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The Chicago Commission on Human Relations (CCHR) is charged with enforcing the Chicago Human Rights Ordinance and the Chicago Fair Housing Ordinance. The Commission investigates complaints to determine whether discrimination may have occurred, and uses its enforcement powers to punish acts of discrimination. Under the City’s Hate Crime Law, the agency aids hate crime victims. CCHR also employs proactive programs of education, intervention, and constituency building to discourage bigotry and bring people from different groups together.
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2012 was an exciting year of change for the Commission on Human Relations (CCHR)! We spent the better part of 2011 assessing and reflecting on our work, challenges, and resources so that in 2012 we could become a more efficient and results-oriented agency that serves the needs of all Chicagoans. In the process we reduced our footprint, consolidated our office space from two floors to one, and increased overall effectiveness.

A major priority in 2012 was to better communicate our message to the public. This included cross-branding CCHR communication, redesigning and translating the CCHR brochure into Spanish, Chinese, and Polish. We created new legal fact sheets to provide easy-to-read information about specific areas of discrimination. Lastly, the CCHR stepped into the social media arena for the first time and created a Facebook page.

Also in 2012, Mayor Rahm Emanuel appointed new members to our Board of Commissioners. Applicants were selected based on a variety of factors including, but not limited to, good standing in the community, demonstrated commitment and ability, and legal expertise in employment, housing, and public accommodation discrimination. The final selection of seated Commissioners are uniquely qualified and dynamic individuals who have a proven history of delivering on the mission of the CCHR and are recognized as advocates and liaisons to their respective communities.

Our Inter-Group Relations (IGR) team revamped our education program to be more pro-active and created a new workshop series for both youth and adults on topics such as Bullying and Conflict Resolution as a means to prevent acts of hate and violence in our schools and our communities. The Adjudication Division made major strides in reducing and successfully addressing the number of outstanding investigations of complaints filed in the previous year and completed work on the updated Subject Matter Index of Precedential Decisions, the first to be published in almost six years. The Index briefly describes all Board of Commissioners rulings and other precedential decisions issued in CCHR discrimination cases since 1990, by legal topics and subtopics. The Index is posted on the CCHR website, and hard copies are available at the CCHR for inspection or for purchase. The index is an invaluable research tool for attorneys and the general public who want to learn more about CCHR’s case law.

As we lay the groundwork for continued improvements in delivering on the CCHR’s mission of addressing bias and discrimination, we share just a sample of the Commission’s activities in 2012. Please review our report and visit our webpage and Facebook page to learn more about our efforts to reduce incidents of hate, discrimination, and violence in Chicago. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mona Noriega
Chairman and Commissioner
It is the policy of the City of Chicago to assure full and equal opportunity to all residents. The Chicago Commission on Human Relations (CCHR) serves as the city’s civil rights department and enforces the Chicago Human Rights and Fair Housing Ordinances which prohibit discrimination. Under the City's hate crime law, the CCHR also assists hate crime victims and develops and conducts pro-active programs to educate and prevent incidents of bias and hate.

**Board of Commissioners**

The CCHR Board of Commissioners is appointed by the Mayor of the City of Chicago and serves as the public leadership and community voice. The board receives reports on the work of the department from staff, and helps staff improve services to the public. The board also makes the final rulings in all fully adjudicated discrimination cases. The Board may adopt the hearing officer’s recommendations in full, reject or modify them consistent with applicable law, or remand cases for further hearing.

**Office of the Chair**

The Office of the Chair develops and directs the implementation of policies and manages the day to day operations of the department. It is also responsible for all fiscal, personnel, media, and public relations functions for the organization. The chair of the Commission on Human Relations also serves as the commissioner of the department.
**Adjudication**

The Adjudication Division of the CCHR enforces the Chicago Human Rights and Fair Housing Ordinances by investigating and adjudicating complaints of discrimination in housing, employment, public accommodations, credit and bonding. Persons who feel they have been discriminated against in Chicago because of membership in one or more of the following fourteen protected categories may file a complaint with the Commission: race, sex, color, age, religion, disability, national origin, ancestry, sexual orientation, gender identity, marital status, parental status, military discharge status, and source of income.

