

CRS Report for Congress

The Family and Medical Leave Act

Updated July 10, 2001

Linda Levine
Specialist in Labor Economics
Domestic Social Policy Division



Prepared for Members and
Committees of Congress

The Family and Medical Leave Act

Summary

The Congress passed the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (FMLA) as one means of easing the time conflicts that have developed in the past few decades as more and more married mothers began to work outside the home. While employed single parents always have felt the pressure of trying to fulfill both workplace and child-rearing responsibilities, this work-family juggling act increasingly has spread to married couples with young children. In addition, the aging of the population and the lengthening of life spans makes it increasingly likely that individuals will have to grapple with the competing demands of their jobs and of caring for elderly relatives. The typical informal caregiver of the elderly is an employed, married, middle-aged woman who often has a young child at home. For these reasons, working mothers are widely regarded as the FMLA's chief beneficiaries.

The Act requires private employers with at least 50 employees and public employers to extend job-protected, *unpaid leave* to employees who meet length-of-service and hours-of-work eligibility requirements. The 12-week-per-year leave entitlement is available to covered, eligible employees to care for their own, a child's, or a parent's "serious health condition," or to care for their newborn, newly adopted, or newly placed foster child. The leave need not be taken in one block of time. Employers must maintain group health benefits while employees are on FMLA leave.

The law's impact is discussed in a 2001 report commissioned by the U.S. Department of Labor. Almost 62% of public and private sector employees worked at covered employers and met the Act's eligibility criteria in 1999-2000. Employees' use of the statute has increased significantly since the mid-1990s. Only one-fifth of FMLA leaves were taken on an intermittent basis in 1999-2000. Employees said they most often took leave under the FMLA to care for their own serious health conditions. A majority of persons who took leave for FMLA-reasons maintained their benefits (94%) and 66% received some pay while absent. "Lack of funds" was the reason most often given by persons who stated that they needed time off for FMLA-reasons but did not take it. Although co-workers of FMLA leave-takers typically had to take up the slack, 67% reported that the law had not affected them. Almost 64% of employers rated the Act as very/somewhat easy to administer in 1999-2000, which was significantly below the 85% recorded 5 years earlier. A majority of employers said the FMLA had neither affected various measures of firm and employee performance nor changed their costs (e.g., for administration or benefits).

Suggestions have been made to change the statute and its regulations to make them more employee-friendly or employer-friendly. The former proposals include broadening the Act's firm size threshold, loosening employee eligibility requirements, and expanding the reasons for FMLA leave as well as the groups whom leave-takers may assist. The latter proposals include clarifying and tightening the definition of a serious health condition, lengthening the time increment for tracking intermittent leave, and extending the period in which employers must respond to an employee's notification of leave. Some of these recommendations are contained in bills introduced to date during the 107th Congress.

Contents

An Overview of the FMLA and Its Regulations	2
By Whom, To Whom, and For What Reason	2
Length and Form of Leave	4
Employee and Employer Notification	4
Maintenance and Accrual of Benefits	5
Record-Keeping Requirements	5
Enforcement	5
Other Provisions	6
Experience Under the Act	7
Employer Coverage and Employee Eligibility	7
Knowledge of the FMLA	7
Use of FMLA Leave	8
Intermittent Leave	9
Reasons for Using FMLA Leave	9
Returning to Work After FMLA Leave	9
Impact on Employees	10
Employer Compliance with P.L. 103-3	11
Employer Administration of the FMLA	12
Impact of the Benefit Mandate on Covered Employers	12
FMLA Policy Issues	14
Expanding the FMLA	14
Coverage and Eligibility	14
FMLA-Qualifying Reasons	15
Groups Whom Employees May Take FMLA Leave to Assist	15
Paid Leave	16
Clarifying or Tightening the FMLA	17
Serious Health Condition	17
Intermittent Leave	18
Employer Response Time to Notification of Need for Leave	19
Legislation Introduced in the 107 th Congress to Amend the FMLA	19

List of Tables

Table 1. Employees Taking Their Longest Leave Under the FMLA	8
Table 2. Reasons for Longest Leave Taken under the FMLA	9
Table 3. Changes in Selected Costs since Coverage Under the FMLA Began, by Establishment Size	14
Appendix Table 1. Compliance Activity Under the FMLA	22

The Family and Medical Leave Act

The Congress passed the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (P.L. 103-3) as one means of easing the time conflicts that have developed in the past few decades as more and more married mothers began to work outside the home. “The majority of American women have always been mothers, and now a majority of mothers are also employees.”¹ While employed single parents always have felt the pressure of trying to fulfill both workplace and child-rearing responsibilities, the work-family juggling act increasingly has spread to married couples with dependent children (i.e., under age 18). Both spouses have been breadwinners in the majority of these families since 1978.² In 2000, for example, the husband and wife were in the labor force in 67.2% of married-couple families with dependent children. The share of married mothers caring for their own infants (i.e., less than 1 year old) and bringing home paychecks has grown greatly as well. In 2000, the labor force participation of mothers with infants was 53.3%, and 63.8% of them were employed full-time (i.e., 35 or more hours per week). More broadly, 60.2% of all women were in the labor force, 75.3% of all working women held full-time jobs, and 46.5% of all labor force participants were women.

Because of the aging of the baby-boom generation and the lengthening of life spans, it also is increasingly likely that individuals will have to grapple with the competing demands of their jobs and of caring for parents or elderly relatives. In the mid-1990s, the typical informal or family caregiver of an older friend or relative was an employed, married, middle-aged woman who often had a dependent child at home.³ About one-fifth of working parents were members of the “sandwich generation” in 1997, that is, providers of both elder care and child care.⁴ With women more likely than men to be unpaid caregivers and with mothers more likely than not to be in the labor force, working women in general — and working mothers in particular — are widely viewed as the chief beneficiaries of the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA).

This report begins by summarizing the major provisions of the FMLA and its regulations. It then examines what the experience of employees and employers has been with the Act. The report next discusses the issues currently of interest to the

¹Spain, Daphne, and Suzanne M. Bianchi. *Balancing Act: Motherhood, Marriage, and Employment among American Women*. New York, The Russell Sage Foundation, 1996. p. 167.

²U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

³National Alliance for Caregiving and the American Association of Retired Persons. *Family Caregiving in the U.S.: Findings from a National Survey*, 1997.

⁴Families and Work Institute. *The 1997 National Study of the Changing Workforce, Executive Summary*.

public policy community in connection with the law and its regulations. It closes with a review of bills introduced to date that would amend P.L. 103-3.

