

Preliminary Content Analysis of Consent Decrees for Sex Discrimination in Employment Cases

The WAGE Project February 27, 2006

Through reviews of Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) and Department of Justice (DOJ) cases and news reports, The WAGE Project has identified 160 sex discrimination in employment cases that were resolved through consent decrees between 1997 and 2005. All of these cases were filed in federal court. Of the 160 cases, 139 were brought by the EEOC, 20 were brought by the DOJ, and 1 was brought by the Department of Labor. (A subsequent analysis will include a selection of privately filed cases.) This sample includes only cases of discrimination against women workers. Copies of consent decrees have been obtained for 79 cases.

For the purpose of defining a sample for a study of consent decree implementation, decrees were coded and analyzed. The decrees were coded for types of discrimination complaint, specific remedies, consent decree entry and expiration, parties, state, industry, and worker occupations. Coding was based on the actual consent decrees and/or EEOC settlement summaries. The coding sheet is attached.

Consent Decree Entry and Expiration

Of the identified consent decree cases, 95.7% (153) were entered between 2000 and 2005. The prevalence of consent decrees in later years, particularly between 2002 and 2005, may reflect the greater availability of settlement information from the EEOC for those years rather than increased consent decree use. Table 1 illustrates the distribution of consent decree entry dates.

Table 1. Consent Decrees By Entry Dates

(Numbers in parentheses are cases for which we have copies of consent decrees.)

Year	Number of cases	% Cases
1997	1 (1)	.6%
1998	1 (1)	.6%
1999	5 (5)	3.1%
2000	10 (9)	6.3%
2001	7 (7)	4.4%
2002	15 (13)	9.4%
2003	47 (21)	29.4%
2004	47 (17)	29.4%
2005	27 (5)	16.9%
Total	160	100%

Consent decrees were in place at these places of employment from 12 months to 84 months. (See Table 2.) The average length of consent decrees in this sample was 32 months; the median was 30 months.

Table 2. Consent Decrees By Length

(Numbers in parentheses are cases for which we have copies of consent decrees.)

Length of Consent Decree	Number of cases	% Cases
12 months	10 (8)	7.7%
18 months	2	1.5%
24 months	53 (29)	40.8%
36 months	46 (24)	35.4%
48 months	9 (7)	6.9%
60 months	9 (4)	6.9%
84 months	1	.8%
Total	130	100%

As shown in Table 3, expiration of 130 of these consent decrees has occurred or will occur between 1999 and 2011. Expiration dates could not be identified for 30 cases.

Table 3. Consent Decrees By Expiration Dates

(Numbers in parentheses are cases for which we have copies of consent decrees.)

Year	Number of cases	% Cases
1999	1 (1)	.6%
2001	5 (5)	3.8%
2002	4 (4)	3.1%
2003	6 (6)	4.6%
2004	10 (10)	7.7%
2005	29 (20)	22.3%
2006	27 (12)	20.8%
2007	29 (10)	22.3%
2008	14 (3)	10.8%
2009	2 (1)	1.5%
2010	2 (0)	1.5%
2011	1 (0)	.8%
Total	130	100%

Types of Sex Discrimination Complaints

Of the 160 cases, over two-thirds involve complaints of sexual harassment. As Table 4 shows, retaliation (44.4%) is the second most frequently cited grounds, followed by constructive discharge at 20.6%.

Table 4. Consent Decrees By Complaint Types

(Numbers in parentheses are cases for which we have copies of consent decrees. Please note that many cases involve multiple types of complaints.)

Complaint Type	Number of cases	% Cases
Sexual harassment	109 (51)	68.1%
Retaliation	71 (29)	44.4%
Constructive Discharge	33 (16)	20.6%
Hiring	24 (15)	15%
Firing	21 (6)	13.1%
Other terms and conditions	16 (12)	10%
Promotion	13 (4)	8.1%
Pregnancy	11 (6)	6.9%
Equal pay	10 (6)	6.3%

Many cases included multiple types of complaints. For example, sexual harassment, retaliation, and constructive discharge were frequently linked in complaints. Of the sexual harassment complaints, 52.3% also involved some form of retaliation. In 30.3% of sexual harassment consent decree cases, plaintiffs claimed that they had been constructively discharged. Race, ethnicity, or national origin was a component of 10% of the consent decree cases.