The CCHR conducts administrative hearings if the investigation reveals substantial evidence of an ordinance violation. If the Board of Commissioners rules that discrimination has occurred, violators can be ordered to pay damages and fines to the city, and, if applicable, the Board can also order injunctive relief.

**Inter-Group Relations (IGR)**

The CCHR's Inter-Group Relations Division (IGR) mediates conflicts, advocates on behalf of victims of hate crimes, and proactively works to prevent discrimination through the delivery of educational programs in schools and communities most at risk for violence based on bias and stereotypes.

![IGR Hate Crime Victim Advocate Norman White delivering Bullying Workshop to youth](image)

**Advisory Councils**

The Advisory Councils to the Commission on Human Relations help to identify and address practices and actions which have a discriminatory impact on their respective constituency groups. In addition, the councils serve as liaisons between city government and the community to promote cooperation and enhance services. Councils also provide assistance in designing educational and enforcement programs for the Commission. Individual members of the advisory councils are appointed by the Mayor to serve as volunteers representing their respective communities.
The Board of Commissioners makes the final rulings in all fully adjudicated discrimination cases after reviewing the recommended ruling of the hearing officer who conducted the administrative hearing. The Board may adopt the hearing officer’s recommendation in full, reject or modify it consistent with applicable law, or remand the case for further hearing.

In 2012, the Board entered 12 final rulings. Seven rulings were in favor of complainants: three finding ordinance violations and ordering remedies, and four determining the amount of attorney fees to be paid to the prevailing complainant’s counsel. Five rulings were in favor of respondents, finding no ordinance violation and dismissing the cases.

If a party to a case ruled on by the Commission seeks to have the Commission’s decision reversed, it may appeal to the Circuit Court of Cook County and potentially on to the appellate level and beyond. The Commission, however, has a strong record of having its decisions upheld by the courts and continue to do so in 2012.

In Alexander v. 1212 Restaurant Group et.al., CCHR No. 00-E-110, the Illinois Supreme Court denied Respondents’ petition for further appeal. Thus the ruling of the CCHR stands as entered after being fully affirmed by the Circuit and Appellate Courts. CCHR had ruled that an employee had been subjected to a hostile work environment based on perceived sexual orientation. The Commission ordered $140,000 in punitive damages, $35,000 in emotional distress damages, over $83,000 in attorney fees, and fines.

In Flores v. A Taste of Heaven et.al., CCHR No. 06-E-32, the Illinois Appellate Court issued an opinion fully affirming the Commission’s final ruling. The decision affirmed the quality of the Commission’s procedural framework as well as the careful decision making of both the hearing officer and the Commission throughout the case.

Mona Noriega, Chairman and Commissioner
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Adjudication

The CCHR executes City of Chicago policy which strongly opposes discrimination, and is careful to impose the powerful remedies available under Chicago’s ordinances, only when justified by the evidence and applicable law. The CCHR enforces the Chicago Human Rights Ordinance and the Chicago Fair Housing Ordinance by –

• Receiving and investigating formal complaints filed by members of the public.
• Facilitating the settlement of cases where possible.
• Determining, after investigation and a public administrative hearing, whether prohibited discrimination occurred.
• Ordering remedies if discrimination is proved.

The Human Rights Ordinance prohibits discrimination in employment, public accommodations, credit transactions, and bonding. The Chicago Fair Housing Ordinance prohibits housing discrimination. The discrimination must be based on one or more of these 14 protected categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age (over 40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Color</td>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Origin</td>
<td>Gender Identity</td>
<td>Source of Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancestry</td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Military Discharge Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Parental Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The discriminatory conduct must have occurred in the City of Chicago. A discrimination complaint must be filed within 180 days of the alleged discriminatory action.

When discrimination is proved at an administrative hearing, the Board of Commissioners can order the offender to –

• Pay fines to the City of Chicago, up to $500 per violation.
• Take specific actions to address discriminatory practices (injunctive relief).
• Pay damages to the complainant for out-of-pocket losses and emotional distress.
• Pay punitive damages to the complainant in appropriate cases.
• Pay the complainant’s attorney fees.
2012 Discrimination Claims

In 2012, 249 new discrimination complaints were filed with the Commission as compared to 267 in 2011, a reduction of 7%. However, housing discrimination complaints continued to rise for the third straight year. The 97 housing discrimination complaints filed in 2012 represent a 33% increase over the 73 filed in 2011, and the largest number of housing discrimination complaints filed in a single year since 2003. As a result, the largest proportion of new discrimination complaints in 2012 concerned housing at 39%, while 33% concerned employment, 27% concerned public accommodations, and less than 1% concerned credit transactions.