An Overview of the FMLA and Its Regulations

Prior to passage of the FMLA, the provision of family and medical leave — like the provision of many employee benefits — was up to the discretion of individual employers. While some employers offered their employees leave to care for ill family members or to care for the employee's own illness, other employers did not. In the latter case, an employee's request for leave — whether paid or unpaid — could be denied, and the family caregiver risked losing his/her job if absent from work. Further, some employers had formal leave policies that were applied uniformly to their workforces while others had informal policies and the granting of leave depended on the particular circumstances.

By Whom, To Whom, and For What Reason

The Act requires

- private employers who have had 50 or more employees on their payrolls for at least 20 workweeks in the current or preceding calendar year and who are engaged in commerce or in any industry/activity affecting commerce, and
- public employers (i.e., federal, state, and local governments;⁵ and local education agencies)⁶

⁵In 1996, P.L. 104-1 (the Congressional Accountability Act) extended FMLA coverage from staff of the House and Senate to employees of other legislative branch agencies and P.L. 104-331 extended FMLA coverage to staff of the White House and to specified presidential appointees.

⁶The FMLA contains special rules for employees of local educational agencies (as defined in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act) and any private elementary or secondary school.

to extend *job-protected*,⁷ *unpaid leave*⁸ to employees who have worked for these organizations

- at least 12 (not necessarily consecutive) months,
- a minimum of 1,250 hours (excluding paid or unpaid leave time) in the 12 months preceding the start of their FMLA leave, and
- who work at a facility where 50 or more persons are employed by the employer within 75 miles

for the following reasons:

- the birth of a child of the employee and to care for the newborn child,
- the placement with the employee of a child for adoption or foster care and to care for the newly placed child,⁹
- to care for an immediate family member (i.e., spouse, child under age 18 unless incapable of self-care due to an activity-limiting disability, or parent)¹⁰ with a “serious health condition”¹¹ that necessitates the employee’s presence, or
- to care for the employee’s own serious health condition (including maternity-related disability) that makes them unable to perform the functions of their position.

⁷Generally, employees returning from FMLA leave must be restored to their original jobs or to jobs equivalent in pay, benefits, and other terms/conditions of employment. Employers do not have to reinstate employees or continue their FMLA leave if the individuals would have been terminated had they been working during the leave period (e.g., as part of a mass layoff). Employers also may refuse to reinstate to their jobs the highest paid 10% of employees, namely, *key employees*, if doing so will cause “substantial and grievous economic injury” to business operations. Employers are required to provide written notification to employees who request leave for FMLA-purposes of their status as key employees and the reason(s) for which they are being denied job restoration. (In determining whether restoration of key personnel would cause substantial/grievous injury, employers can consider such things as their ability to do without the individual or the expense of restoring the employee if a permanent replacement had been hired during the leave period.) Employers must give these employees a reasonable period to return to work after receipt of the notification.

⁸Employees may opt to use certain kinds of accrued *paid leave* to cover all or part of their FMLA entitlement. Substitution of accrued paid sick or family leave is subject to the employer’s policies concerning the use of these benefits. *Employers may require workers to take their accrued paid vacation or personal leave for FMLA-purposes.*

⁹FMLA leave taken to care for a newborn child or a newly placed child must end within 12 months after the birth or placement.

¹⁰In some states, a common law spouse would be eligible.

¹¹If the need for leave is related to a serious health condition, employers may require employees to obtain multiple certifications from health care providers. Employees have a minimum of 15 calendar days to get certification in support of their own or an immediate family member’s serious health condition. The policy issues section of this report defines and discusses the term.

Length and Form of Leave

Eligible employees at covered employers are entitled to a maximum of *12 workweeks of leave for FMLA reasons in a 12-month period*.¹² To give employees not only the time but also the flexibility to balance the competing demands of work and family, P.L. 103-3 allows employees to take their 12-week entitlement on an intermittent basis.¹³ In other words, the leave may be taken in separate blocks of time for the same FMLA reason. Flexibility also was built into the Act by permitting eligible employees to work a reduced schedule (i.e., fewer hours per week or per day).

In those cases where employees can foresee the need to take intermittent or reduced schedule leave, they must work with their employers to schedule it to avoid disrupting business operations. Employers may temporarily transfer employees to a job with equivalent compensation that more easily accommodates their altered work hours. Employers must account for intermittent FMLA leave in the shortest increment that their payroll system uses for other types of leave, so long as it is 1 hour or less.

Employee and Employer Notification

When employees can foresee the use of FMLA leave, they should provide 30 days' notice to their employers. When the need to take leave is unforeseen, employees are to provide notice "as soon as practicable." This has been interpreted to mean employees giving employers notice within 1-2 business days of realizing their need to take leave. Employees should provide enough information to allow employers to determine whether the leave is for a FMLA reason, although employees do not have to refer to the Act when notifying employers. In those cases in which employers were not made aware that an employee was away from work for a reason covered under the statute and in which employees want the leave to be counted toward their 12-week entitlement, employees are to give timely notice of their intent (i.e., within 1-2 business days of returning to work).

Covered employers must provide information to their employees about the law. The information is to be conveyed in a posting approved by the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) and in employee handbooks or other written material. In addition, employers must provide written notice within 1-2 business days of having received an employee's notice of need for leave stating that the leave will count against the employee's FMLA entitlement; detailing whether the employee must furnish medical certification (see footnote 11); and, among other things, explaining the employee's right to substitute accrued paid leave for unpaid FMLA leave and whether the employer is requiring such substitution (see footnote 8), the employee's right to job

¹²For the 12-month period, employers may chose a calendar year, a fixed 12-month leave or fiscal year, or a 12-month period before or after an employee's leave under the FMLA begins.

¹³Employees are entitled to intermittent/reduced schedule leave to care for their own, a child's, or a parent's serious health condition. They must obtain their employers' agreement to use intermittent leave for the other two FMLA-qualifying reasons.

restoration upon returning from leave and whether the individual is a key employee (see footnote 7), and the employee's obligation to make co-premium payments for maintenance of employer-provided group health insurance.

Maintenance and Accrual of Benefits

The only fringe benefit that employers are required to continue providing to employees on FMLA leave is group health insurance.¹⁴ The obligation to continue the absent employees' health coverage ceases if/when employees tell employers that they do not intend to return to work when the leave period ends or if they do not return to work at that time. For those employers who require employee contributions toward health insurance, the employers' obligation also stops if employees are more than 30 days late in paying their share of the premium and if employers have given them 15 days' advance written notice informing them of the impending cessation of coverage.