Consent Decree Distribution Across Industries

The plurality of consent decrees (36.9%) in the sample stemmed from cases in the service industry, with 20% of cases from the retail trade and 14.4% from manufacturing.

Table 5. Consent Decrees by Industry

(Numbers in parentheses are cases for which we have copies of consent decrees.)

Industry	Number of cases	% Cases
Services	59 (30)	36.9%
Retail and Wholesale Trade	32 (13)	20%
Manufacturing	23 (13)	14.4%
Public Administration	12 (12)	7.5%
Transportation	12 (3)	7.5%
Finance	6 (1)	3.8%
Construction	5(2)	3.1%
Communication	4 (2)	2.5%
Agriculture	3 (2)	1.9%
Electric and Gas	2 (1)	1.3%
Real Estate	2 (0)	1.3%

Sexual harassment (38.5%), hiring (33.3%), retaliation (36.6%), and constructive discharge (36.4%) claims were more likely to be found in service industry consent decrees. Equal pay (40%) and other terms and conditions (25%) claims were more often identified in manufacturing. The largest percentage of pregnancy claims (36.4%) was in retail trade cases.

Consent Decree Distribution Across Occupations

Plaintiffs in consent decree cases were most likely to be service workers (30%), sales workers (19.4%), laborers/helpers (18.1%), or administrative support workers (10.6%).

Table 6. Consent Decrees by Plaintiff Occupation

(Numbers in parentheses are cases for which we have copies of consent decrees.)

Plaintiff Occupation	Number of cases	% Cases
Service Workers	48 (32)	30%
Sales Workers	31 (8)	19.4%
Laborers/Helpers	29 (14)	18.1%
Administrative Support Workers	17 (9)	10.6%
Operatives	12 (4)	7.5%
Officials and Managers	8 (3)	5%
Professionals	6 (3)	3.8%
Crafts Workers	6 (4)	3.8%
Technicians	3 (2)	1.9%

(Note: since cases were coded from consent decrees and in most cases complaints were not available, some of the worker classifications was approximated.)

Promotion (38.5%) and retaliation (26.8%) cases more frequently involved sales workers. The largest percentage of sexual harassment (34.9%), hiring (37.5%), and constructive discharge (42.5%) consent decree cases had plaintiffs who were service workers. Equal pay cases (30%) more often involved laborers and helpers. Pregnancy cases most often involved administrative support staff (36.4%) and officials and managers (27.3%). Firing cases (42.9%) were most likely to affect sales workers.

Consent Decree Remedies

Consent decrees provided a range of remedies, including concrete concessions to named plaintiffs, institutional reforms, and mechanisms for institutional transparency. Almost all (96.3%) consent decrees in the sample provided monetary awards to plaintiffs. As Table 7 illustrates, employee trainings (56.9%), compliance reports (56.3%), and the dissemination of anti-discrimination or sexual harassment policies (51.2%) were required in over half of the cases.

Table 7. Consent Decrees by Types of Remedies

(Numbers in parentheses are cases for which we have copies of consent decrees.)

Type of Remedy	Number of cases	% Cases
Monetary Award	154 (72)	96.3%
Employee Training	91 (63)	56.9%
Compliance reports	90 (65)	56.3%
Post/Distribute Policy	82 (60)	51.2%
Create/Revise Policies	70 (55)	43.8%
New Procedures	64 (44)	40%
Record Keeping	50 (45)	31.3%
Supervisor Accountability	37 (22)	23.1%
Monitor appointed	33 (22)	20.7%
Letter of Reference	18 (14)	11.3%
Recruit/Hire more women	16 (9)	10%
Reinstatement	10 (6)	6.3%
Post Job Notice	9 (6)	5.7%
Objective Criteria for Hiring and Promotion	8 (4)	5%
Write Job Descriptions	5 (4)	3.1%
Allow interviews with employees	4 (1)	2.5%
Analysis of Promotion or Compensations	2 (1)	1.3%
Apology	2 (1)	1.3%

(Note: Cases for which we were able to use the actual consent decrees rather than only EEOC summary information may appear to have more remedies. The EEOC summaries provide only highlights of remedies in each case.)

