

Report to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee

March 2015

Prepared by:

Department of Fair Employment and Housing

2218 Kausen Drive, Suite 100 Elk Grove, CA 95758

Kevin Kish, Director



Table of Contents

Int	roduction	1
Ex	ecutive Summary	1
Ва	ckground	2
A.	Complainants' Demographic Information	7
В.	Immediate Right to Sue Notices Issued10	0
C.	Complaints Filed by Basis and Accusations Issued by Basis	1
D.	Complaints Referred to Mediation, Mediations Conducted, Settlements, and Total Settlement Amounts	8
E.	Cases Settled by Enforcement Division and Legal Division and Amount of Settlements	9
F.	Complaints Referred to Litigation	0
G.	Accusations Issued and Civil Complaints Filed	0
Н.	Percentage of Complaints Closed within 100 Days and 365 Days of Filing 2	1
Ι.	Number of Cases Assigned per Investigator and per Attorney	2

Introduction

The Supplemental Report of the 2014-15 Budget requires the Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH or Department) to submit a report to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee that includes the following information for each calendar year beginning January 1, 2011 through December 31, 2014: (a) each complainant's county of residence and all other available demographic information, such as race, sex, age, and primary language; (b) total number of requests for immediate rights to sue issued; (c) total cases filed by basis and total accusations issued by basis;(d) number of cases referred to department-conducted mediation, number of mediations conducted, number of settlements, and the total value of those settlements; (e) number of cases settled by the Enforcement Division and Legal Division and the total amount of settlements for each Division; (f) number of cases the Department referred to litigation; (g) number of accusations issued and number of civil complaints the Department filed; (h) percentage of cases closed within 100 days of filing and within 365 days of filing, respectively; and (i) average number of cases assigned per investigator and per attorney.

This report provides data requested by the Joint Legislative Budget Committee as well as background information about how changing structures and procedures – including historic changes brought about by SB 1038 in 2012 – have impacted the Department's work over the past four years. Preparing this report has helped the Department critically assess its current information management systems as well as its internal allocation of resources. This assessment will be ongoing as the Department transitions to new leadership.

Executive Summary

The DFEH annually processes more than 19,000 complaints alleging violations of laws enforced by the Department. Each year, a majority of complaints involve allegations of discrimination in employment under the Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA). However, the number of complaints alleging discrimination in housing under the FEHA and violations of the Unruh Civil Rights Act, the Disabled Persons Act, and the Ralph Civil Rights Act has increased in each of the years covered by this report and has more than doubled since 2011.

Disability discrimination and retaliation are the most common bases for complaints of employment discrimination in each of the years covered by the report. Similarly, disability discrimination is the most common basis for complaints of housing discrimination.

In the past four years, the Department has conducted 1,644 formal mediations resulting in 1,019 settlements with monetary recovery of \$16,982,408. In the same time period, the Department has negotiated an additional \$22,419,629 in monetary settlements outside formal DFEH mediation. These numbers do not include the societal value of affirmative relief and policy changes resulting from settlements.

A number of factors discussed in this report have led to a sharp increase in investigator caseloads over the time period covered. In 2014, each investigator was assigned an

average of 203 cases over the course of the year compared to 138 in 2011. High caseloads have contributed to ongoing difficulties in closing cases in a timely fashion. The federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requires that DFEH complete 50% of its investigations of housing complaints within 100 days of the filing of the complaints. The Department did not meet this target in 2011 through 2013. By making structural, personnel, and system changes, the Department began meeting the target in June 2014. However, continued attention needs to be paid to this issue.

Background

Mission, History, and Structure

The mission of the DFEH is to protect Californians from employment, housing and public accommodation discrimination, and hate violence. The DFEH is the largest state civil rights agency in the country, with 189 authorized positions at this time. It was established by the Legislature in 1959 as the Division of Fair Employment Practices. In 1980, the DFEH was established as an independent department charged with enforcing California's comprehensive employment, housing, public accommodations and public service non-discrimination laws, as well as the State's bias-related hate violence law. The Department is part of the Business, Consumer Services and Housing Agency and is administered by a Director appointed by the Governor.

The DFEH's statutory mandate is to protect the people of California from employment, housing and public accommodations discrimination and hate violence pursuant to the California Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA), Unruh Civil Rights Act, Disabled Persons Act, and Ralph Civil Rights Act. The FEHA (Government Code section 12900 et seq.) prohibits workplace discrimination and harassment on the basis of race, religious creed, color, national origin, ancestry, physical disability, mental disability, medical condition, genetic information, marital status, sex, gender, gender identity, gender expression, age, sexual orientation, and military and veteran status, or because another person perceives the employee to have one or more of these characteristics.

Included in the FEHA is the California Family Rights Act (CFRA), which requires employers of 50 or more employees to provide protected leave of up to 12 work weeks in a 12-month period to eligible employees to care for their own serious health condition or that of an eligible family member. Included as well is California's Pregnancy Disability Leave Act (PDLA), which requires an employer to provide female employees, disabled by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition protected leave of up to four months and thereafter returns to work.

With regard to housing, the FEHA prohibits discrimination and harassment on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, gender, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, marital status, national origin, ancestry, familial status, source of income, disability, and genetic information, or because another person perceives the tenant or applicant to have one or more of these characteristics. The FEHA also mandates reasonable accommodation of religious beliefs or observances in the workplace, including religious dress and grooming practice, requires employers and housing providers to reasonably accommodate persons with disabilities, and prohibits covered entities from retaliating against any person because he or she has opposed practices

forbidden by the FEHA or filed a complaint, testified, or assisted in any DFEH or court proceeding related to a FEHA claim.

The Unruh Civil Rights Act (Civil Code section 51) prohibits business establishments in California from discriminating in the provision of services, accommodations, advantages, facilities and privileges to clients, patrons and customers because of their sex, race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, disability, medical condition, genetic information, marital status, and sexual orientation. Similarly, the Disabled Persons Act (Civil Code section 54 et seq.) provides that individuals with disabilities or medical conditions have the same right as the general public to the full and free use of streets, highways, sidewalks, walkways, public buildings, medical facilities(including hospitals, clinics, and physicians' offices), and privileges of all common carriers, airplanes, motor vehicles, railroad trains, motorbuses, streetcars, boats, or any other public conveyances or modes of transportation (whether private, public, franchised, licensed, contracted, or otherwise provided), telephone facilities, adoption agencies, private schools, hotels, lodging places, places of public accommodation, amusement, or resort, and other places to which the general public is invited, subject only to the conditions and limitations established by law, or state or federal regulation, and applicable alike to all persons.

The Ralph Civil Rights Act (Civil Code section 51.7) guarantees the right of all persons within California to be free from any violence, or intimidation by threat of violence, committed against their persons or property because of political affiliation, or on account of sex, race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, disability, medical condition, genetic information, marital status, or sexual orientation, or position in a labor dispute, or because another person perceives them to have one or more of these characteristics.

The DFEH operates out of five offices throughout California. The Department's Enforcement Division consists of investigators (also known as consultants) who receive and investigate employment, housing, public accommodations, and hate violence complaints in each office. The Legal Division operates out of two offices and prosecutes cases referred by the Enforcement Division. A systemic litigation unit within the Legal Division focuses on systemic complaints, meaning complaints that allege a business-wide pattern or practice of discrimination impacting a large number of complainants statewide. The Office of Compliance Programs, also within the Legal Division, monitors state contractors' compliance with nondiscrimination programs. The Dispute Resolution Division mediates complaints and operates out of three offices. The Department maintains a communication center where staff members receive and respond to phone calls, written correspondence and emails from the public and assist with pre-filing inquiries and Public Records Act (PRA) requests.