Other kinds of benefits (e.g., paid leave and seniority) do not accrue while employees are on unpaid FMLA leave, if these benefits do not accumulate for individuals while they are on other types of unpaid leave. Although FMLA leave is not considered a break in service under an employer's retirement plan, the leave time does not count toward the plan's eligibility or vesting requirement.

Record-Keeping Requirements

Employers are required to keep records in accordance with the Fair Labor Standards Act and with the FMLA's regulations. Unless the DOL believes a violation has occurred or it is investigating a complaint, the Department cannot require an employer to submit records more than once over a 12-month period.

Covered employers with eligible employees must maintain certain information, in no particular form, for at least 3 years. The information includes basic payroll records (e.g., the employee's name and other identifying information, compensation, and hours worked); dates of FMLA leave; hours of leave if taken in increments of less than 1 workday; copies of employee notices of leave submitted to the employer; copies of employer notices given to employees; any documents describing benefits, policies, or practices concerning the taking of paid and unpaid leaves; and records of any disputes between an employee and the employer regarding designation of leave under the Act.

Enforcement

It is unlawful for employers to interfere with employees exercising their rights under the statute. Further, employers cannot retaliate or discriminate against employees based on their FMLA usage when making decisions regarding such things as hiring, promotion, discipline, or termination.

¹⁴If employees have chosen cash payments in lieu of group health benefits, employers need not maintain those payments.

For all private, state, and local government employees and for some federal employees, the Wage and Hour Division in the DOL's Employment Standards Administration administers and enforces P.L. 103-3. It operates a nationwide toll-free referral service (1-866-487-9243). If, after investigating complaints, the Wage and Hour Division cannot resolve the matter to its satisfaction, the DOL's Office of the Solicitor may seek to compel compliance through the courts. Employees also may bring a private civil action if they believe there has been a violation of the Act; they do not have to file a complaint with the government before filing suit. If an employer violates the FMLA, the employee may recover such things as wages, benefits, other lost compensation, and liquidated (not punitive) damages in the case of willful violations.¹⁵

The FMLA has a 2-year statute of limitations that starts from the last date of a violation. The statute of limitations is extended 1 year for willful violations.

Other Provisions

In those jurisdictions that have enacted their own family/medical leave laws, employees are entitled to the most generous benefit provided under the federal or state law.¹⁶ Employers may offer family/medical leave that is more generous than contained in the federal law, as well.

¹⁵In the case of the Congress and some congressional agencies (e.g., Congressional Budget Office), the Office of Compliance handles FMLA enforcement. Some other legislative branch agencies (e.g., General Accounting Office (GAO) and the Library of Congress (LOC)) handle FMLA enforcement internally. Employees in the executive branch — unlike those at private firms, the GAO, and the LOC for example — are not entitled to sue because of alleged FMLA violations. Executive branch employees can only obtain appellate judicial review of Merit Systems Protection Board decisions in the federal circuit. The Office of Personnel Management issues the FMLA regulations applicable to federal employees. See Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance. *Review and Report on the Applicability to the Legislative Branch of Federal Laws Relating to Terms and Conditions of Employment and Access to Public Services and Public Accommodations*, Appendix III. December 31, 1998.

¹⁶For example, several states have passed legislation that allows employees to take family leave for reasons other than those in the FMLA. Laws in such states as California, Illinois, Massachusetts, Minnesota, North Carolina, Rhode Island, Vermont, and the District of Columbia require employers to provide employees varying amounts of time away from work to attend some of their children's school activities. Employers in Utah must grant employees leave to accompany their children to court appearances, and those in Oregon cannot take adverse actions against employees required to attend court hearings involving their children. In Massachusetts, employers must give employees time-off to accompany children or elderly relatives to medical or other appointments. In Vermont, employers must grant employees leave to go to medical appointments or to meet similar obligations. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. *State Labor Laws. Monthly Labor Review*, various January issues since 1994.

Experience Under the Act

P.L. 103-3 established the Commission on Leave, which sponsored surveys of employees and employers covering an 18-month period in 1994 and 1995, to assess the impact of family/medical leave policies. In January 2001, the DOL released *Balancing the Needs of Families and Employers: Family and Medical Leave Surveys, 2000 Update*.¹⁷ It is derived from surveys of employees and employers covering an 18-month period in 1999 and 2000. The information that follows is drawn from this report, unless otherwise indicated.

It should be noted that various business groups raised objections and suggested changes to the 2000 survey round, in part because of perceptions that it was meant to elicit support for the Clinton Administration's desire to broaden the Act (e.g., by minimizing the negative consequences of the law for employers and for the co-workers of FMLA leave-takers).

Employer Coverage and Employee Eligibility

According to the employer survey, the FMLA applied to only 10.8% of private sector establishments in 1999-2000.¹⁸ Yet at the same time, 58.3% of employees who worked at private sector employers were covered by the Act. These disparate proportions reflect the fact that most worksites in the private sector are relatively small and therefore exempt from P.L. 103-3, but most people are employed by relatively large firms.

According to the employee survey, which covered both public and private sector workers, *88.9 million persons worked at covered establishments and met the FMLA's eligibility criteria in 1999-2000. Covered, eligible workers accounted for 61.7% of all employed persons in the United States. An additional 21.5 million individuals (or 14.9% of all employees) worked at covered employers but did not fulfill the Act's length-of-service and hours-of-work eligibility requirements. Thus, almost one in five employees at covered worksites were ineligible to utilize the FMLA during the latest survey period. Another 33.6 million people (or 23.3% of all employees) did not work at covered establishments.*

Knowledge of the FMLA

Almost 60% of employees — regardless of whether they worked at covered or non-covered employers — reported that they were aware of the FMLA's existence in 1999-2000. About one-half of employees at all worksites said they did not know if the law applied to them personally, however. Employees at covered establishments were significantly more likely than those at non-covered establishment to know their correct status under the statute. Nonetheless, just *37.9% of employees at covered employers correctly knew that the FMLA applied to them.*

¹⁷The report is available at: [<http://www.dol.gov/dol/asp/public/fmla/main.htm>].

¹⁸The actual unit surveyed was an establishment (i.e., a worksite) rather than an employer. These words will be used interchangeably in this report.

Far more covered establishments (84.0%) than employees correctly knew that the law applied to them. Non-covered establishments showed greater confusion about their status, however, with 55.5% reporting that they did not know whether the Act applied to them.