Monetary awards in these consent decree cases ranged in size from \$6,250 to \$50 million. Almost three quarters of the total award settlements (73.4%) were above \$100,000. (See Table 8.) In two cases, the amount of the settlement was undisclosed.

Table 8. Consent Decrees by Size of Monetary Award

(Numbers in parentheses are cases for which we have copies of consent decrees.)

Size of Monetary Payment	Number of cases	% Cases
Under \$50,000	8 (8)	5.3%
\$50,000-\$99,999	34 (19)	22.4%
\$100,000-\$249,999	51 (17)	33.6%
\$250,000-\$999,999	43 (17)	28.3%
\$1 million and over	16 (11)	10.5%

In all of these cases, EEOC and DOJ maintained some oversight over implementation of consent decrees to which they were a party. To further enhance oversight and compliance, consent decrees in 20.7% (33) of cases required the appointment of monitors. However, few of these monitors were independent of the defendant company. In only 7 cases was an independent, court-appointed plaintiff mandated. These cases are:

EEOC v. Abercrombie & Fitch Stores
EEOC v. Dial Corporation

EEOC v. Hanson Motors, Inc. d/b/a Volkswagen, Inc.
EEOC v. Rookies, Inc. d/b/a Rookies Sports Bar and Rookies II, LLC d/b/a The Little Waldorf Saloon
EEOC v. Morgan Stanley, Inc.
EEOC v. Roquemore, Pringle & Moore, Inc.
EEOC v. Technicolor, Inc.

In the other 26 cases, the consent decree required appointment of internal monitors such as HR consultants, EEO officers, the defense attorney firm, or other monitors to be selected by the defendant. In a few cases, approval of the internal consultant by the EEOC was required.

A significant proportion of consent decrees mandated changes in institutional procedures. Procedural changes included modifications or introduction of practices for handling complaints, investigations, hiring, and wage setting. Additional elements of procedures included assurances of confidentiality, availability of multiple and multi-lingual personnel to take complaints, and anonymous complaint mechanisms such as work site complaint boxes and 800-numbers.

Supervisory accountability remedies included agreements to terminate and/or refuse to rehire harassers, inclusion of complaint handling in evaluations of supervisors, and increased and highly publicized disciplinary penalties.

Consent decrees differed in their requirements for trainings and reports. Most decrees required training for both managerial and non-managerial personnel. Some decrees specified training content and/or required EEOC or DOJ review of consultant selection and materials before trainings could be conducted. Other decrees mandated training with few specifications.

Reporting requirements similarly varied in their specificity. Some decrees required the defendant to report on pay scales, hiring patterns, new complaints, outcomes of investigations, and trainings. Others simply required periodic compliance reports.

In addition to the above remedies, every consent decree contained language requiring the defendant to refrain from sex discrimination and from retaliation against those employees who filed complaints or assisted in the investigation of complaints. A large number of decrees also required that information on complaints be expunged from plaintiff records and that employers make their records available for inspection to EEOC or DOJ inspectors. Exit interviews and mentoring programs were remedies less frequently required.

Remedies and Complaint Types

Clear patterns emerge in the relationship between specific remedies and complaint types. (See Table 9.) Based on the available data, trainings were more likely to be required in cases involving sexual harassment, equal pay, and constructive discharge claims. Trainings were least likely to be required as a remedy for promotion complaints. Policy changes more often were found in equal pay and pregnancy cases, and least likely in cases charging discrimination in promotion. Changes in procedures were most often a part of consent decrees resolving claims of discrimination in hiring. Reports to the EEOC, DOJ, and other external agencies more often were

required in cases involving discrimination in pay, hiring, and other terms and conditions. Pregnancy discrimination cases were least likely to result in reporting requirements. Monitors were more likely to be appointed in promotion and hiring cases and least likely in pregnancy cases.

Table 9. Remedies By Consent Decree Complaint Type

(Numbers of cases in sample in parentheses. Bolded percentages indicate strongest relationships between complaint and remedy types. Please note that many cases involve multiple types of complaints.)