Since 2013, the Department has housed the Fair Employment and Housing Council, a body that issues regulations interpreting and implementing rights and obligations under the FEHA. In addition, the DFEH tracks and analyzes legislation, routinely engages in public outreach, and provides training and technical assistance to employers, business establishments, and housing providers regarding their responsibilities under the law. The Department has partnered with UC Irvine School of Law, UC Davis School of Law, Pepperdine School of Law's Straus Institute for Dispute Resolution, Southwestern Law

School, CSU Bakersfield, and College of the Canyons to provide students hands-on experience in investigating, mediating and prosecuting FEHA cases.

Recent Changes

On January 1, 2013, SB 1038 went into effect, making sweeping changes to the FEHA and the enforcement role of the DFEH. There has not been a more significant change to California's civil rights law since the 1959 enactment of the Fair Employment Practices Act (FEPA) and the 1980 reorganization of the FEPA and the Rumford Fair Housing Act into the FEHA.

SB 1038 eliminated the Fair Employment and Housing Commission, an entity separate from the DFEH with its own budget that both promulgated regulations and adjudicated FEHA claims in an administrative forum. The law transferred the regulatory functions of the Commission to the DFEH by creating a rulemaking body called the Fair Employment and Housing Council (Council) within the Department. SB 1038 ended administrative adjudication of FEHA claims and, for the first time, authorized the DFEH to file and prosecute civil actions directly in court. But before prosecuting a case, the Department provides free dispute resolution through its in-house Dispute Resolution Division.

To implement SB 1038, DFEH redirected positions to hire more mediators for its Dispute Resolution Division, increasing the ability of the Department to resolve cases without litigation but reducing the number of Enforcement Division positions available to investigate complaints. At the same time, DFEH redirected more resources to its systemic team in the Legal Division in order to increase the number of high impact, systemic discrimination cases the Legal Division could pursue under its strengthened prosecutorial power.

Since its creation, the new DFEH Council has drafted proposed amendments to the California Family Rights Act regulations (currently under review by the Office of Administrative Law); proposed amendments to a number of the former Commission's employment regulations (currently undergoing public review and comment); and is in the process of drafting the first proposed regulations interpreting California laws prohibiting housing discrimination.

Other internal changes have also had significant impacts on the Department's operations. In July 2012, the DFEH launched an electronic complaint filing and case management system. The electronic case management system allows staff in any DFEH office to view and access case files remotely, significantly increasing internal transparency.

Implementation of the system also resulted in changes to the filing process—not only in 2012, but also in subsequent years as the Department responded to feedback from the public and internal needs (see discussion under "Explanation of Data in this Report" on the following page). These changes are ongoing as the Department endeavors to make its processes as responsive and efficient as possible.

Explanation of Data in this Report

The electronic complaint filing and case management system implemented by the Department in 2012 brought changes in how DFEH tracks and reports data. These changes – along with changes in our processes – have resulted in some challenges in reporting consistent data over the period covered by this report. In particular, tracking of "complaints" has changed over time. Prior to implementation of the electronic system in July 2012, DFEH staff conducted initial interviews with complainants before creating a "complaint." These interviews did not result in a "complaint" (as the Department uses that term) if DFEH staff determined that the Department lacked jurisdiction over the matter or if the complainant chose not to move forward after being interviewed. These initial interviews were not included in counts of complaints.

The electronic system initially allowed complainants to file complaints online without being interviewed or otherwise discussing their claims with a DFEH investigator. A number of these initial filings were ultimately closed because of lack of jurisdiction or because the complainant chose not to move forward, but they were nonetheless counted as "complaints" under the new system. Subsequently (beginning on January 29, 2013 for housing complaints and on September 21, 2014 for all other complaints), a pre-complaint inquiry (PCI) process was added to the online system for all filings. Under this process, investigators again conduct intake interviews to determine whether the department has jurisdiction before a "complaint" is prepared. The electronic system cannot currently distinguish between open PCIs and complaints, although the system can identify PCIs that have been closed without resulting in a complaint.

In practical terms, this means that the number of complaints or cases reported for 2011 and the first half of 2012 do not include cases where an initial interview of a complainant did not lead to a "complaint." The number of reported housing cases from July 2012 (when the electronic system was implemented) through January 2013 (when the PCI process began for housing cases) includes all filings, even those ultimately closed for lack of jurisdiction or that otherwise did not result in a full investigation. Similarly, the number of reported non-housing cases from July 2012 through September 2014 includes all filings. For this report, for the time period after the PCI process was created (after January 2013 for housing and after September 2014 for non-housing cases), the Department has excluded cases that did not lead to "complaints," meaning PCI cases that were closed after an initial interview without further investigation. The reported case numbers do include any open PCIs (because the system cannot distinguish those cases from complaints), some number of which will ultimately be closed without further investigation and will not lead to a complaint. The number of open PCIs included in this report should nonetheless be very small, since the vast majority of PCIs from 2013 and 2014 have been processed and have either been closed without further investigation (meaning they are not counted) or have been accepted for investigation (meaning they are counted as complaints).

-

¹ Except verified complaints filed online by individuals who wish to forego the DFEH investigation and receive an immediate Right-to-Sue notice.

DFEH is currently working to modify its case management system to: distinguish between PCIs and complaints. This capability will allow the Department to determine whether a matter in an investigator's caseload is a PCI assigned for intake or a complaint assigned for investigation; to compare the number of PCIs rejected to the number accepted for investigation (and thereby converted to complaints); and to compare the number of PCIs to the number of complaints requesting an immediate Right-to-Sue. This capability will allow the Department to better track and report data over time.

A. Each complainant's county of residence and all other available demographic information for each calendar year

The following tables show the total number of employment and housing discrimination complaints based on the county of the complainant. The data is broadly consistent with the state's population demographics, with the largest number of complaints originating in the most populous counties. It is important to note that information such as race, sex, age, primary language, etc. is voluntary self-reporting data and not available for each complaint. For this reason, the Department does not have complete data on the other requested demographic information, including the race, sex, age, and primary language of complainants.

Complainants' County of Residence Employment Complaints					
	2011	2012	2013	2014	
Alameda	880	785	734	709	
Alpine	3		1		
Amador	14	13	17	10	
Butte	63	47	62	50	
Calaveras	22	22	13	16	
Colusa	5	9	9	8	
Contra Costa	528	499	493	476	
Del Norte	4	3	9	18	
El Dorado	77	60	66	72	
Fresno	509	410	364	373	
Glenn	8	9	11	6	
Humboldt	30	28	31	46	
Imperial	41	51	51	35	
Inyo	10	6	7	3	
Kern	346	371	335	319	
Kings	59	39	35	53	
Lake	12	19	13	16	
Lassen	5	11	7	5	
Los Angeles	6,043	5,099	6,236	5,889	
Madera	56	58	42	52	
Marin	119	87	74	71	
Mariposa	6	6	1	3	
Mendocino	15	17	20	20	
Merced	103	97	94	60	
Modoc	3		3	6	
Mono	4	2	4	5	
Monterey	158	124	119	122	
Napa	55	49	45	48	
Nevada	42	26	38	17	
Orange	1,413	1,111	1,445	1,400	
Placer	158	139	159	170	
Plumas	4	4	7	5	
Riverside	720	676	744	720	

