016	18:00	14:00	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
89.	05/09/2016	10:00	05/10/2016	18:00	14:00	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
90.	04/28/2016	10:00	04/28/2016	18:00	7:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP

91.	04/26/2016	10:00	04/27/2016	18:00	14:00	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
92.	04/25/2016	10:00	04/25/2016	18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Missing Time Entry
93.	04/22/2016	10:00	04/22/2016	18:00	7:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
94.	04/14/2016	10:00	04/14/2016	10:45	0:45	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
95.	04/13/2016	10:00	04/13/2016	18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
96.	04/12/2016	10:00	04/12/2016	10:28	0:30	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
97.	04/11/2016	10:00	04/11/2016	11:02	1:00	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
98.	04/06/2016	10:00	04/06/2016	18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
99.	04/05/2016	10:00	04/05/2016	18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
100.	03/28/2016	14:45	03/29/2016	18:00	10:15	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
101.	03/24/2016	10:00	03/24/2016	18:00	7:00	Sick Leave	Undocumented
102.	03/14/2016	10:00	03/14/2016	18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
103.	03/09/2016	10:00	03/09/2016	18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
104.	03/04/2016	10:00	03/04/2016	18:00	7:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
105.	03/03/2016	10:00	03/03/2016	18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
106.	02/16/2016	10:00	02/16/2016	18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
107.	02/11/2016	10:00	02/11/2016	10:11	0:15	Leave Without Pay	Absence Without Leave
108.	02/03/2016	16:01	02/03/2016	18:00	2:00	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
109.	02/01/2016	10:00	02/02/2016	18:00	14:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
110.	01/25/2016	10:08	01/25/2016	17:00	6:45	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
111.	01/25/2016	10:00	01/25/2016	10:08	0:15	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP
112.	01/21/2016	10:00	01/22/2016	18:00	14:00	Leave Without Pay	Missing Time Entry
113.	01/14/2016	13:00	01/14/2016	18:00	4:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
114.	01/11/2016	10:00	01/11/2016	18:00	7:00	Sick Leave	Charged To LWOP
115.	01/07/2016	10:00	01/07/2016	18:00	7:00	Leave Without Pay	LWOP for Undocumented Sick
116.	01/04/2016	10:00	01/05/2016	18:00	14:00	Leave Without Pay	Unscheduled LWOP