Complaint Type	Train	Policy	Recruit	Report	Monitor	Procedures	Supervisor Accountability	Award
Sexual Harassment	61.5% (67)	45.9% (50)	3.7% (4)	54.1% (59)	22% (24)	44% (48)	28.4% (31)	100% (109)
Equal Pay	60% (6)	60% (6)	0	80% (8)	20% (2)	20% (2)	0	100% (10)
Promotion	38.5% (5)	30.8% (4)	46.2% (6)	61.5% (8)	30.8% (4)	30.8% (4)	30.8% (4)	84.6% (11)
Hiring	45.8% (11)	41.7% (10)	45.8% (11)	70.8% (17)	29.2% (7)	62.5% (15)	12.5% (3)	83.3% (20)
Retaliation	59.2% (42)	40.8% (29)	2.8% (2)	53.5% (38)	23.9% (17)	36.6% (26)	31% (22)	98.6% (70)
Pregnancy	54.5% (6)	63.2% (7)	0	36.4% (4)	0	18.2% (2)	18.2% (2)	100% (11)
Other Terms & Conditions	50% (8)	50% (8)	25% (4)	81.3% (13)	25% (4)	50% (8)	50% (8)	87.5% (14)
Constructive Discharge	69.7% (23)	54.5% (18)	3% (1)	63.6% (21)	27.3% (9)	48.5% (16)	45.5% (15)	100% (33)
Firing	42.9% (9)	23.8% (5)	4.8% (1)	38.1% (8)	9.6% (2)	14.3% (3)	19% (4)	100% (21)

The data also suggest some relationship between type of complaint and size of monetary settlement. A larger percentage of consent decrees stemming from hiring complaints had settlements of \$1 million or more. (See Table 10.) Equal pay, promotion, and retaliation claims tended to have the largest percentage of settlements in the \$250,000 to \$999,999 range. However, this analysis did not differentiate between class action cases and those involving named plaintiffs.

Table 10. Consent Decree Type By Size of Monetary Payment

(Numbers of cases in sample in parentheses. Please note that many cases involve multiple types of complaints.)

Complaint Type	Under \$50,000	\$50,000-\$99,999	\$100,000 – \$249,999	\$250,000 – \$999,999	\$1 million and over
Sexual Harassment	2.8% (3)	21.5% (23)	35.5% (38)	30.8% (33)	9.3% (10)
Equal Pay	10% (1)	20% (2)	20% (2)	30% (3)	20% (2)
Promotion	0	18.2% (2)	18.2% (2)	36.4% (4)	27.3% (3)
Hiring	15% (3)	15% (3)	15% (3)	20% (4)	35% (7)
Retaliation	2.9% (2)	24.3% (17)	30% (21)	35.7% (25)	7.1% (5)
Pregnancy	0	30% (3)	50% (5)	10% (1)	10% (1)
Other Terms & Conditions	7.1% (1)	7.1% (1)	42.9% (6)	21.4% (3)	21.4% (3)
Constructive Discharge	3% (1)	9.1% (3)	45.5% (15)	36.4% (12)	6.1% (2)
Firing	9.5% (2)	4.8% (1)	42.9% (9)	38.1% (8)	4.8% (1)

Parties and Remedies

Remedies also differed according to whether the EEOC or DOJ was a party to the consent decree. DOJ consent decrees were more likely than EEOC cases to include reporting requirements, changes in procedures, and increased recruitment of women among the remedies. Internal monitors only were appointed in EEOC cases.

A larger proportion of EEOC consent decrees (99.3%) awarded monetary payments, compared with 75% of DOJ cases. Moreover, DOJ monetary settlements also tended to be smaller. Over 85.7% of DOJ consent decree settlements were under \$100,000. Only 21.9% of EEOC settlements were under \$100,000. Of cases in this sample where plaintiffs were awarded over \$1 million, 87.5% were brought by the EEOC.

Remedy differences may in part be explained by differences in caseloads between the two agencies. DOJ intervenes only in charges of discrimination against public agencies; EEOC cases are against private employers. A larger proportion of DOJ consent decrees included claims of discrimination in hiring and other terms of employment whereas a larger proportion of EEOC consent decrees were comprised of sexual harassment cases. Nonetheless, the increased likelihood of DOJ consent decrees to include reporting requirements and procedure changes may reflect more than just the composition of the caseload.