Complainants' County of Residence Housing Complaints					
	2011	2012	2013	2014	
Alameda	62	51	57	72	
Alpine					
Amador	1			1	
Butte	3	10	8	11	
Calaveras		2			
Colusa					
Contra Costa	17	32	33	38	
Del Norte		1	3		
El Dorado	3	2	7	7	
Fresno	20	25	31	41	
Glenn			1		
Humboldt	6	5	5	9	
Imperial	2	3	2	3	
Inyo					
Kern	20	24	15	26	
Kings		4	1	6	
Lake		5	1	4	
Lassen	3	1			
Los Angeles	238	335	351	448	
Madera	1	3	4	2	
Marin	5	17	19	12	
Mariposa	1				
Mendocino	1	3	2	6	
Merced	3	1	4	4	
Modoc					
Mono				1	
Monterey	3	8	10	20	
Napa	3	1	6	4	
Nevada		2	2	1	
Orange	39	68	71	88	
Placer	8	10	2	12	
Plumas					
Riverside	40	61	43	56	

	2011	2012	2013	2014
Sacramento	863	884	831	848
San Benito	36	16	39	28
San				
Bernardino	790	694	791	846
San Diego	1,107	954	1,099	1,141
San Francisco	469	398	496	553
San Joaquin	321	298	359	340
San Jose				1
San Luis Obispo	109	81	81	81
San Mateo	256	276	270	234
Santa Barbara	138	193	163	188
Santa Clara	732	533	544	422
Santa Cruz	80	54	59	68
Shasta	54	67	50	59
Sierra		2	2	2
Siskiyou	14	7	10	9
Solano	284	238	226	188
Sonoma	196	170	172	164
Stanislaus	203	179	166	194
Sutter	28	33	20	27
Tehama	15	14	20	16
Trinity	2	2	3	3
Tulare	201	152	157	131
Tuolumne	28	23	22	12
Ventura	297	249	323	281
Yolo	73	97	85	78
Yuba	29	22	19	18
Not Identified		3	18	15
Out of State	172	320	535	882
Totals	18,012	15,836	17,849	17,632

	2011	2012	2013	2014
Sacramento	23	55	72	94
San Benito			2	3
San				
Bernardino	31	51	49	58
San Diego	62	97	87	105
San Francisco	17	48	36	37
San Joaquin	7	19	15	22
San Jose				
San Luis				_
Obispo	12	7	4	6
San Mateo	51	69	46	54
Santa Barbara	5	8	11	10
Santa Clara	38	47	53	67
Santa Cruz	6	11	8	13
Shasta	5	8	16	20
Sierra				
Siskiyou		2	1	6
Solano	12	20	13	22
Sonoma	12	12	22	22
Stanislaus	6	15	8	14
Sutter	2	2	3	2
Tehama	1	1	2	1
Trinity	1			2
Tulare	3	12	11	6
Tuolumne			1	1
Ventura	8	23	19	20
Yolo	1	5	7	10
Yuba	1	2	1	2
Not Identified				6
Out of State	10	35	37	49
Totals	793	1,223	1,202	1,524

The tables on the following page show the total number of Unruh Civil Rights Act, Ralph Civil Rights Act, and Disabled Persons Act complaints based on the county of the complainant. No 2011 data is provided for Disabled Persons Act complaints because the Department began separately tracking those complaints in July 2012 when the DFEH launched its electronic case management system.