The Commission remains concerned about the high proportion of race discrimination claims it continues to receive. It was race discrimination which spurred the passage of the first anti-discrimination laws decades ago. Yet people still regularly claim race bias in all of the areas of activity covered by Chicago’s ordinances. Public concern about issues of race calls for ongoing, multifaceted action—even as attention is directed to additional kinds of prejudice and discrimination.
**DISCRIMINATION CLAIMED IN NEW COMPLAINTS**

The percentage figures in the table below show the percentage of complaints filed in 2012 which contained a claim of discrimination on the basis named. A complaint may claim discrimination on more than one basis (e.g. sex and age) arising out of the facts alleged. Thus, the number of claims usually exceeds the number of complaints.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROTECTED CLASS</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Public Accom.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total Claims</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Origin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancestry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Identity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Status</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Income</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Discharge Status</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL COMPLAINTS</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the 83 employment discrimination complaints filed in 2012, race was the most frequently alleged discrimination basis, appearing in 47% of the complaints. Following were sex and age discrimination, each claimed in 28% of the complaints, disability in 19%, sexual orientation in 12%, and national origin in 10%. Claims based on the remaining protected classes appeared in 7% or fewer of new employment discrimination complaints.

There were three final rulings by the Board of Commissioners based on employment discrimination in 2012:

**Sex Discrimination (Pregnancy):**

*Tarpein v. Polk Street Company d/b/a Polk Street Pub et al., CCHR No. 09-E-23 (Apr. 18, 2012) (Petition for Attorney’s Fees)*

In 2011, the Board found liability and ordered remedies where a bartender-manager was subjected to pregnancy-related sex discrimination. In 2012, the Board granted the Complainant’s petition for attorney’s fees in the amount of $26,439.30 and $752.38 in costs.

*Sleper v. Maduff & Maduff LLC, CCHR No. 06-E-90 (May 16, 2012)*

A law firm was found liable for pregnancy-related sex discrimination for discharging an associate attorney because of her pregnancy and pregnancy-related leave. Remedies included $2,500 in emotional distress damages, $9,466.45 in back pay, and a $500 fine. Attorney’s fees are pending.

**Sex Discrimination (Sexual Harassment)**


The Board found liability where it ruled that a restaurant owner-manager sexually harassed and constructively discharged an employee through unwelcome sexual advances such as kissing her and appearing with clothing unfastened. The individual and corporate owners were ordered to pay fines of $500 each, to adopt a sexual harassment policy, and to pay complainant emotional distress damages of $2,000, punitive damages of $4,000, and back pay of $13,550. Attorney’s fees are pending.
A complaint may claim discrimination on more than one basis (e.g. sex and age) arising out of the facts alleged. Thus the 140 claims exceed the total number of complaints. Of 83 employment discrimination complaints filed in 2012, the most frequent claims were based on race (39), sex (23), and age (23). Disability was also a frequent basis of complaints (16); as was national origin (8).
Housing Discrimination

Of the 97 housing complaints filed in 2012, 72% alleged source of income discrimination involving Housing Choice Vouchers, also known as Section 8 Vouchers. Discrimination against low income households who receive these federal subsidies (administered in Chicago through the Chicago Housing Authority) continues as a significant fair housing issue. The Fair Housing Ordinance offers the only available legal remedy for this type of discrimination in Chicago.

Race discrimination was the next most frequent claim in the housing area, asserted in 27% of the complaints filed in 2012. Next was disability discrimination, claimed in 16% of discrimination complaints, followed by sex discrimination in 6%. Other types of discrimination were claimed in 3% or fewer of new housing discrimination complaints.