Possible Sample Selection Criteria

The consent decrees discussed above provide a number of possibilities for criteria for sampling for the implementation study. For the purpose of our discussion, below are some considerations regarding these criteria.

Presence and Type of Monitor: An operating theory is that consent decrees with a court appointed monitor have more force. The original charts that a law student produced in December failed to distinguish between independent monitors and internal monitors. After recoding the data, we found that 7 cases had independent court monitors and 26 cases had internal monitors. For the study, we could compare cases with independent court monitor, internal monitor, and no monitor. Independent court monitor cases could be paired with internal monitor and non-monitor cases with similar remedies, industries, and workers.

Monetary Award Size: Almost all consent decrees provide a monetary award. However, the awards range substantially in size. Based on the theory that companies that faced larger financial penalties have a greater incentive for compliance, we could compare implementation in cases with small, medium, and large size awards. Size of monetary payment is probably best evaluated against company revenue in order to better gauge the impact of the payment on the companies' bottom lines. In addition, class action suits will need to be differentiated from cases involving named plaintiffs.

Size of Company: Size of company may influence the effectiveness of consent decree remedies. Annual revenue and number of employees are probably the best measures of company size. Collection of these data, however, is extremely time consuming. Perhaps we should narrow down the cases of interest before collecting these data.

Type of Complaint: We could narrow the focus on only a specific type of complaint in order to compare the effectiveness of different remedies related to that complaint. We also could choose two or more types of complaints that had the same sets of remedies.

Type of Remedies: Another option for the study would be to compare cases with one remedy with those who did not have this remedy. In addition to the monitor example above, we could pair cases in which reporting was required with cases where it was not. We could conduct similar analyses using supervisor accountability, training, policy change, and procedure change variables.

Industry and Occupation: Industry or occupation type would provide another useful comparison. For example, we could select cases with similar remedies in different industrial settings.

Plaintiff Parties: Another take would be to compare consent decrees and implementation in terms of the party that brought the case to court (e.g. EEOC, DOJ or private party).

Entry/Expiration/Length of Decree: A decision needs to be made on whether we only want to include in the study cases in which the consent decree will have expired by the time of the study.

If we do, the next question is whether we want to specify how long the decree should have expired for the case to be included. Alternatively, we could use lapsed time since expiration or length of decree as independent variables.

Cases included in the Consent Decree Analysis Sample

(SH=sexual harassment, P=Pay, PM=promotion, H=hiring, R=retaliation, PG=pregnancy, OT=other terms and conditions, D=constructive discharge, F=firing, and RA=race.)

Case	Obtained Consent Decree	Types of Harassment
DOL v. Ford Motor Co.	yes	H
EEOC v. Abercombie & Fitch Stores		PM, H, F, RA
EEOC v. ABM Industries, Inc. and American Building Maintenance	yes	SH, OT
EEOC v. Advantage	yes	R, F
EEOC v. Airguide Corporation and Pioneer Metals, Inc.		SH, R, D
EEOC v. Alternative Resources Corp.		P
EEOC v. Ameripride Services		H
EEOC v. Austin J. Decoster d/b/a Decoster Farms of Iowa	yes	SH, R
EEOC v. Bell Gas		SH, P, D
EEOC v. Bell Atlantic	yes	P, PG
EEOC v. Benchmark Residential Services, Inc.	yes	SH, R
EEOC v. Berge Ford, Inc. and Auto Care Center, LLC		R, PG
EEOC v. Big Lots, Inc		SH, F
EEOC v. BK, Inc. d/b/a Church's Chicken	yes	SH, D
EEOC v. Block's Lighthouse Supper Club, Inc. (went out of business)		SH
EEOC v. Bob Evans Farms, Inc.	yes	SH, F
EEOC v. Boca Chica d/b/a Loca Luna Restraunt		SH
EEOC v. Brinker International Chili's of MD		SH, R, F
EEOC v. Brink's Inc		PM
EEOC v. BSH Home Appliances Corporation	yes	SH, R
EEOC v. Canyon Lake Property Owners Association		SH
EEOC v. Carl Buddig & Co.	yes	H, OT, RA
EEOC v. Coit Services, Inc.		SH, D
EEOC v. Colonial Ice Cream		SH
EEOC v. Comcast Corp. 1		PM, F, R
EEOC v. Comcast Corp. 2		PM, RA
EEOC v. Control Building Services		SH, R, D
EEOC v. Dan LePore & Sons and L.F. Driscoll		SH, R
EEOC v. Dial Corporation	yes	SH
EEOC v. Dillard Trucking		SH
EEOC v. DTG Rent A Car d/b/a Dollar Rent A Car		SH, R, F
EEOC v. EaglePicher, Inc. f/k/a Eagle-Picher Industries, Inc.	yes	SH, R, OT, D
EEOC v. EGW Temporaries		H, RA
EEOC v. Eldorado Stone, LLC and Eldorado Stone Operations, LLC	yes	SH, R, D
EEOC v. Emergency Medicine Associates, Inc.		SH, PM, R, OT