Although employers stated that they most often got their information about the FMLA from “existing company policies or practices” (89.4%), the number that also obtained information from the Labor Department increased significantly between the 1994-1995 (53.9%) and 1999-2000 (83.1%) survey periods. The third most often cited source of FMLA information, which also posted a significant increase over the 5-year period (from 57.0% to 77.9%), was attorneys or consultants.

Use of FMLA Leave

Use of the FMLA increased substantially over time. According to the employee surveys, 18.3% of all eligible persons at covered worksites who took leave for FMLA reasons in 1999-2000 did so under the Act.¹⁹ This was significantly above the 11.6% recorded for 1994-1995. As shown in **Table 1**, those who exercised their FMLA entitlement during the latest survey period also accounted for a significantly larger share of all leave-takers and of all employees.

Table 1. Employees Taking Their Longest Leave Under the FMLA

Employees taking their longest leave under the FMLA, as a percent of:	Survey period	
	1994-1995	1999-2000
All employees	1.2	1.9
All leave-takers ^a	7.2	11.7
All eligible, covered leave-takers	11.6	18.3

Source: DOL. *Balancing the Needs of Families and Employers: Family and Medical Leave Surveys, 2000 Update.* Washington, D.C., January 2001.

^a Leave-takers are individuals, regardless of their status under the FMLA, who took leave during the survey period for FMLA-reasons.

The rate of leave-taking under P.L. 103-3 also increased significantly over time according to the employer surveys.²⁰ In 1994-1995, there were 3.6 FMLA leave-

¹⁹Leave-takers in the employee survey who said that they had heard of the Act were asked whether their longest leave was taken under the FMLA. Much of the information presented from the two rounds of employee surveys concerns the longest leave taken (if more than one leave was taken) because respondents were not asked about multiple leaves in the initial survey.

²⁰Establishments that stated they were covered by the FMLA were asked the number of
(continued...)

takers per 100 covered employees; in 1999-2000, the figure was a substantially higher 6.5 FMLA leave-takers per 100 covered employees.

The absolute number of employees who took leave under the Act in 1999-2000 was much higher according to the employer survey (4.6-6.1 million employees) than according to the employee survey (2.2-3.3 million employees).²¹ Some of this discrepancy could be because employees were unaware that employers counted their leave toward their FMLA entitlement, or because employers counted employees who took leave under the FMLA multiple times.

Intermittent Leave. Although P.L. 103-3 allows persons who need family/medical leave to take it for short periods of time so long as it does not exceed 12 workweeks in a 12-month period, *the great majority of FMLA leave is not taken intermittently*. According to both the employee and employer surveys, about 20% of FMLA leaves were taken intermittently in the latest survey period.

Reasons for Using FMLA Leave. As shown in **Table 2**, employees said attending to their own health was the predominant reason for taking leave under the FMLA in both survey periods. Caring for a newborn, newly adopted, or newly placed foster child was the second most common reason.

Table 2. Reasons for Longest Leave Taken under the FMLA

Reason for longest leave	Percent of leave-takers under the FMLA	
	1994-1995	1999-2000
Own health	48.1	37.8
Maternity-disability	11.3	10.9
Care of a newborn, newly adopted, or newly placed foster child	21.2	24.4
Care of ill child	—	13.5
Care for ill spouse	—	—
Care of ill parent	—	10.6

Source: DOL. *Balancing the Needs of Families and Employers: Family and Medical Leave Surveys, 2000 Update*. Washington, D.C., January 2001.

Note: A “—” indicates less than 10 unweighted cases and accounts for figures not totaling 100%.

²⁰(...continued)

employees who had taken leave under the Act.

²¹The results of the establishment survey were adjusted to take into account public as well as private worksites.

Returning to Work After FMLA Leave. Virtually all FMLA leave-takers said they resumed working for their same employer (about 98.0% in both survey periods). The establishment survey yielded much different results, however, with 29.8% of covered worksites reporting non-returning FMLA leave-takers in 1999-2000 for example. While 52.6% of those employers with non-returning FMLA leave-takers said only one person did not come back to work, those with two or more non-returning leave-takers increased significantly between the survey rounds (from 14.6% to 47.4%).

Under certain circumstances, the law permits employers that have maintained the health benefits of employees on FMLA leave to ask non-returnees to repay costs.²² More than 13% of employers with non-returnees tried to recover health insurance costs and about 46% said they were successful in their efforts. (The issue of the cost of P.L. 103-3 to employers is addressed later in this section.)

Impact on Employees

Not surprisingly, *many of the 23.8 million individuals who took leave for FMLA reasons in 1999-2000 —whether or not they were eligible, covered employees—felt the experience was positive.* Sizeable majorities of these leave-takers thought the time away from work had a positive impact on their ability to care for family members (78.7%), on their own or a family member's emotional well-being (70.1%), and on their own or a family member's physical health (63.0%).²³ In addition, *most of these leave-takers (72.6%) were very/somewhat satisfied with the length of their longest absence.*²⁴

More than 9 out of 10 persons who took leave for FMLA reasons were able to maintain their benefits (e.g., health, life, and disability insurance; pension contributions; and vacation or sick time). In addition, *about two-thirds of leave-takers said they received some pay during their time off*, and 42.9% of paid leave-takers had money coming in from multiple sources.²⁵ Most paid leave-takers (72.2%) received their full paychecks for the whole leave period, but 58.2% of the leave-takers who received no or partial pay reported difficulty making ends meet.²⁶ And, *virtually*

²²Employers cannot seek repayment if the employee does not return to work because of continuation of the same health condition that precipitated the FMLA leave or because of circumstances beyond the employee's control.

²³Of those leave-takers who thought the leave had a positive effect on their own or a family member's physical health, 93.5% reported that they felt the time-off made it easier for them to comply with a doctor's instructions and 83.7% that it led to a quicker recovery time. A substantial minority (32.0%) said the leave delayed or avoided the need to enter a long-term care facility.

²⁴The median length of the longest leave taken was 10 days.

²⁵Sick leave was the source of pay most commonly reported by leave-takers (61.4%), followed by vacation leave (39.4%) and personal leave (25.7%).

²⁶Of the 23.8 million leave-takers who were away from work for FMLA-reasons in 1999-2000, 8.2 million (or 34.5%) received no pay and 4.4 million (or 18.5%) received partial pay.

(continued...)

all leave-takers who returned to their same employers went back to the same or an equivalent position (97.1%).

Among individuals whose co-workers had taken leave for FMLA reasons, 46.2% indicated that they assumed additional duties, 32.1% worked more than their usual number of hours, and 22.9% worked a different shift. Nevertheless, *a majority (67.4%) said that their co-worker's leave for FMLA reasons did not have any impact on them.* This question touches on the idea of "work-family backlash" (i.e., young, unmarried, or childless employees who resent or are demoralized by co-workers for taking leave because they are asked to perform extra work to compensate for the leave-takers' absence). It is raised again in the policy issues section of this report when the subject of intermittent leave is taken up.