There were five final rulings by the Board of Commissioners based on housing discrimination in 2012:

Disability Discrimination

Montelongo v. Azarpira, CCHR No. 09-H-23 (Feb. 15, 2012)

In 2011, the Board found liability where a property owner refused to rent to a mother based on the disability of her son. In 2012, the Board granted the Complainant’s petition for attorney’s fees and costs in the amount of $7,386.25.

Race Discrimination

McGhee v. MADO Management LP, CCHR No. 11-H-10 (Apr. 18, 2012)

The Board entered a finding of no liability where it found no racially discriminatory refusal to rent where the evidence showed an advertised apartment was rented before the Complainant contacted the owner in response to the ad, and no other units were available to rent.

Source of Income Discrimination


In 2011, the Board found liability based on source of income discrimination and ordered remedies where a publicly-supported housing developer refused to complete sales to two Complainants because their purchases would be partly financed through another public program which required an additional inspection. In 2012, the Board granted the Complainants’ petition for attorney’s fees in the amount of $56,484.50 and costs of $366.60.
The Board found no liability where a Section 8 housing voucher holder failed to prove that a condominium unit owner and her listing agent prevented the voucher holder from applying to rent the unit based on source of income. No direct evidence of discriminatory intent was presented and the circumstantial evidence was insufficient to prove Respondents acted with discriminatory intent.

**Sexual Orientation Discrimination**

*Gilbert and Gray v. 7355 South Shore Condominium Assn. et al., CCHR No. 01-H-18/27 (June 20, 2012)*

In 2011, the Board found liability based on sexual orientation discrimination and ordered relief where a condominium association president harassed a lesbian unit owner and blocked the sale of a unit to a lesbian purchaser. In 2012, the Board granted the Complainants’ petition for attorney’s fees in the amount of $61,535.66 and costs of $6,653.39.

A complaint may claim discrimination on more than one basis (e.g. sex and age) arising out of the facts alleged. Thus the 128 claims exceed the number complaints. Of the 97 complaints received in 2012, 70 claimed source of income discrimination. Race (26) and disability (16) were the next most frequent types of housing discrimination claims.
PUBLICATION

Of the 68 public accommodation complaints filed in 2012, race was the leading basis claimed, appearing in 46% of the new complaints. Disability was the next most frequent type of discrimination claimed, in 37% of complaints filed in 2012. Disability discrimination claims in this area often involve the accessibility of retail businesses, especially restaurants, to wheelchair users and other people with disabilities. Access to public accommodations remains a key compliance issue for people with disabilities and an issue for an aging population.

The next most frequent types of claims in the public accommodation area in 2012 were sex discrimination in 16% of new complaints, then sexual orientation and gender identity, each claimed in 12% of new complaints, then color and national origin, each claimed in 6% of new complaints. Claims based on the remaining protected classes appeared in 4% or fewer of the public accommodation discrimination complaints filed in 2012.

There were four final rulings by the Board of Commissioners based on public accommodation discrimination in 2012:

RACE DISCRIMINATION

Johnson v. Hyde Park Corp. d/b/a Hyde Park Citgo, CCHR No. 08-P-95/96 (Feb. 15, 2012)
No race discrimination was found where Pakistani employees refused to allow an African-American couple to purchase gasoline using $100 bills found suspect when tested with a pen designed to identify counterfeit currency, as the testing procedure was applied to all customers regardless of race. References to “your friends” or “your brother” did not show racial animus under the circumstances, including the employees’ limited English proficiency.

Jones v. Minah Inc. d/b/a Sunshine Shell Gas Station, CCHR No. 11-P-75 (Sept 19, 2012)
The Board found no race discrimination where the Complainant’s version of an incident at a gas station, including use of a racial slur, was not credible and was directly contradicted by credible testimony of a third party witness.

Hudson v. G-A Restaurant LLC d/b/a Manor Chicago, CCHR No. 10-P-112 (July 18, 2012)
The Board ruled that a nightclub’s refusal to admit an African-American man and his party was not based on race, where the evidence showed he did not have a properly-made reservation, the club was booked to capacity, and his party was invited to wait in line pursuant to the policy for those without reservations. Use of the term “you people” by door staff was found not race-based in the context presented.
A complaint may claim discrimination on more than one basis (e.g. sex and age) arising out of the facts alleged. Thus the 103 claims exceed the total number of complaints. Of the 68 complaints received in the public accommodations area, race discrimination claims appeared in 31 new complaints, followed by disability (25), sex (11), and sexual orientation (8), and gender identity (8).