Alameda 2 2011 2012 2013 2014 Alameda 2 3 4 2 Fresno 4 2 4 Humboldt 6 2 4 Kern 3 5 2 Kings 1 6 1 Lake 1 1 2 Los Angeles 3 8 11 21 Madera 2 1 1 1 Mendocino 1 1 1 1 Mendocino 1 1 1 1 Merced 2 1 1 1 Monterey 1 1 1 1 Napa 1 1 4 4 4 4 Placer 1 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 <th colspan="5">Complainants' County of Residence Ralph Complaints</th>	Complainants' County of Residence Ralph Complaints				
Contra Costa 2 3 4 2 Fresno 2 4 Humboldt 3 5 2 Kern 3 5 2 Kings 1 1 1 Lake 1 1 1 Los Angeles 3 8 11 21 Madera 2 1 1 1 Mendocino 1 2 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 2 1 1 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3		2011	2012	2013	2014
Fresno 2 4 Humboldt 8 1 1 Kern 3 5 2 Kings 1 1 1 Lake 1 1 1 Los Angeles 3 8 11 21 Madera 2 1 1 Mendocino 1 1 1 Merced 2 1 1 1 Monterey 1 1 1 1 1 Monterey 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 1 4	Alameda	2		7	5
Humboldt Kern 3 5 2 Kings 1 1 1 Lake 1 1 2 Los Angeles 3 8 11 21 Madera 2 1 1 Merced 2 1 1 1 Merced 2 1 1 1 Monterey 1 1 1 1 1 Monterey 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 3 1 2 1 1 1 4 8 5 8 8	Contra Costa	2	3	4	2
Kern 3 5 2 Kings 1 1 1 Lake 1 1 2 Los Angeles 3 8 11 21 Madera 2 1 1 Mendocino 1 1 1 Napa 1 1 1 1 Napa 1 1 4 8 3 3 3 3	Fresno			2	4
Kings 1 1 1 Lake 1 2 1 Los Angeles 3 8 11 21 Madera 2 1 1 Merced 2 1 1 1 Monterey 1 1 1 1 1 Napa 1 2 1 1 4 2 5 8 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	Humboldt				
Lake 1 2 Madera 2 1 Mendocino 1 1 Merced 2 1 1 Merced 2 1 1 Monterey 1 1 1 Napa 1 1 1 Nevada 1 1 1 Orange 1 4 4 4 Placer 2 1 1 Plumas 1 1 1 1 Riverside 2 7 3 3 3 6 2 8 8 1 1 3 3 8 6 6 6 2 2 2 4 8 8 3 1 3 1 3 1 3<	Kern		3	5	2
Lake 1 2 Madera 2 1 Mendocino 1 1 Merced 2 1 1 Merced 2 1 1 Monterey 1 1 1 Napa 1 1 1 Nevada 1 1 1 Orange 1 4 4 4 Placer 2 1 1 Plumas 1 1 1 1 Riverside 2 7 3 3 3 6 2 8 8 1 1 3 3 8 6 6 6 2 2 2 4 8 8 3 1 3 1 3 1 3<	Kings	1			1
Madera 2 Mendocino 1 Merced 2 1 1 Monterey 1 1 1 Napa 1 1 1 Nevada 1 1 1 Orange 1 4 4 4 Placer 2 1 1 1 Riverside 2 7 3 3 3 Sacramento 3 6 2 5 5 8 8 6 6 6 2 5 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 9 3 8 8 8 8 9 8 8 9 9 3 8 9 2			1		
Madera 2 Mendocino 1 Merced 2 1 1 Monterey 1 1 1 Napa 1 1 1 Nevada 1 1 1 Orange 1 4 4 4 Placer 2 1 1 1 Riverside 2 7 3 3 3 Sacramento 3 6 2 5 5 8 8 6 6 6 2 5 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 9 3 8 8 8 8 9 8 8 9 9 3 8 9 2	Los Angeles	3	8	11	21
Mendocino 1 Merced 2 1 1 Monterey 1 1 Napa 1 1 Nevada 1 1 Orange 1 4 4 4 Placer 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 3 1			2		
Merced 2 1 1 Monterey 1 1 Napa 1 1 Nevada 1 1 Orange 1 4 4 4 Placer 2 1 1 Plumas 1 1 1 Riverside 2 7 3 3 Sacramento 3 6 6 San Benito 1 3 2 San Benito 4 2 5 San Diego 2 2 4 8 San Diego 2 2 4 8 San Joaquin 1 3 2 San Luis 0bispo 3 3 Obispo 3 3 4 1 1 Santa 3 4 1 1 1 Santa Clara 3 4 1 1 1 Shasta 1 1 2 2 2 2 Sonoma 1 2 2 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1</td>					1
Monterey 1 Napa 1 Nevada 1 Orange 1 4 4 4 Placer 2 1 2 1 1 1 3 4 4 2 5 5 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 </td <td></td> <td>2</td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td>		2		1	1
Napa 1 Nevada 1 Orange 1 4 4 4 Placer 2 1 Plumas 1 1 1 Riverside 2 7 3 3 Sacramento 3 6 6 San Benito 1 5 San Benito 1 2 5 San Diego 2 2 4 8 San Diego 2 2 4 8 San Francisco 2 6 2 Salinas 1 3 2 San Luis 0bispo 3 San Mateo 2 2 2 1 Santa 8 1 1 Santa 8 1 1 Santa Clara 3 4 1 1 Shasta 1 1 2 2 Sonoma 1 2 2 2<					
Nevada 1 4 4 4 4 4 4 Placer 2 1 1 4 4 4 4 4 Placer 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 1 3 4 8 3 3 3 3 2 2 2 2 2 1 3 2 2 2 1 3 3 2 3 3 3				1	
Orange 1 4 4 4 Placer 2 1 Plumas 1 Riverside 2 7 3 3 Sacramento 3 6 6 6 San Benito 1 San Benito 1					
Placer 2 1 Plumas 1 Riverside 2 7 3 3 Sacramento 3 6 6 San Benito 1 San Benito 1 San Benito 1 San Bernardino 4 2 5 San Diego 2 2 4 8 San Diego 2 2 4 8 San Francisco 2 6 2 Salinas 1 3 2 Salinas 1 3 2 San Luis Obispo 3 Santa 3 4 1 1 Santa 3 4 1 1 Santa 3 4 1 1 Shasta 1 1 1 Sierra 1 2 2 2		1	1		1
Plumas 1 Riverside 2 7 3 3 Sacramento 3 6 6 San Benito 1 6 6 San Benito 1 8 8 Bernardino 4 2 5 San Diego 2 2 4 8 San Diego 2 2 4 8 San Francisco 2 6 2 Salinas 1 3 2 Salinas 1 3 2 San Luis Obispo 3 3 San Mateo 2 2 2 1 Santa 3 4 1 1 Shata 3 4 1 1 Shasta 1 1 2 2 Sonoma 1 2 2 2 Sonoma 1 2 2 2 Sonoma 1 1 <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>4</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td>		1	4	-	-
Riverside 2 7 3 3 Sacramento 3 6 6 San Benito 1 1 San Bernardino 4 2 5 San Diego 2 2 4 8 San Diego 2 2 4 8 San Diego 2 2 4 8 San Diego 2 6 2 Salinas 1 3 2 Salinas 1 3 2 San Joaquin 1 3 2 San Luis Obispo 3 3 Santa Barbara 1 1 1 Santa Clara 3 4 1 1 Shasta 1 1 1 Sierra 1 1 2 Sonoma 1 2 2 Sonoma 1 2 2 Stanislaus 1 1 Tular			4		I
Sacramento 3 6 6 San Benito 1 San Bernardino 4 2 5 San Diego 2 2 4 8 San Diego 2 2 4 8 San Diego 2 2 4 8 San Francisco 2 6 2 Salinas 1 3 2 San Joaquin 1 3 2 San Luis Obispo 3 3 San Mateo 2 2 2 1 Santa Barbara 1 1 1 Santa Clara 3 4 1 1 Shasta 1 1 1 2 Solano 2 2 2 2 Sonoma 1 2 2 2 Stanislaus 1 1 1 Tulare 2 1 1 1		0			
San Benito 1 San Bernardino 4 2 5 San Diego 2 2 4 8 San Diego 2 2 4 8 San Diego 2 2 4 8 San Francisco 2 6 2 Salinas 1 3 2 San Joaquin 1 3 2 San Luis 0bispo 3 San Mateo 2 2 2 1 Santa 8 8 8 1 1 Santa Clara 3 4 1 1 1 Shasta 1 1 1 1 1 1 Sierra 1 2		2	-		
San Bernardino 4 2 5 San Diego 2 2 4 8 San Diego 2 2 4 8 San Diego 2 6 2 Salinas 1 3 2 Salinas 1 3 2 San Joaquin 1 3 2 San Luis Obispo 3 3 San Mateo 2 2 2 1 Santa 3 4 1 1 Santa Clara 3 4 1 1 Shasta 1 1 1 Sierra 1 2 2 2 Sonoma 1 2 2 Stanislaus 1 1 2 Tulare 1 1 1 Ventura 2 4 9				6	6
Bernardino 4 2 5 San Diego 2 2 4 8 San Francisco 2 6 2 Salinas 1 3 2 Salinas 1 3 2 San Joaquin 1 3 2 San Luis Obispo 3 3 San Mateo 2 2 2 1 Santa Barbara 1 1 1 Santa Clara 3 4 1 1 1 Shasta 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2			1		
San Diego 2 2 4 8 San Francisco 2 6 2 Salinas 1 3 2 Salinas 1 3 2 San Joaquin 1 3 2 San Luis Obispo 3 3 San Mateo 2 2 2 1 Santa Barbara 1 1 1 Santa Clara 3 4 1 1 Shasta 1 1 1 1 Sierra 1 2 2 2 2 Sonoma 2 2 2 2 2 Stanislaus 1 2 1 1 Tulare Ventura 2 4 9			1	2	_
San 6 2 Salinas 1 3 2 San Joaquin 1 3 2 San Luis Obispo 3 3 San Mateo 2 2 2 1 Santa Barbara 1 1 Santa Clara 3 4 1 1 Shasta 1 1 1 Sierra 1 2 2 2 Sonoma 1 2 2 Stanislaus 1 1 1 Tulare Ventura 2 1 1 Yolo 1 1 1 0 Out of State 1 2 4 9		2			
Francisco 2 6 2 Salinas 1 3 2 San Joaquin 1 3 2 San Luis Obispo 3 3 San Mateo 2 2 2 1 Santa Barbara 1 1 1 Santa Clara 3 4 1 1 1 Shasta 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 <				4	0
Salinas 1 San Joaquin 1 3 2 San Luis Obispo 3 San Mateo 2 2 2 2 1 Santa Barbara 1 1 1 Santa Clara 3 4 1 1 1 Shasta 1 1 1 1 1 1 Sierra 2 <		2		6	2
San Joaquin 1 3 2 San Luis 3 3 Obispo 3 3 San Mateo 2 2 2 1 Santa 3 4 1 1 Santa Clara 3 4 1 1 Shasta 1 1 1 Sierra 1 2 2 2 Sonoma 1 2 2 Stanislaus 1 1 2 Tulare Ventura 2 1 1 Yolo 1 1 1 Out of State 1 2 4 9					
San Luis 3 Obispo 3 San Mateo 2 2 2 1 Santa Barbara 1 1 Santa Clara 3 4 1 1 Shasta 1 1 Sierra 1 2 2 2 Sonoma 1 2 2 Stanislaus 1 1 1 Tulare Ventura 2 1 1 Yolo 1 1 1 Out of State 1 2 4 9			1	3	
Obispo 3 San Mateo 2 2 2 1 Santa Barbara 1 1 Santa Clara 3 4 1 1 Shasta 1 1 1 Sierra 1 2 2 2 Sonoma 1 2 2 Stanislaus 1 1 1 Tulare Ventura 2 1 1 Yolo 1 1 1 Out of State 1 2 4 9				0	
San Mateo 2 2 2 1 Santa Barbara 1 1 Santa Clara 3 4 1 1 Shasta 1 1 1 Sierra 2 2 2 2 Solano 2 2 2 2 Sonoma 1 2 2 Stanislaus 1 1 1 Tulare Ventura 2 1 1 Yolo 1 1 1 Out of State 1 2 4 9				3	
Barbara 1 Santa Clara 3 4 1 1 Shasta 1 1 Sierra 1 2 Solano 2 2 2 Sonoma 1 2 Stanislaus 1 1 Tulare Ventura 2 1 Yolo 1 1 Out of State 1 2 4 9		2	2	2	1
Santa Clara 3 4 1 1 Shasta 1 1 Sierra 1 2 Solano 2 2 2 Sonoma 1 2 Stanislaus 1 1 Tulare Ventura 2 1 Yolo 1 1 Out of State 1 2 4 9	Santa				
Shasta 1 Sierra 1 Solano 2 2 2 Sonoma 1 2 Stanislaus 1 1 Tulare Ventura 2 1 Yolo 1 1 Out of State 1 2 4 9	Barbara				1
Sierra 1 Solano 2 2 2 Sonoma 1 2 Stanislaus 1 1 Tulare Ventura 2 1 Yolo 1 1 Out of State 1 2 4	Santa Clara	3	4	1	1
Solano 2 2 2 Sonoma 1 2 Stanislaus 1 1 Tulare Ventura 2 1 Yolo 1 1 1 Out of State 1 2 4 9	Shasta			1	
Sonoma 1 2 Stanislaus 1 Tulare 2 1 Ventura 2 1 Yolo 1 1 Out of State 1 2 4 9	Sierra				1
Sonoma 1 2 Stanislaus 1 Tulare 2 1 Ventura 2 1 Yolo 1 1 Out of State 1 2 4	Solano	2		2	2
Stanislaus 1 Tulare 2 Ventura 2 Yolo 1 Out of State 1 2 4 9				1	2
Tulare 2 1 Ventura 2 1 Yolo 1 1 Out of State 1 2 4 9					1
Ventura 2 1 Yolo 1 1 Out of State 1 2 4 9					
Yolo 1 1 Out of State 1 2 4 9		2			1
Out of State 1 2 4 9				1	
		1	2		-
Totals 27 48 77 90					