Employer Compliance with P.L. 103-3

Employers indicated that they most often conveyed information about the Act through postings on bulletin boards (92.4%) or through employee handbooks (91.9%). The law requires covered employers to notify their workforce by these two means. Fewer employees at covered establishments (55.8%) reported that their employers had posted notices about the statute.

Under the statute, covered employers may require employees to provide documentation if they need leave for a serious health condition. Virtually all establishments (92.0%) did so for employees who took leave under the FMLA in 1999-2000. Employers also may require employees to use their accrued paid leave rather than unpaid FMLA leave. A majority of covered employers (63.2%) said they followed this practice. Covered employers also are supposed to provide employees with written notice of how much FMLA leave they have taken and how the law relates to pre-existing leave and benefit policies. Most establishments said they complied, with 82.3% providing the former and 92.6% providing the latter.

Despite employers presumably having gained greater familiarity with the 1993 law and its 1995 final regulations, they appear to continue to have difficulty complying with it. The Society of Human Resource Management (SHRM), in its *2000 FMLA Survey*, declared that the Act "stands in contrast with other employment laws which have caused less confusion over the years as the law becomes settled and more understood by both employers and employees."²⁷ In the first full fiscal year following the FMLA's implementation, the Wage and Hour Division found violations in 61.6% of the complaints lodged by employees. The ratio of violations to total complaints has varied little over the ensuing years, and in FY1999 stood at 61.2%. (See **Appendix Table 1.**)

²⁶(...continued)

Those leave-takers with no or partial pay frequently coped with their loss of wages by limiting extras, using savings earmarked for this or another situation, putting off paying bills, or cutting leave time short.

²⁷Society for Human Resource Management. *Research: SHRM 2000 FMLA Survey*. p. 27-28. (Hereafter cited as SHRM, *2000 FMLA Survey*.)

Complaints lodged under the law have most often involved an employer's failure to reinstate an employee returning from FMLA leave to the same or an equivalent position (46% of the complaints filed, on average, since the Act's implementation). Another 22% dealt with an employer's refusal to grant leave, and an additional 16% were related to employer discrimination against employees who took leave under the Act. (See **Appendix Table 1.**)

According to the DOL's summary of litigation, the Department's Solicitor brought suit in 32 cases through FY1999 for unresolved FMLA violations.²⁸ The court cases most often concerned an employer who had terminated an employee while they were on FMLA leave. Other cases dealt with employers who failed to restore returning employees to their same or an equivalent position and with employers who denied requests for FMLA leave.

Employer Administration of the FMLA

In 1999-2000, *employers most often (98.3%) handled the work of FMLA leave-takers by temporarily assigning it to other employees.*²⁹ Hiring an outside temporary replacement came in a distant second at 41.3%. The use of this option as well as hiring a permanent replacement fell significantly since 1994-1995, possibly due to the tightening of the labor market between survey periods.

In terms of the ease or difficulty of administering the Act, employer responses varied widely. At one end of the spectrum, 86.0% of employers said they found it very/somewhat easy to determine whether the law applied to their organization and 83.4% found it very/somewhat easy to determine whether certain employees were eligible. At the other end of the spectrum, 54.4% of employers replied that they found it very/somewhat difficult to administer the FMLA's notification, designation, and certification requirements and 52.8% found it very/somewhat difficult to coordinate the FMLA with other federal laws. On an overall basis, *a majority of employers (63.6%) rated the Act as very/somewhat easy to administer, but the proportion dropped significantly from its 1995 level (85.1%).* This finding could be related to the need for more employers to become familiar with the law and its regulations because, as previously discussed, the rate of FMLA leave-taking increased significantly over the 5-year period.

Impact of the Benefit Mandate on Covered Employers

Several provisions were included in P.L. 103-3 to minimize its impact on employers. Employers indicated they found the requirement that employees give advance notice of foreseeable leave to be the most useful of these provisions, followed by the requirement that employees provide written medical certification for serious

²⁸The Wage and Hour Division reported that it resolved 88% of all complaints filed from August 1993 through FY1999.

²⁹This also was the most frequently used option among employers who said they relied on more than one method to cope with an employee's absence.

health conditions. The least useful provision intended to help employers manage FMLA leave was allowing them to deny job restoration to key employees.

A large majority of employers said that the FMLA had no noticeable effect on their establishment's performance (i.e., 76.5% said it had no effect on productivity; 87.6%, on profitability; and 87.7%, on growth). In the relatively few instances that employers thought the Act had any impact, they were much more likely to believe it hurt rather than helped their bottom line: two to three times as many employers reported a negative as opposed to positive effect on the three measures of business performance.

Similarly, *most employers reported that P.L. 103-3 did not have a perceptible impact on the individual performance of employees (i.e., 67.0% said it had no effect on productivity; 76.3%, on absences; 85.9%, on turnover; 95.6%, on career advancement; and 64.7%, on morale). However, significantly more employers reported in 2000 than in 1995 that the statute had a negative impact on individual productivity and absences. According to the SHRM's 2000 FMLA Survey, the human resources (HR) professionals who responded indicated that productivity loss was the most costly consequence of the FMLA. In addition, 63% of respondents said that, because of the Act, their firms had had to keep some employees who otherwise would have been terminated for poor attendance.*

The opportunity to take FMLA leave intermittently has concerned employers because it could be more disruptive to business operations and be more burdensome from a record-keeping standpoint than if the leave entitlement were exercised just once in a 12-month period. According to the DOL-commissioned establishment survey, however, *81.2% of covered employers stated that intermittent leave did not have any impact on productivity and 93.7% said that it did not affect profitability.*

Another measure of the FMLA's impact on covered employers is the costs it imposes, such as those involved in administration, benefit continuation, and the temporary replacement of leave-takers (e.g., hiring and training costs). *Although a majority of establishments said in response to the DOL-commissioned survey that these costs had not changed since they became covered by the Act, a sizeable minority reported higher FMLA-related expenses. (See Table 3.) Respondents to the SHRM's 2000 FMLA Survey indicated that after productivity losses, the next costliest items associated with the law were the time and effort expended by HR staff and the replacement of leave-takers. However, the majority of survey respondents said that it was too difficult to quantify the overall cost of FMLA administration (30%) or that they had not done so (66%).*

Table 3. Changes in Selected Costs Since Coverage Under the FMLA Began, by Establishment Size

Type of employer expenditure	Percent of covered establishments with:		All covered establishments
	1-250 employees	251 or more employees	
<i>Administrative costs</i>			
Increased	41.9	63.3	43.4
Decreased	—	—	—
Unchanged	58.0	36.7	56.6
<i>Cost of continuing benefits during leave</i>			
Increased	26.9	45.7	28.1
Decreased	—	—	—
Unchanged	73.0	54.0	71.8
<i>Hiring/training costs</i>			
Increased	21.6	35.6	22.5
Decreased	—	—	—
Unchanged	78.3	64.3	77.4

Source: DOL. *Balancing the Needs of Families and Employers: Family and Medical Leave Surveys, 2000 Update*. Washington, D.C., January 2001.