To prove a prima facie case in a public accommodation discrimination complaint, the complainant must show 1) that he or she is a member of a protected class, 2) that he or she attempted to avail themselves of the products or services offered by the respondent, 3) that others outside of his or her protected class were treated differently, and 4) the complainant suffered a material harm because of the action(s) of the respondent.
**Resolution of Complaints**

People who believe they have been subjected to discrimination as defined in the City of Chicago ordinances file a written complaint with the CCHR. After a complaint is filed, the CCHR notifies each named respondent and sets a deadline to submit a written response and any documents that support the respondent’s position. The complainant also receives a deadline to reply to any response and to submit any documentation that supports the allegations of the complaint. The CCHR will offer the parties the opportunity to try to settle the case before the investigation is completed. Settlement is voluntary. The CCHR does not propose or advocate particular settlement terms, but staff may draft the agreed terms of a settlement for the parties to sign.

A substantial percentage of discrimination complaints close due to settlement between the parties. Settlement may occur prior to completion of a full investigation or after a case has advanced to the hearing process. In 2012 a total of 52 or 21% of closed cases were resolved by settlement.

Commission staff, independent mediators, and hearing officers encourage parties to try to settle their dispute and are skilled to facilitate the process. The CCHR is authorized to order parties to participate in a confidential settlement conference conducted by one of its independent mediators. The CCHR typically does this after a substantial evidence finding but before appointment of a hearing officer, if there appears to be settlement potential. In 2012, the Commission held 12 such settlement conferences.

---

**Chart of Resolution of 2012 Housing Complaints - 72 Total Cases Closed**
CHART OF RESOLUTION OF 2012 EMPLOYMENT COMPLAINTS – 96 TOTAL CASES CLOSED

19 Settled
22 Complainant Withdrew Case
10 Complainant Failed to Cooperate
10 Lack of Jurisdiction
34 No Substantial Evidence
1 Board Ruling After Hearing

CHART OF RESOLUTION OF 2012 PUBLIC ACCOMMODATION COMPLAINTS - 76 TOTAL CASES CLOSED

11 Settled
12 Complainant Withdrew Case
10 Complainant Failed to Cooperate
1 Lack of Jurisdiction
37 No Substantial Evidence
5 Board Rulings After Hearing
The Inter-Group Relations (IGR) division of the Commission on Human Relations reacts to incidents of violence and proactively provides educational workshops to reduce discrimination and hate while promoting inter-group understanding. This unit is regularly called upon in times of crisis to intercede in communities where violence may have occurred or has the potential for occurring. Many of these conflicts occur in or around schools, and in communities between residents and neighbors. Mediation by IGR has been successful in helping to resolve a variety of conflicts such as:

- Tensions within schools between competing groups of students
- Tensions between community residents and small neighborhood merchants
- Conflicts in condominiums
- Conflicts in senior citizen buildings
- Tensions between places of worship and community residents
- Tensions between youth and neighborhood merchants

The IGR Unit works closely with aldermen, police, clergy, and other key leadership to engage the community and develop community-based solutions. IGR staff are trained in mediation techniques that are key in bringing parties in conflict together to help them dialogue and resolve their differences. In 2012, IGR provided 301 responses to community tensions which included formal mediation sessions between parties in conflict.

**Mediating Community Tensions**

Here are just two examples community tensions that were successfully mediated.

**Example 1: Youth Violence**

*In January 2012, a YouTube video capturing the attack of a young Asian student by six other youth behind an elementary school received national media attention. The victim reportedly told the media that his attackers yelled the “N” word while they punched and kicked him in the face and body, before dragging him behind garbage dumpsters where they continued the vicious assault.*
Upon learning of the incident, the Commission reached out to the Chicago Police Department, community organizations, and several schools in the area. As a result, the Commission delivered 20 bullying workshops reaching more than 500 students in the 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th grades.