EEOC v. Equicredit Corporation of America		SH
EEOC v. Ernst & Young, LLP		SH
EEOC v. EZ Buy EZ Sell Recycler Corporation	yes	SH, R
EEOC v. Family Motor Inn	yes	SH, R, D
EEOC v. Fifth Third Bank		SH
EEOC v. First Student, Inc.		SH
EEOC v. First Transit f/k/a Ryder		SH, R, RA
EEOC v. Flint Ink Corp.	yes	P
EEOC v. Foster Wheeler Constructors, Inc. and Pipe Fitters Association, Local Union 597	yes	SH, RA
EEOC v. Fred Fuller Oil Company, Inc. and Fuller's Convenience Stores, Inc.	yes	SH, R, D, F
EEOC v. Gaumer Co., Inc.		R, PG
EEOC v. Geologistics		R, OT
EEOC v. GMRI d/b/a Red Lobster	yes	SH, D
EEOC v. Golf Galaxy, Inc.	yes	SH, R, D
EEOC v. Good Samaritan Community Healthcare & Puyallup Professional Association d/b/a Good Samaritan Surgery Center	yes	SH, R, D
EEOC v. Gordon Trucking	yes	OT
EEOC v. Great American Foods Corporation		SH
EEOC v. Great Plains Coca-Cola Bottling Co.		SH
EEOC v. Groendyke Transport, Inc.		SH, R, F
EEOC v. Gurtz Electric Company & Pickus Construction & Equipment Co.	yes	SH
EEOC v. Hannah Motors		SH, R, D
EEOC v. Hanson Motors, Inc. d/b/a Volkswagen, Inc.	yes	SH, R, D
EEOC v. Harbor Freight Tools		SH, R, F
EEOC v. Hendrickson Trailer Suspension Systems	yes	OT, F
EEOC v. Highland Fruit Growers, Inc.	yes	SH, R, D
EEOC v. Hitchen and Lucerne, Inc.	yes	R, F
EEOC v. Home Depot, Inc. (Houston)		PM
EEOC v. Home Depot CO		SH, R, RA
EEOC v. Home Depot 3 (WI)		SH, R
EEOC v. Huntwood Industries		SH, D
EEOC v. Interstate Brands		SH, OT
EEOC v. I Sector Copr. and All Star Systems, Inc.		SH
EEOC v. James G. Kennedy & Co.		SH
EEOC v. J.C. Penney Co., Inc.	yes	SH, PG
EEOC v. Jack in the Box, Inc.	yes	SH, R
EEOC v. Jerry Chambers Chevrolet, Inc.		SH, R
EEOC v. Rookies, Inc. d/b/a Rookies Sports Bar and Rookies II, LLC d/b/a The Little Waldorf Saloon	yes	SH, D
EEOC v. John Harvard's Brew House		R, PG, F
EEOC v. Johnson International, Inc.		H, PG
EEOC v. JPI Partners		PG, F
EEOC v. L&L Wings, Inc.	yes	SH
EEOC v. Lubrication Technologies		PM