Complainants' County of Residence Unruh Complaints					
	2011	2012	2013	2014	
Alameda	10	8	13	13	
Amador		8			
Butte		2	1	1	
Contra Costa	4	7	10	8	
El Dorado			1		
Fresno		5	7	8	
Imperial			1		
Kern	5	6	7	3	
Lake	1				
Los Angeles	30	42	54	90	
Madera	1	1			
Mendocino		1			
Merced	1	2	1	2	
Monterey			3	1	
Napa			1	1	
Nevada		1			
Orange	3	12	5	15	
Placer		1	2	2	
Riverside	3	5	4	11	
Sacramento	6	15	15	35	
San Benito	1				
San Bernardino	2	10	2	13	
San Diego	10	9	17	18	
San Francisco	10	4	6	8	
San Joaquin		5	4	1	
San Luis Obispo			1	3	
San Mateo	3	8	1	3	
Santa Barbara			2	2	
Santa Clara	7	5	8	18	
Santa Cruz	-	2	2	3	
Shasta		1		1	
Siskiyou		2		-	
Solano	3	2	4	6	
Sonoma	1		3	3	
Stanislaus	2	2	1	2	
Tehama			1		
Tulare	1	2	1	2	
Ventura	1	1	3	3	
Yolo	<u>'</u>	•	1		
Out of State	4	20	8	19	
Totals	109	189	190	295	

Complainants' County of Residence Disabled Persons Act Complaints				
	2012	2013	2014	
Alameda	1	1	4	
Contra Costa		2	1	
Fresno	1		4	
Humboldt			1	
Kern	2		1	
Los Angeles	4	5	7	
Monterey			1	
Nevada		1		
Orange	1	2	3	
Placer			1	
Riverside		2	1	
Sacramento	2	2	5	
San Benito		1		
San Bernardino		1	2	
San Diego	1	1	2	
San Francisco			1	
San Joaquin	1			
San Mateo			1	
Santa Barbara			1	
Santa Clara	1	1	1	
Shasta	1			
Solano				
Sonoma		1	1	
Stanislaus		1	1	
Yuba				
Out of State	1	1	4	
Totals	16	22	43	

B. Total number of immediate "Right to Sue" notices issued

The FEHA requires that individuals exhaust their administrative remedies by filing a complaint and obtaining a Right to Sue notice from the Department before filing a lawsuit under the FEHA alleging employment discrimination. Administrative exhaustion is not required for complaints alleging housing discrimination under the FEHA or for complaints alleging violations of the other laws enforced by the DFEH. The Department accepts requests for an immediate Right to Sue notice from persons who have decided to forgo an investigation and proceed directly to court in employment discrimination cases. The complaint must be filed within one year from the last act of discrimination or the complainant may lose his or her right to file a lawsuit under the FEHA.

The DFEH issued the following number of immediate "Right to Sue" notices for each of the below listed calendar years:

Immediate "Right to Sue" Notices Issued					
2011	2012	2013	2014		
11,447	8,674	10,914	10,568		

C. Total complaints filed by basis and total accusations issued by basis

The tables in this section show the total number of complaints filed by basis. Complainants may file a complaint alleging discrimination on more than one basis. For example, an individual might allege that she has been discriminated against based on both her sex and her race, and that she has suffered retaliation, all in the same complaint. As a result, the number of bases is significantly higher than the number of complaints filed.

The following tables also show the number of "accusations" filed by basis. Prior to 2013, the Department initiated prosecution by filing an "accusation" (administrative pleading) before the former Fair Employment and Housing Commission. Under SB 1038, the Department is now authorized to file civil complaints directly in the state or federal trial courts rather than with the Commission. As a result, the tables for 2013 and 2014 include civil complaints with their bases, rather than accusations.

In 2011, a total of 18,012 employment and 793 housing complaints were filed on the bases shown below.

Total Employment Complaints Filed by Basis in 2011 = 18,012	No.
Age - 40 or Over	3,872
Association - Must be Used with Another Basis	530
Disability - Mental and Physical	9,379
Family Care	798
Marital Status	383
National Origin/Ancestry	2,021
Other	576
Race/Color	3,427
Religion	492
Retaliation	7,728
Sex - Harassment	3,713
Sex - Orientation	727
Sex - Other Allegations	2,350
Sex - Pregnancy	937
Total Employment Bases	36,933

Total Housing Complaints Filed by Basis in 2011 = 793	No.
Age - 40 or Over	4
Association - Must be Used with Another Basis	10
Disability - Mental and Physical	444
Familial Status (Children)	146
Marital Status	16
National Origin/Ancestry	86
Other	7
Race/Color	141
Religion	8
Retaliation	57
Sex - Harassment	30
Sex - Orientation	28
Sex - Other Allegations	27
Sex - Pregnancy	5
Source of Income	20
Total Housing Bases	1,029

In 2011, a total of 27 Ralph and 109 Unruh complaints were filed on the bases shown below.