IGR Director Pablo Medina delivering the new Bullying Workshop to youth
Example 2: Consumer/Merchant Tensions

During the fall of 2011, a South Side alderman asked the Commission to intervene in ongoing tensions based on race, between community residents and several small businesses in the ward. The ward office had received numerous complaints from residents about the poor business practices, including allegations of selling outdated merchandise, LINK card fraud, and disrespectful behavior toward African American customers. At just about the same time in a nearby ward, a small business owner and four other people were shot and killed in a robbery of a cell phone store. This shooting served to further heighten tensions in the community between residents and the businesses.

For the next several months, IGR staff identified stakeholders including community organizations, Special Service Area Patrol Units, business owners, schools, and residents to facilitate constructive conversations regarding differences and stereotypes. Through these partnerships, new models of communication were forged and new relationships between community and the businesses were established.

Symbolic of this larger community tension, IGR staff was able to successfully mediate a conflict between a community resident and a business in which the resident complained that she was racially profiled and illegally detained while shopping in one of the offending stores. Through the mediation process, the parties were able to voice their concerns, identify their commonalities, and ultimately resolved their differences respectfully.

Awards Presentation at the International Human Relations Task Force, 2012 Unity Festival at Marquette Park
In 2012, the CCHR prioritized education as a tool to prevent discrimination and hate crimes. The IGR Unit developed a new human relations curriculum consisting of nine modules: 1) Stereotypes; 2) Prejudice; 3) Discrimination; 4) Understanding Diversity; 5) Power and Privilege; 6) Sensitivity; 7) Bullying; 8) Hate Crimes; and 9) Disability Enforcement Training.

At the onset of 2012, while preparing to embark on the new training program, an Asian youth was severely beaten by a group of other young people. The attack was posted on YouTube and viewed by thousands. The IGR Unit was poised with a developed curriculum and was soon responding to the community’s requests to deliver Bullying workshops. By the time work was concluded in this case, IGR had facilitated 20 sessions of the Bullying workshop for more than 500 students. Thereafter, Bullying workshops were requested and delivered across the city including Tilden High School, the Hamdard Community Center, and ASPIRA charter schools and Youth Development Program. In addition to the Bullying workshops, IGR also delivered Hate Crime workshops, several Peace Circles as a mediation technique to reduce community tensions, and Disability Enforcement Trainings. In 2012, a total of 33 workshops were requested and delivered.

Commissioner Noriega and other representatives from city, county, state and federal government came together to talk about anti-LGBT hate crimes and discrimination at the Center on Halsted.
HATE CRIME ADVOCACY

In 2012, IGR worked to provide assistance to victims in 68 reported hate crimes. Hate Crimes relate to a specific group of crimes (referred to as predicate offenses) in which hate against the victim’s actual or perceived race, color, creed, religion, ancestry, gender, sexual orientation (including gender identity), physical or mental disability, or national origin is a motivating factor for the crime. These predicate offenses include:

- Assault
- Aggravated Assault
- Battery
- Misdemeanor Theft
- Criminal Trespass to Residence
- Misdemeanor Criminal Damage to Property
- Criminal Trespass to Vehicle
- Criminal Trespass to Real Property
- Mob Action
- Disorderly Conduct
- Harassment by Telephone
- Harassment Through Electronic Communications

Hate crimes are not isolated to one community, nor are the victims of hate crimes all one group. Hate crimes can happen to anyone, anywhere! In 2012, hate incidents were reported in 36 of the city’s 50 wards. A total of 68 hate crimes were reported, which included a dramatic spike in hate crimes that were motivated by sexual orientation. As indicated by figures 1 and 2 above, in the past year sexual orientation hate crimes increased by 56%, causing it to supplant racially motivated hate crimes as the leading category of reported hate crimes, which has historically been the most reported basis for the hate crimes.