Note: Figures may not total 100% due to rounding.

FMLA Policy Issues

Since its inception, proponents and opponents of the FMLA have been suggesting ways to change the Act to make it more employee-friendly or more employer-friendly. Some of the recurring proposals are examined below.

Expanding the FMLA

Coverage and Eligibility. As previously noted, 88.9 million out of 144.0 million public and private sector employees worked at covered establishments and met the FMLA's eligibility criteria in 1999-2000. That left 33.6 million who did not work at covered establishments and 21.5 million workers who, although working for covered employers, did not fulfill P.L. 103-3's hours-of-work and length-of-service requirements. In other words, almost two out of every five employees were not entitled to leave under the FMLA.

Proponents of the FMLA's approach to work-family balance would like to extend it to non-covered or ineligible workers. To make the leave entitlement an option for more employees, it has been suggested that the threshold for coverage of private sector employers be lowered from at least 50, to at least 25, employees. Other way to afford more employees the opportunity to take FMLA leave that have been advanced include (1) eliminating the hours-of-work eligibility requirement or prorating the 12-week leave entitlement based on the number of hours part-time employees' work, and (2) eliminating or reducing the 12-month length-of-service eligibility requirement.

FMLA-Qualifying Reasons. Broadening the situations for which FMLA leave can be taken could well increase what some view as the law's fairly low utilization rate, as would expanding employer coverage or employee eligibility. Additional FMLA-reasons that have been suggested include the following: attending parent-teacher conferences, participating in children's educational and extracurricular activities, taking children or elderly relatives to routine medical or dental appointments, participating in activities necessitated by domestic violence, and giving living organ donations.

"While health-related problems were the most common reason for employees ... to take leave to help family members, they accounted for only 29% of work-related absences," according to a recent study.³⁰ An additional 26% of employee absences were associated with the provision of transportation or other instrumental support for family members; 22%, with school/child care problems; 15%, with the provision of emotional or other support for family members; 5%, with the provision of elder care; 3%, coping with a family member's death; and 1% of employee absences were related to dealing with divorce.

Groups Whom Employees May Take FMLA Leave to Assist. Other proposals would expand the number of groups with serious health conditions for whose care employees may take leave under the statute. For example, it has been recommended that leave could be taken to care for elderly relatives other than the employee's own parent (e.g., a parent-in-law or grandparent). Other groups have included domestic partners, a non-disabled adult child (i.e., age 18 or older), or sibling.³¹

Employers could well oppose loosening firm coverage or employee eligibility requirements, broadening the FMLA-qualifying reasons, or increasing the groups for whom employees could take leave to assist. For example, only 9% of the HR professionals who responded to the SHRM's 2000 *FMLA Survey* thought the Act

³⁰Heymann, S. Jody. *The Widening Gap: Why American Working Families are in Jeopardy and What Can be Done About It*. Excerpts available at: [<http://www.hsph.harvard.edu/globalworkingfamilies/thewideninggap.html>].

³¹According to Heymann in *The Widening Gap*, 15% of employee absences were due to caring for parents; 12%, for spouses or partners; 7%, for grandchildren; and 24% were due to caring for other family members. Another 42% of employee absences were linked to caring for their children's health, educational, childcare, and other needs. (Children were defined to include preschool, school age, and adult children.)

should be expanded to cover additional reasons for leave that could be used on an intermittent basis. If these expansions were to increase utilization of the statute, it would result in more work for covered employers (e.g., determining whether the leave qualifies under the FMLA, tracking the cumulative amount of intermittent FMLA leave taken annually, and arranging for leave-takers' duties to be accomplished while they are absent).

Paid Leave. "Lack of money" was the reason offered most often (77.6%) by those who needed but did not take leave in 1999-2000 for FMLA reasons. Of those who indicated that they could not afford to take leave for FMLA purposes, the vast majority (87.8%) said they would have taken time off if they had received some/additional pay. Among leave-needers who did take leave for family/medical reasons and who received less than full pay during their longest leave, a very small majority (50.9%) said they would have taken more time off if they had received some/additional pay.³²

Rather than amending the FMLA to require paid in lieu of unpaid leave, the Clinton Administration advocated the voluntary use by states of Unemployment Insurance (UI) funds to provide partial wage replacement to parents who could not otherwise take time off to care for a newborn or newly adopted child. The DOL issued a final rule, effective August 2000, on "Birth and Unemployment Compensation" which includes model language for state legislation. (For more information see: CRS Report RS20687, *Unemployment Compensation: Benefits While on Leave for the Birth or Adoption of a Child.*)

Another alternative to the FMLA that some in the Congress have advocated as a means of providing workers with more time to attend to family or personal needs would require amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (FLSA). Under the FLSA, private sector employers must pay an overtime premium to hourly employees who work more than 40 hours in a week. (The overtime premium is 1½ times the employee's hourly rate of pay.) Instead of giving employees their overtime in cash, private employers would be allowed to offer them compensatory time off from the workplace. Since 1978, hourly employees in the public sector have had this option. (For more information see: CRS Report 96-570, *Federal Regulation of Working Hours: An Overview.*)

Yet a third proposal involves initiating and partially funding a demonstration grant program to assist states that are interested in supplementing the income of parents who take leave upon the birth or adoption of a child or to care for a newly born or adopted child. Others eligible for wage replacement could include parents who leave their jobs to care for a son or daughter under 1 year old with a serious health condition. The grants could be paid in a variety of ways (e.g., directly to eligible individuals; through an insurance program including a state temporary disability insurance program, the UI program, or a private disability plan; or through an employer-provided mechanism).

³²Those who favor expanding the law also have recommended that the leave period be lengthened from the current 12 workweeks in a 12-month period.