Total Ralph Complaints filed by Basis (27)	No.
Age – 40 or Over	2
National Origin/Ancestry	7
Disability – Mental and Physical	1
Race/Color	6
Religion	1
Retaliation	2
Sex – Harassment	15
Sex – Orientation	1
Sex – Other Allegations	2
Total	37

Total Unruh Complaints filed by	
Basis (109)	No.
Age – 40 or Over	1
Association – Must be Used with	
Another Basis	2
Familial Status (Children)	2
Marital Status – Married	1
Disability - Mental and Physical	79
National Origin/Ancestry	8
Race/Color	20
Retaliation	1
Sex – Harassment	2
Sex – Orientation	2
Sex – Other Allegations	6
Total	124

The table below shows the bases included in the accusations filed in 2011.

Total Accusations Issued in 2011 = 58		
Туре	Basis	No.
Employment	Age – 40 or Over	3
Employment	Disability	21
Employment	Family Care	6
Employment	Marital Status – Single	1
Employment	National Origin/Ancestry	2
Employment	Race/Color	3
Employment	Retaliation – for Protesting	9
Employment	Sex – Harassment	15
Employment	Sex – Orientation	1
Employment	Sex – Other Allegations	9
Employment	Sex – Pregnancy	6
Housing	Disability	8
Housing	Familial Status (Children)	4
Housing	National Origin/Ancestry	1
Housing	Race/Color	1
Housing	Religion	2
Housing	Retaliation - for Protesting	3
Unruh	Disability	1
Total		96

In 2012, a total of 15,836 employment and 1,223 housing complaints were filed on the bases shown below.

Total Employment Complaints Filed by Basis in 2012 = 15,836	No.
Age - 40 and Over	3,488
Association with a Member of a Protected Class	606
Disability - Mental and Physical	8,086
Engagement in Protected Activity	1,139
Family Care or Medical Leave	1,301
Marital Status	392
National Origin/Ancestry	2,125
Other	1,259
Race/Color	4,030
Religion	595
Retaliation	7,261
Sex - Gender Identity/Expression	199
Sex - Genetic Information	84
Sex - Harassment	3,163
Sex - Orientation	681
Sex - Other Allegations	2,833
Sex - Pregnancy	886
Total	38,128

Total Housing Complaints Filed by Basis in 2012 = 1,223	No.
Age - 40 and over	44
Association with a Member of a Protected Class	14
Disability - Mental and Physical	586
Engagement in Protected Activity	51
Familiar Status (Children)	206
Marital Status	54
National Origin/Ancestry	110
Other	88
Race/Color	305
Religion	24
Retaliation	166
Sex – Genetic Information	4
Sex - Gender Identity/Expression	15
Sex - Harassment	55
Sex - Orientation	45
Sex - Other Allegations	91
Sex - Pregnancy	5
Source of Income	74
Total	1,937

In 2012, a total of 48 Ralph and 189 Unruh complaints were filed on the bases shown below.

Total Ralph Complaints Filed by Basis (48)	No.
Age - 40 and Over	6
Disability - Mental and Physical	4
National Origin/Ancestry	8
Other	12
Political Affiliation	4
Position in a Labor Dispute	8
Race/Color	19
Religion	5
Sex - Gender Identity/Expression	3
Sex - Genetic Information	3
Sex - Harassment	1
Sex - Orientation	9
Sex - Other Allegations	6
Total	88

Total Unruh Complaints Filed by Basis (189)	No.
Age - 40 and Over	22
Association	2
Disability - Mental and Physical	105
Familial Status (Children)	1
Marital Status	3
National Origin/Ancestry	23
Other	23
Race/Color	77
Religion	10
Sex - Gender Identity/Expression	3
Sex - Genetic Information	2
Sex - Harassment	2
Sex - Orientation	9
Sex - Other Allegations	15
Total	297

The table below shows the bases included in the accusations filed in 2012.

Total Accusations Issued in 2012 = 57		
Туре	Basis	No.
Employment	Age - 40 or Over	2
Employment	Disability	15
Employment	Family Care	8
Employment	National Origin/Ancestry	1
Employment	Race/Color	2
Employment	Religion	1
Employment	Retaliation for Filing	2
Employment	Retaliation - for Protesting	8
Employment	Sex – Harassment	8
Employment	Sex – Orientation	3
Employment	Sex - Other Allegations	3
Employment	Sex – Pregnancy	10
Housing	Disability	18
Housing	Familial Status (Children)	9
Housing	Marital Status – Single	2
Housing	National Origin/Ancestry	1
Housing	Source of Income	2
Housing	Retaliation - for Filing	1
Unruh	Disability	19
Unruh	Race/Color	1
Total		116

In 2013, a total of 17,849 employment and 1,202 housing complaints were filed on the bases shown in the tables on the following page.

Total Employment Complaints Filed in 2013 =17,849	No.
•	
Age 40 and over	4,510
Association with a Member of a Protected Class	1,530
Disability - Mental and Physical	11,166
Engagement in Protected Activity	5,810
Family Care or Medical Leave	3,789
Marital Status	590
Other	3,142
Race/Color	6,567
Religion	766
Retaliation	12,537
Sex - Gender Identity or Gender Expression	428
Sex – Genetic Information	419
Sex – Harassment	4,473
Sex – Orientation	881
Sex - Other Allegations	5,178
Sex – Pregnancy	1,163
Total	66,423

Total Housing Complaints Filed in 2013 = 1,202	No.
Age - 40 and over	113
Association with a Member of a Protected Class	43
Disability - Mental and Physical	580
Engagement in Protected Activity	60
Familiar Status (Children)	223
Marital Status	73
National Origin/Ancestry	139
Other	92
Race/Color	397
Religion	41
Retaliation	344
Sex - Gender Identity or Gender Expression	13
Sex – Genetic Information	7
Sex - Harassment	74
Sex - Orientation	46
Sex - Other Allegations	112
Sex - Pregnancy	12
Source of Income	120
Total	2,489

In 2013, a total of 77 Ralph and 190 Unruh complaints were filed on the bases shown below.

Total Ralph Complaints filed by Basis (77)	No.
Age - 40 and Over	11
Disability - Mental and Physical	21
National Origin/Ancestry	18
Other	23
Political Affiliation	2
Position in a Labor Dispute	15
Race/Color	35
Religion	11
Sex - Gender Identity/Expression	4
Sex - Genetic Information	2
Sex - Orientation	14
Sex - Other Allegations	24
Total	180

Total Unruh Complaints filed by Basis (190)	No.
Age - 40 and Over	16
Disability - Mental and Physical	92
Marital Status	7
National Origin/Ancestry	26
Other	26
Race/Color	131
Religion	9
Sex - Gender Identity/Expression	4
Sex - Genetic Information	7
Sex - Orientation	12
Sex - Other Allegations	30
Sex - Pregnancy	1
Total	361

The table below shows the bases included in the civil complaints filed in 2013.