IGR advocates for victims of hate crimes. This includes accompanying victims through the criminal court process to help them understand how hate crimes are prosecuted and what the victim should expect to encounter each step of the way. Staff also work to mobilize community support for victims, and make social service referrals. Equally important, IGR works directly with the Cook County State’s Attorney’s Office and the Chicago Police Department to ensure that hate crime charges are pursued whenever possible, and perpetrators are punished to the full extent of the law.
An example of a hate crime that was successfully prosecuted and in which the IGR Unit provided assistance to the hate crime victim:

In October 2012, three friends went out to a restaurant for dinner. While waiting to place their order, another patron in the restaurant began to direct anti-gay slurs at one of the men in the group. The offending patron’s friends stopped him, and escorted him out of the restaurant. When the man from the first group left the restaurant, the patron who made the slurs was waiting outside where he physically attacked the victim. The offender was arrested and pled guilty to simple battery, and was sentenced to two years of probation. He was also ordered to pay financial restitution to the victim, including medical expenses.

International Outreach

The City of Chicago’s anti-discrimination laws serve as a model, not only in the United States, but in Spain as well. In 2012, Commissioner Noriega was invited by the United States Consulate General in Barcelona Spain to participate in a seminar titled Prevention of Discrimination and Xenophobia in the Local Context. The Commissioner provided an overview of the CCHR’s model of prevention, education, community tension mediations, and advocacy on behalf of victims of hate crimes. The seminar brought together more than 100 human relation professionals from across the world.
2012 was a year of restructuring. To better deliver on Mayor Emanuel’s vision to bring Chicago’s diverse communities together to address common issues of discrimination, hate, and violence, representatives of the African descendant, Arab, Asian, and Latino communities were brought together to create the CCHR’s new Advisory Council on Equity.

Mayor Emanuel replaced the Advisory Council of Immigrant and Refugee Rights and created the Office for New Americans (ONA). ONA is dedicated to improving services and engaging Chicago’s global immigrant communities through enhanced collaboration with community organizations, academic institutions, and the private sector. Through the creation of the ONA, the City affirmed and strengthened its support for immigrant communities, entrepreneurs, and businesses.
**EQUITY ADVISORY COUNCIL**

The CCHR devoted several months in working with the Mayor to identify community leaders representing the African descendant, Arab, Asian, and Latino communities who would serve as the founding members of the new Equity Council.

Prior to the selection and appointment of the new members, CCHR staff conducted extensive outreach into these communities meeting with community organizations, leadership, and institutions serving these diverse populations to share information about the CCHR and to learn first-hand about their concerns and issues. Staff also attended several community meetings and participated in a number of events and programs, such as the African Festival of the Arts, Korean American Association 50th Anniversary, the 43rd Annual 26th St. Mexican Independence Day Parade, and many others.

**ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VETERANS**

The Advisory Council on Veteran Affairs continued its work to address issues of discrimination that impact the veteran’s community, and serve as a liaison between city government and the community. Council members sponsored or participated in numerous programs, including the Salute to Gay Veterans, the Department of Veterans Affairs Resource Fair, City of Chicago Memorial Day Parade, Annual Veterans Stand Down for Homeless Veterans, Pearl Harbor Day Remembrance Program, and the annual Soldier Field Warrior Games.
**Women’s Issues**

The CCHR continued to maintain an active presence with the Women’s community on a number of initiatives and programs. In March the Commissioner served as a panelist for DePaul University’s Women’s History Luncheon. In April, the CCHR participated in Mujeres Latinas en Acción’s panel discussion on sexual harassment. Also in April, the CCHR collaborated with other organizations to celebrate Equal Pay Day. Commissioner Noriega served as one of the speakers for the rally which also included a number of dignitaries and elected officials. Similarly, in August the CCHR helped organize the annual Women’s Equality Day program. This event celebrates the passage of the 19th Amendment granting women the right to vote in the U.S. Lastly, in November the CCHR presented to the Battered Women’s Network.
LGBT Issues

The CCHR also supported a number of programs honoring Chicago’s LGBT community. These included:

• Annual Salute to Gay Veterans
• Gay Pride Parade
• United Latino Pride Celebration
• Chicago Gay and Lesbian Hall of Fame Induction Ceremony
• Anti-LGBTQ Bias and Our Rights: Local and Federal Responses to Hate and Discrimination Panel Discussion hosted at the Center on Halsted
• Forum to Address Violence Against the LGBTQ in the Austin Community

Commissioner Noriega also celebrated the opening of Vida/SIDA’s El Rescate and Chicago House’s TransLifeCenter, and was a recipient of the Cook County State’s Attorney’s 3rd Annual Pride Celebration & Awards.