Clarifying or Tightening the FMLA

Serious Health Condition. The term “serious health condition” is defined as an illness, impairment, injury or mental/physical condition that involves

- any period of incapacity or treatment connected with inpatient care (i.e., an overnight stay) in a hospital, hospice, or residential mental facility;
- a period of incapacity requiring absence of more than 3 consecutive days from work, school, or other regular daily activities that also involves continuing treatment by (or under the supervision of) a health care provider;³³
- any period of incapacity due to pregnancy or for prenatal care;
- a period of incapacity that is permanent or long-term due to a condition for which treatment may not be effective (e.g., Alzheimer’s, stroke, terminal diseases, etc.); or
- any absences to receive multiple treatments (including any period of recovery therefrom) by, or on a referral by, a health care provider for a condition that likely would result in incapacity of more than three consecutive days if left untreated (e.g., chemotherapy, physical therapy, dialysis, etc.)³⁴

Some have argued that the DOL greatly expanded the meaning of the term beyond that originally envisioned by lawmakers. At an oversight hearing conducted in February 15, 2000 by the House Government Reform Subcommittee on National Economic Growth, Natural Resources, and Regulatory Affairs, it was asserted that a DOL nonregulatory guidance letter effectively said that the underlying medical condition (e.g., a cold, the flu, or an earache) did not matter if the technical requirements of the Act were met (e.g., an absence of at least 3 consecutive days that involves continuing treatment from a health care provider). As a result, some have asserted that employees can request FMLA leave for minor, brief illnesses which traditionally have fallen within an employer’s sick leave policy. (Recall that, as shown in **Table 2**, FMLA leave has most often been taken for employees to attend to their own health.) Others have countered that not all employees work for firms that offer sick leave as part of their benefit package.³⁵

³³Continuing treatment means treatment at least twice by a health care provider or once if it results in a continuing regimen of care. Courts have disagreed about what constitutes continuing treatment (e.g., some have ruled differently as to whether taking prescription medication after having seen a health care provider meets the definition).

³⁴Employment Standards Administration. Wage and Hour Division, *FMLA Compliance Guide*. Available at: [<http://www.dol.gov/dol/esa/public/regs/compliance/whd/1421.htm>].

³⁵Half of full-time employees at small private establishments (i.e., those with fewer than 100 employees) were covered by paid sick leave benefits and 48%, by unpaid family leave benefits, in 1996. Somewhat more (56%) full-time employees at medium and large establishments were covered by a paid sick leave policy in 1997. Not surprisingly given the firm-size threshold in the FMLA, many more full-time employees at larger firms (93%) had unpaid family leave available to them. See U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. *Employee Benefits in Small Private Establishments, 1996*. Bulletin 2507, 1999; and *Employee Benefits in Medium and Large Private Establishments, 1997*. Bulletin 2517, 1999.

In recognition of the charge that employees may be taking FMLA leave for something other than a “truly” serious condition, the survey commissioned by the DOL asked persons who gave health-related reasons for taking leave under the Act (excluding disability due to pregnancy) whether their condition required care from a doctor or an overnight stay in a hospital. Virtually all those who took leave in 1999-2000 to deal with their own or a family member’s illness (99.1%) responded that a doctor’s care was required. Fewer (67.0%) reported that they or a family member had to be hospitalized overnight.

To remedy the perceived problem — which allegedly permits abuse of the Act, increases employers’ administrative burden, and sparks litigation — it has been proposed that the regulation be clarified and tightened. One notion that has been advanced would make clear that an illness, injury, impairment or condition for which treatment and recovery are brief (e.g., fewer than 7 or 14 days) does not constitute a serious health condition. It further has been suggested that the regulation be revised to list specific examples of serious conditions (e.g., heart attack, severe respiratory condition, spinal injury, appendicitis, pneumonia, severe arthritis, severe nervous disorder, an injury caused by a serious accident on or off the job, or an ongoing pregnancy including related complications). But, in responding to questions posed during a hearing held by the Subcommittee on Children and Families of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions on July 14, 1999, the Deputy Administrator of the DOL’s Wage and Hour Division expressed concern that such a list might imply there were *no* circumstances in which illnesses that “everyone would agree are normally not serious conditions” could warrant FMLA leave. He pointed out that the flu — an oft-used example of a nonserious condition for which FMLA leave currently can be taken if it lasts more than 3 days and requires the continuing treatment of a health care provider — kills tens of thousands of people each year.

Intermittent Leave. As previously noted, the DOL regulations require employers to account for intermittent leave in the smallest increment that their payroll systems use to account for absences as long as it is 1 hour or less. It has been argued that keeping track of such short segments of time is extremely arduous, particularly if the firm’s payroll and attendance systems are not integrated or if the system for recording intermittent leave is not automated. In response, it has been noted that relatively few employees have taken FMLA leave on an intermittent basis.

A suggestion that has been made to lessen the record-keeping burden is to extend the minimum FMLA leave increment to one-half day. Others have countered that lengthening the increment would substantially penalize those who took leave by withholding half a day’s pay when the employee only needed to be absent for one-half hour for example. The size of the penalty could potentially discourage some employees from taking intermittent leave altogether.

One argument that has been put forth against the use of intermittent leave — particularly when little notice is provided — is that it deprives employers of the ability to mitigate work disruptions and consequently can wreck havoc on the duties and

schedules of leave-takers' co-workers as they typically are made to temporarily pick up the slack.³⁶ This, in turn, could adversely affect employee productivity and morale.

If extending the minimum increment of intermittent leave were to discourage the practice, then it would lessen the FMLA's arguably negative impact on other workers. However, as mentioned earlier when the results of the DOL-commissioned surveys were discussed, co-workers of leave-takers generally did not think the Act adversely affected them. If, instead, extending the minimum increment meant that FMLA leave still were taken intermittently but the leave-takers had to be absent for 4 hours rather than 1 hour, for example, then the Act's burden on co-workers presumably would increase.

Employer Response Time to Notification of Need for Leave.

Employers must respond in writing within 1-2 business days to an employee's notification of the need for leave. Some have asserted that this is an extremely short period in which to determine whether the leave comes under the Act and to provide further guidance to employees — particularly as employees do not have to mention the FMLA in their notification and especially if employees informally tell their immediate supervisors rather than directly informing the employers' HR personnel who process the paperwork.

One recommendation has been made to lengthen the employer's response period to 3 weeks. In addition, it has been suggested that employers be allowed to make retroactive designations of absences as falling under the FMLA.