Total Civil Complaints Filed in 2013 = 27		
Туре	Basis	No.
Employment	Age - 40 or Over	1
Employment	Disability – Mental and Physical	3
Employment	Engagement in Protected Activity	5
Employment	Race/Color	1
Employment	Retaliation for Filing	3
Employment	Sex – Gender Identity or Gender Expression	3
Employment	Sex – Harassment	3
Employment	Sex – Orientation	2
Employment	Sex – Other Allegations	5
Employment	Pregnancy	4
Housing	Age – 40 and Over	1
Housing	Disability – Mental and Physical	7
Housing	Familial Status	14
Housing	Marital Status	1
Housing	Race/Color	5
Housing	Sex – Harassment	1
Housing	Sex – Orientation	4
Housing	Sex – Other Allegations	1
Housing	Source of Income	1
Ralph	Sex – Orientation	4
Unruh	Sex – Orientation	1
Total		70

In 2014, a total of 17,632employment and 1,524 housing complaints were filed on the bases shown on the following page.

Total Employment Complaints Filed in 2014 = 17,632	No.
Age - 40 or Over	4,338
Association with a Member of a	4,330
Protected Class	1,652
Disability - Mental and Physical	11,060
Engagement in Protected Activity	6,238
Family Care or Medical Leave	3,973
Marital Status	456
National Origin/Ancestry	3,421
Other	2,440
Race/Color	6,488
Religion	736
Retaliation	12,344
Sex – Gender Identity/Expression	439
Sex – Genetic Information	447
Sex – Harassment	4,312
Sex - Orientation	921
Sex – Other Allegations	5,134
Sex - Pregnancy	1,181
Totals	65,338

Total Housing Complaints Filed in 2014 = 1,524	No.
Age - 40 or Over	117
Association with a Member of Protected Class	82
Disability - Mental and Physical	773
Engagement in Protected Activity	109
Familiar Status (Children)	252
Marital Status	71
National Origin/Ancestry	175
Other	74
Race/Color	475
Religion	69
Retaliation	414
Sex –Gender Identity/Expression	17
Sex –Genetic Information	8
Sex – Harassment	100
Sex – Orientation	73
Sex – Other Allegations	142
Sex - Pregnancy	17
Source of Income	145
Total	3,113

In 2014, a total of 90 Ralph and 295 Unruh complaints were filed on the bases shown below.

Total Ralph Complaints filed by Basis (90)	No.
Age - 40 and Over	17
Disability - Mental and Physical	34
National Origin/Ancestry	30
Other	15
Political Affiliation	9
Position in a Labor Dispute	12
Race/Color	39
Religion	13
Sex - Gender Identity/Expression	8
Sex - Genetic Information	6
Sex - Orientation	9
Sex - Other Allegations	30
Total	222

Total Unruh Complaints filed by	
Basis (295)	No.
Age - 40 and Over	44
Disability - Mental and Physical	150
Marital Status	8
National Origin/Ancestry	51
Other	50
Race/Color	164
Religion	21
Sex - Gender Identity/Expression	11
Sex - Genetic Information	10
Sex - Orientation	14
Sex - Other Allegations	46
Sex - Pregnancy	5
Total	574

The table below shows the bases included in the civil complaints filed in 2014.

Total	Total Civil Complaints Filed in 2014 = 18					
Туре	No.					
Employment	Disability – Mental and Physical	1				
Employment	Military or Veteran Status	3				
Employment	National Origin/Ancestry	1				
Employment	Race/Color	2				
Employment	Retaliation for Filing	3				
Employment	Sex – Harassment	8				
Employment	Sex – Other Allegations	9				
Employment	Sex – Pregnancy	3				
Housing	Disability – Mental and Physical	12				
Housing	Familial Status	4				
Housing	Race/Color	1				
Total		47				

For reference, the chart below shows the total number of complaints filed annually with the DFEH from 2011 through 2014, broken down by law: FEHA employment, FEHA housing, Ralph Civil Rights Act, Unruh Civil Rights Act and Disabled Persons Act. No 2011 data is provided for Disabled Persons Act complaints because the Department began separately tracking those complaints in July 2012 when the DFEH launched its electronic case management system.

Complaints Filed by Law								
Law 2011 2012 2013 2014								
FEHA Employment	18,012	15,836	17,849	17,632				
FEHA Housing	793	1,223	1,202	1,524				
Ralph Civil Rights Act	27	48	77	90				
Unruh Civil Rights Act	109	189	190	295				
Disabled Persons Act		16	22	43				
Totals	18,941	17,312	19,340	19,584				

D. Number of complaints referred to department-conducted mediation, number of mediations conducted, number of settlements and total value of settlements

In the early 2000's, the DFEH received a one-time budget augmentation to fund a pilot mediation program using contract mediators. After this funding ran out, the Department continued the program with the services of volunteer mediators. For a limited time, the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) funded two Enforcement Division positions to mediate housing discrimination complaints. The DFEH redirected two positions from Enforcement to continue to provide housing mediations after HUD funding was eliminated. In May of 2010, the Department created a Mediation Division,

using additional redirected investigator positions to hire attorney mediators, and began offering free voluntary mediation services on a regular basis.

Under SB 1038, the Department's Dispute Resolution Division began mediating complaints referred for mandatory dispute resolution by the Legal Division prior to filing a civil complaint. Additionally, the Dispute Resolution Division continues to provide voluntary early mediation services for complaints referred by the Enforcement Division.

The data below reflects the total number of complaints referred, mediated and settled, and is not broken down by Legal Division vs. Enforcement Division referrals. The Dispute Resolution Division controls the number of complaints it will accept for processing based on the number of mediators available to mediate cases. A majority of the referrals originate in the Enforcement Division and are voluntary, rather than mandatory, mediations. The number of complaints referred exceeds the number of mediations conducted because complaints referred for voluntary mediation cannot proceed to mediation unless all parties agree to mediate.

In 2012, there was a decrease in referrals due to the Department's transition to an electronic case management system, which, among other functions, was intended to automatically refer complaints for mediation, but could not. The increase in mediations conducted in 2013 and 2014 reflects the hire of additional mediators using investigator positions diverted from the Enforcement Division, and the combined efforts of the Dispute Resolution Division and Legal Division to resolve SB1038 referred cases on behalf of complainants and the State of California.

The reported settlement amounts in this section and in section E below reflect monetary recovery only. Many complaints filed for investigation with the Department have low economic damages and are unattractive to the private bar. However, most Department settlements include "affirmative relief" in the form of injunctions, training and monitoring, and changes in policies that increase fair employment or housing opportunities. Some settlements include only affirmative relief and no economic recovery. The economic and societal value of affirmative relief is not reflected in this data.

Dispute Resolution Division							
No. of Complaints Number of Referred for Mediations No. of Total S Year Mediation Conducted Settlements An							
2011	1,133	371	241	\$2,629,323			
2012	858	200	166	\$2,257,914			
2013	1,222	453	265	\$3,880,182			
2014	1.298	620	347	\$8,214,989			

E. Number of cases settled by the Enforcement and Legal Divisions and the total amount of settlements for each division

The table below presents the settlements by the Enforcement and Legal Divisions for 2011 through December 2014, not including affirmative relief. These settlements were reached without the participation of the Dispute Resolution Division, and the data does not include settlements resulting from that Division's mediations, which are shown in

section D above. Dispute Resolution Division settlements and triaging cases with the Legal Division have lowered the number of settlements reached in the Enforcement Division. Similarly, SB 1038 mandatory dispute resolution has lowered the number of cases reported as settled by the Legal Division.

The amounts listed below are those that respondents or defendants agreed to pay, and complainants or real parties agreed to accept, in order to resolve their discrimination cases.