EEOC v. Lutheran Medical Center	yes	SH
EEOC v. Macnab Manufacturing, Inc.	yes	SH, R
EEOC v. Marine Bank of the Florida Keys		SH, R, D, F
EEOC v. Marriott Vacation Club International		SH, R
EEOC v. Meade Lexus Group, Inc.	yes	SH
EEOC v. Meristar Management Co., LLC, Radisson Inn Rochester		SH, R, D
EEOC v. Midamerica Hotels Corp., Northwest Development Co. d/b/a Burger King	yes	SH
EEOC v. Minnesota Beef Industries		SH, P, D
EEOC v. Morgan Stanley, Inc.	yes	P, OT
EEOC v. Mount Carmel		SH,R
EEOC v. New England Serum Company, Inc.		SH, RA
EEOC v. Norgen Co.		PM, R
EEOC v. Norstoan Apparel Shops d/b/a Fashion Cents		SH, R, F
EEOC v. Oil Shoppe, d/b/a Jiffy Lube	yes	SH, PG
EEOC v. O'Reilly Automotive, Inc. d/b/a O'Reilly Auto Parts	yes	R, PG
EEOC v. P&O Nedlloyd, Ltd.	yes	PG, RA
EEOC v. Palm Management Corp.	yes	H
EEOC v. Parmalat Bakery		SH, R, D
EEOC v. Performance Food Group d/b/a Carroll County		H
EEOC v. Phoenix Suns Limited Partnership and Sports Magic Team, Inc.	yes	H
EEOC v. PJAX, Inc. 1		H, R
EEOC v. PJAX, Inc. 2		SH, R, D
EEOC v. Pizza Hurt		SH, D
EEOC v. Rare Hospitality d/b/a Longhorn Steakhouse		SH, R
EEOC v. Priority Staffing, Inc. (went out of business)		SH, R
EEOC v. Produce, Inc. and Six L's Packing Co.		SH, R, F
EEOC v. Ralph's, Inc. d/b/a Sherman IGA and IGA, Inc.	yes	SH, D
EEOC v. Rent-A-Center, Inc.	yes	SH, PM, H, D
EEOC v. Reynolds Metals Company and Local 400, United Steelworkers Union		SH, R
EEOC v. Rivera Vineyards		SH, H, R
EEOC v. RLS, Inc d/b/a SEBOs Do-It-Center		SH, D
EEOC v. Rochdale Village		H
EEOC v. Rogers Enterprises, Inc. d/b/a Rogers & Hollands Jewelers		SH, R
EEOC v. Roquemore, Pringle & Moore, Inc.	yes	SH, RA
EEOC v. Rose Casual Dining, L.P. d/b/a Applebee's Neighborhood Grill & Bar Restaurant		SH, R
EEOC v. RY-4, Inc. d/b/a Roy's Poipu Bar and Grill		SH
EEOC v. Ryan's Family Steak Houses		SH, D
EEOC v. Ryder Integrated Logistics		SH
EEOC v. Sierra Development Co., d/b/a Club Cal Nevada	yes	P, R
EEOC v. Simat, Helliesen & Eichner, Inc. Reed Telepublishing, Ltd.	yes	SH