Legislation Introduced in the 107th Congress to Amend the FMLA

Title V of H.R. 265/S. 18, the Right Start Act of 2001, would expand family and medical leave. Subtitle A, the "Family Income to Respond to Significant Transitions Insurance Act," would create a 5-year demonstration grant program to assist states in supplementing the income of parents who take leave upon the birth or adoption of a child or to care for a newly born or adopted child; it would not amend the FMLA. Subtitle B, "Family and Medical Leave Fairness Act of 2001," would lower the size threshold for coverage of private sector firms to those with at least 25 employees. Subtitle C, the "Time for Schools Act of 2001," would entitle eligible employees at covered employers to a total of 24 hours of leave in a 12-month period for participating in an academic activity involving their children (e.g., parent-teacher conference or interview for a school). The "school involvement leave" could be taken intermittently. Accrued paid vacation, personal, or sick leave could be substituted for unpaid FMLA leave for this purpose. If the school involvement leave were foreseeable, the employee is to provide 7 days' notice; if it is not, the employee is to

³⁶Employees are to provide 30 days' advance notice to their employers when they can foresee the need for FMLA leave. When the need for leave is unforeseen, employees are to supply notice "as soon as practicable" (i.e., within 1-2 business days of realizing the need for leave). According to the SHRM's *2000 FMLA Survey*, HR professionals who responded indicated that, on average, 60% of employees who took leave provided little advance warning.

provide such notice as is practicable. Employers may require that notification of school involvement leave be supported by documentation. Subtitle D concerns employment protections for battered women. It would amend the FMLA by entitling employees to leave who, because of the effects of domestic violence, are unable to perform their workplace functions or who need to care for a son, daughter, or parent if such individual is affected by domestic violence. FMLA leave for this purpose may be taken on an intermittent or reduced schedule basis.

Provisions in H.R. 1990/S. 940 (No Child Left Behind Act of 2001) also lower the firm-size threshold for FMLA coverage to 25 or more employees and establish a demonstration grant program of wage replacement for individuals who take leave upon the birth or adoption of a child or to care for a newly born or adopted child. The latter would not amend the FMLA.

A number of other bills would broaden the FMLA as well. H.R. 1312 would expand the reasons for taking leave under the FMLA to include caring for a son or daughter due to the death of a spouse. H.R. 2287 would allow eligible employees to take leave to care for a domestic partner, parent-in-law, adult child, sibling, or grandparent with a serious health condition. H.R. 2328 would eliminate the requirement that an employee work 1,250 hours in a 12-month period to be eligible for FMLA leave, thereby covering part-timers.

H.R. 2366/S. 489, the Family and Medical Leave Clarification Act, would define *serious health condition* to exclude those short-term illnesses, injuries, impairments, or conditions “for which treatment and recovery are very brief” and to include a variety of examples such as heart attack, severe respiratory condition, spinal injury, pneumonia, severe arthritis, severe nervous disorder, injury caused by a serious accident on/off the job, ongoing pregnancy and related complication/illness, childbirth and recovery therefrom. Employees could be required to take intermittent leave in increments of up to half their workday. In addition, employees whose daily work assignment typically includes travel and who requests intermittent/reduced schedule leave could be required to take leave for the duration of the work assignment if the employer is unable to reasonably accommodate the employee’s request. If employers do not exercise their right to have FMLA leave-takers substitute paid for unpaid leave, they could require employees who want leave under the statute to request it in a timely manner and if that is not done, *deny the leave*. A timely request would be considered

- not less than 30 days in the case of foreseeable leave and include submission of “any written application required by the employer for the leave not later than 5 working days after providing notice to the employer,” or
- in the case of unforeseeable leave, oral notification of the need for leave not later than the date the leave begins (or within such additional time as is necessary due to an employee’s being physically or mentally incapacitated) and any written notification required by the employer not later than 5 working days after providing oral notice (or within such additional time as is necessary due to an employee’s being physically or mentally incapacitated).

In the case of FMLA leave for a serious health condition, employers could require leave-takers to choose between any paid absence provided under a collective

bargaining agreement or “under any other sick leave, sick pay, or disability plan, program, or policy of the employer” and unpaid leave under the statute. Further, the Secretary of Labor must review all FMLA regulations. Previously issued regulations and associated opinion letters would no longer be effective once final regulations were issued to implement the amendments made by the bill to the 1993 Act.

H.R. 1489/S. 163, the Civil Rights Procedures Protection Act of 2001, would amend certain civil rights statutes, including the FMLA, to prevent the involuntary application of arbitration to claims that arise from alleged unlawful employment discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, or disability.

Appendix Table 1. Compliance Activity Under the FMLA

Completed compliance activity	Fiscal year							Total
	1993 ^a	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	
<i>Total number of complaints</i>	98	1,881	2,619	2,534	2,670	3,795	2,912	16,509
<i>Type of compliance action</i>								
Conciliation	76	894	1,495	1,671	2,039	2,189	1,794	10,158
Investigation	22	987	1,124	863	631	1,606	1,118	6,351
<i>Nature of employee complaints</i>								
Refusal to grant FMLA leave	36	404	574	585	699	716	589	3,603
Refusal to restore to same or equivalent position	38	875	1,053	949	1,276	1,841	1,505	7,537
Health benefits	6	96	90	76	77	91	49	485
Discrimination	9	150	293	279	468	849	624	2,672
Other	2	113	235	278	95	298	145	1,166
Multiple reasons ^b	7	243	374	367	55	—	—	1,046
<i>Status of compliance</i>								
No violations, total	27	723	1,095	1,074	1,187	1,424	1,131	6,661
Employer not covered	4	54	81	75	66	70	53	403
Employee not eligible	5	141	169	189	146	201	139	990
Complaint not valid	13	425	733	671	885	774	713	4,214
Other ^c	5	103	112	139	90	379	226	1,054

Completed compliance activity	Fiscal year								Total
	1993 ^a	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999		
<i>Violation findings^d</i>									
Grand total, employees	71	1,158	1,524	1,460	1,483	2,371	1,781	9,848	
Monetary damages (in thousands)	\$8.8	\$784.5	\$2,872.4	\$2,152.6	\$2,867.4	\$4,520.6	\$5,851.5	19,058	

Source: U.S. Department of Labor.

^a The FMLA was in effect only from August 5, 1993 through September 30, 1993 in FY1993.

^b Since FY1998, only the primary complaint that an employee files is reported.

^c Includes cases terminated before completion generally at the complainant's request.

^d Through FY1999, 88% of the grand total of cases were successfully resolved and the remainder were reviewed for potential litigation. The DOL filed 32 court cases, of which four are pending, and a friend-of-the-court brief in six cases, of which none are pending.