Calendar Year	Number of Settled Cases	Enforcement Division	Number of Settled Cases	Legal Division
2011	670	\$7,818,762	55	\$2,742,933
2012	470	\$5,219,464	744 ²	\$8,214,458
2013	398	\$4,047,606	39	\$1,721,277
2014	280	\$3,470,910	32	\$9,740,961

F. Number of complaints referred to litigation

The table below shows the number of complaints the Enforcement Division referred to the Legal Division for litigation for 2011 through December of 2014. The Enforcement Division refers cases to the Legal Division for prosecution after the Enforcement Division makes a determination of cause (finding that the case has merit) and if the case is not resolved by settlement in the Enforcement Division. The Legal Division makes the final determination regarding cause, and refers cases it intends to prosecute to the Dispute Resolution Division for SB 1038 mediation.

Calendar Year	Employment	Housing	Ralph	Unruh	Disabled Persons Act (CC54)	Total Cases Referred
2011	70	31	0	10	0	111
2012	75	33	4	23	0	135
2013	56	40	0	5	1	102
2014	32	58	1	6	1	98

G. Number of accusations issued and number of civil complaints the Department filed

The tables below show the number of accusations filed in 2011 and 2012 and the number of civil complaints filed in 2011through December 2014. Prior to 2013, after being served with an accusation, a respondent could require the Department to

²

²The 2012 number of settled cases does not result from the same methodology as the numbers for other years. This figure includes the approximately 685 claimants who received money as the result of the settlement of a group action. The numbers for the other years, in which there were no group or class action settlements, reflect only the number of cases.

withdraw the accusation and file a civil complaint, so the matter could be litigated in court and not before the Commission. Thus, the data presented for 2011 and 2012 also includes civil complaints.

Civil complaints often are filed on behalf of multiple complainants. The number of complainants on whose behalf accusations or civil complaints were filed also is reflected in the numbers reported below.

	Accusations Filed							
						Total Complainants		
2011	48	16		1	65	58	78	
2012	37	27		19	83	57	100	

	Civil Complaints Filed						
Calendar Year	Underlying Employment Complaints	Underlying Housing Complaints	Underlying Ralph Complaints	Underlying Unruh Complaints	Total Underlying Complaints	Total Civil Complaints Filed	Total Complainants
2011	17	2			19	19	22
2012	17	10		18	45	26	49
2013	13	23	4	1	41	27	58
2014	12	17		_	29	18	48

H. Percentage of complaints closed within 100 days of filing and within 365 days of filing

The federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requires that DFEH complete 50% of its investigations of housing complaints dual-filed³ with HUD within 100 days of the filing of the complaints. As shown in the chart below, the Department did not meet this target in 2011 through 2013. As a result of this and other factors, the Department was placed on a Performance Improvement Plan by HUD. However, by making structural, personnel, and system changes, the Department successfully met HUD's performance expectations in 2014.

As requested by the Legislature, the chart also includes information on the number and percentage of employment complaints closed within 100 days. It should be noted that, for employment complaints, the California Fair Employment and Housing Act requires that, if the Department does not complete its investigation within 150 days of the filing of a complaint, the Department must issue a written notice advising the complainant of his or her right to withdraw the complaint and request a Right to Sue notice.

The chart also provides information on the number and percentage of investigations closed within 365 days of the filing of the complaints. For employment complaints, when

21

³A complaint over which both the Department and HUD have jurisdiction is filed with both entities and is called "dual-filed." In California, the DFEH investigates the complaints that are dual-filed with the DFEH and HUD.

a Right to Sue notice has not been requested earlier, the Department must issue a Right to Sue notice at the completion of its investigation or one year after the complaint is filed, whichever occurs first.

	Employment Complaints									
Calendar Year	Percentage Closed Within 365 Days									
2011	6,017	1,457	24%	4,472	74%					
2012	5,366	1,684	31.5%	3,455	64.5%					
2013	8,326	2,404	29%	5,727	69%					
2014	7,013	2,332	33%	4,565	65%					

Housing Complaints							
Calendar Year	Total Closed	Closed Within 100 Days	Percentage Closed Within 100 Days	Closed Within 365 Days	Percentage Closed Within 365 Days		
2011	804	295	37%	480	60%		
2012	771	347	45%	390	51%		
2013	1,530	557	36%	913	60%		
2014	1,568	900	56.5%	618	39.5%		

I. Average number of cases assigned per investigator and per attorney

The average number of case assignments per attorney is represented in the tables below. There are multiple possible methodologies for calculating the average number of case assignments. The numbers below result from dividing the number of open cases assigned to the Legal Division in each calendar year by the number of "personnel years" (PYs)⁴ worked by attorneys that year. The number of open cases assigned to the Legal Division does not include cases for which attorneys are leading pre-filing investigations (those cases remain assigned to the Enforcement Unit in the Department's current electronic system). The number of open cases also does not include cases actually filed in court to enforce discovery obligations during the investigation of a potential discrimination case. The number of open cases does include the total number of complaints underlying a civil action in cases where multiple complaints result in a single filed lawsuit.

The average number of cases assigned does not reflect the fact that multiple attorneys are assigned to most cases, with up to seven attorneys assigned to the most complex litigation handled by the Department. In this way, the numbers undercount the number of cases each attorney is working on at any given time. Further, the numbers are

⁴ A personnel year is the actual or estimated portion of a position expended for the performance of work. For example, a full-time position which was filled by an employee for half of a year would result in an expenditure of 0.5 personnel years.

affected by the Department's creation of a systemic litigation team in 2013, with several attorneys primarily assigned to a smaller number of more complex cases.

Finally, the data below does not reflect legal assignments that are not counted as "cases," including case grading with the Enforcement Division, participation in antidiscrimination training for public and private groups, teaching and overseeing legal clinics, and internal legal work for the Department, including participation in personnel actions and internal investigations, as well as analysis of legal issues that arise in the operation of the Department's work.

Average No. of Cases Assigned per Attorney						
2011	2012	2013	2014			
16	17	19	13			

The average number of case assignments per investigator is represented in the tables below. These numbers represent the average number of cases assigned in each year divided by the number of personnel years (PYs) worked in that year by staff in investigator classifications.⁵ For purposes of this section of the report, the number of "cases" includes cases where a complaint was generated as well as those cases where staff conducted an intake and determined that the department did not have jurisdiction, meaning no "complaint" was generated, as the Department uses that term (see discussion on page 5). However, information on the number of cases that did not result in a complaint is not available for the month of February 2011 and for the first six months of 2012. Also not included in these numbers are complaints requesting an immediate right to sue, because such requests are not assigned to investigators.

Average No. of Cases Assigned per Investigator						
2011	2012	2013	2014			
138	128	161	203			

These figures represent the average total number of cases assigned over the course of the year. The actual number of cases assigned at any given point in time varies over the course of the year and depends on the number of filings and available investigators. On March 5, 2015, the average number of cases assigned to each full-time employment investigator was 100, and the average number of cases assigned to each full-time housing investigator was 75. The actual number of employment cases assigned to each full-time investigator ranged from 60 to 144. The actual number of housing cases assigned to each full-time investigator ranged from 57 to 109. In addition, there were 550 cases that had not yet been assigned.

Analysts in investigation duties (6 PYs for 2011 and 2 for 2012).

⁵ For 2011 and part of 2012 (before implementation of the electronic case management system), staff in Legal Analyst classifications spent approximately half of their working hours doing work currently handled by staff in investigator classifications. For this reason, the number of PYs for 2011 and 2012 includes time worked by Legal