EEOC v. South Beach Beverage Co., Inc. and Pepsico, Inc.	yes	SH, P, R
EEOC v. SPD Technologies		P
EEOC v. SSA Marine, Inc., Stevedoring Services of America, Inc.	yes	H
EEOC v. Staffing Network, LLC		P
EEOC v. Starwood Hotel & Resorts Worldwide d/b/a W. Seattle Hotel	yes	SH, D
EEOC v. STI Holdings, Inc. f/k/a Stoughton Trailers, Inc.	yes	H, R
EEOC v. Swift Transportation Co., Inc. (Kansas)	yes	OT
EEOC v. Swift Transportation Co., Inc.	yes	P
EEOC v. Taco Bell		SH
EEOC v. Technicolor, Inc.	yes	SH, R
EEOC v. Tom Lange Co.		SH, R, F
EEOC v. Tratoras Construction		SH, R, OT, D
EEOC v. Trendwest Resorts, Inc.		PM
EEOC v. TRA Industries, Inc. d/b/a Huntwood Industries, Inc.	yes	SH, D
EEOC v. Union Pacific Railroad		SH
EEOC v. UPI Partners		PG
EEOC v. U.S. Contractors, Ltd.		SH, R, D, F
EEOC v. Unicom Electric, Inc. d/b/a Unicom Global Systems Solutions and Unity in Communications	yes	SH, R, RA
EEOC v. Urban Retail Properties/ Louis Joilet Mall	yes	SH
EEOC v. Victor-Arch, Inc. d/b/a Archibald's Drive Thru	Yes	H, F
EEOC v. Walmart 2		SH, R, D
EEOC v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. 1	yes	H, PG
EEOC v. West Covina Motors, Inc. d/b/a Clippinger Chevrolet Oldsmobile and West Covina Dodge	Yes	SH, R
U.S. v. CA Regents	yes	SH, R
U.S. v. Calcasieu Parish School Board	yes	H, R
U.S. v. City of Alma, GA and Bacon County, GA	yes	H
U.S. v. City of Bastrop	yes	SH, RA
U.S. v. Columbus Co., N.C.	yes	SH
U.S. v. Erie Co., NY	yes	OT
U.S. v. Hampshire Co., WV	yes	H
U.S. v. H.N. McElroy and Harris County	yes	SH, OT, RA
U.S. v. Lumberton Municipal Utility District	yes	SH
U.S. v. McLennan Co.	yes	PM, OT
U.S. v. Mecklenberg Co., NC	yes	SH
U.S. v. New Mexico Department of Public Safety	yes	SH
U.S. v. North Little Rock School District	yes	SH, R
U.S. v. NYC Board of Education	yes	PM, H, RA
U.S. v. Prince Georges Co., MD	yes	SH, R
U.S. v. State of North Carolina Dept of Corrections	yes	SH, PM, H, OT
U.S. v. Tennessee Department of Transportation	yes	H
U.S. v. University of New Mexico Health Services	yes	PG, OT

Center's Childrens' Psychiatric Hospital		
U.S. v. West Terre Haute	yes	SH, OT, D
U.S. v. William R. Johnson, Ashtabula County Sheriff and Bd. of County Commissioners of Ashtabula County	yes	H, R
U.S. v. Zuni Public School District	yes	SH

Consent Decree Coding Sheet

Name of Case

Type(s) of Complaints

- Sexual Harassment Equal Pay Promotion
- Hiring Retaliation Pregnancy
- Constructive Discharge Firing Other Terms & Conditions
- Race, National Origin

Court Federal Court State Court

Case Brought By EEOC DOJ DOL Other

State _____

Date case filed _____

Date cd entered _____

Date cd expired _____

Sector

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation | <input type="checkbox"/> Finance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Forestry/Fishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Communications | <input type="checkbox"/> Insurance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mining | <input type="checkbox"/> Electric/Gas | <input type="checkbox"/> Real Estate |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Construction | <input type="checkbox"/> Sanitary Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Manufacturing | <input type="checkbox"/> Retail Trade | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Admin. |

Size of Employer

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 15-19 employees | <input type="checkbox"/> 500-999 employees | <input type="checkbox"/> 2,500-4,999 employees |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 20-99 employees | <input type="checkbox"/> 1000-1,499 employees | <input type="checkbox"/> 5,000-9,999 employees |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 100-499 employees | <input type="checkbox"/> 1,500-2,499 employees | <input type="checkbox"/> 10,000 or more |

Type(s) of plaintiff workers

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Officials and Managers | <input type="checkbox"/> Craft Workers |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Professionals | <input type="checkbox"/> Operatives |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Technicians | <input type="checkbox"/> Laborers and Helpers |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sales Workers | <input type="checkbox"/> Service Workers |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Administrative Support Workers | |

Remedies

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Employee Training | <input type="checkbox"/> New procedures (complaint, investigation, hiring) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Revise or Create New Policy | <input type="checkbox"/> Supervisor accountability |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Revise Job Descriptions/Categories | <input type="checkbox"/> Post notice of policy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Post Job Opportunities | <input type="checkbox"/> Require reinstatement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recruit and/or hire more women | <input type="checkbox"/> Establish objective criteria for assignments and promotion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Report to EEOC | <input type="checkbox"/> Written apology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Report to Others _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Record keeping |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Monetary payment | <input type="checkbox"/> Allow interviews |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Independent monitor | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Internal Monitor | |

Size of total monetary award: \$ _____