

Decision Regarding Findings Reports INV-24-4 and INV-24-5 Concerning the Conduct of Toronto Police Service Board Member Ann Morgan

Decision By:

Joseph Maiorano, Deputy Inspector General of Policing

I. INTRODUCTION

- [1] The Inspectorate of Policing (“IoP”) received two separate complaints (INV-24-4 and INV-24-5¹) regarding how the Toronto Police Service Board (“TPSB”) Chair, Ann Morgan, handled two separate deputations at the April 30, 2024, meeting of the TPSB.
- [2] The IoP investigated these complaints to determine if Ms. Morgan committed misconduct contrary to the *Code of Conduct for Police Service Board Members Regulation*, O Reg 408/23 (“Code of Conduct”), enacted under the *Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019*, SO 2019, c 1, Sch 1 (the “Act”). Following an investigation, an IoP inspector prepared a Findings Report² which was provided to me for consideration.
- [3] Having reviewed the Findings Report and considered the applicable law, I find that Ms. Morgan did not commit misconduct in relation to how she handled the complainants.³ In fact, I believe Ms. Morgan’s conduct was both professional and fair given the circumstances.

II. BACKGROUND

- [4] Members of the public are permitted to speak at TPSB meetings, subject to some requirements, so long as their deputation relates to an agenda item. The requirement for deputations to be on topic is codified in TPSB by-law No 161.
- [5] On April 30, 2024, the TPSB was scheduled to have a meeting. The publicly available agenda for this meeting included the item, “Community Safety and Policing Act – Compliance Update.” This item was described as an update on the TPSB’s compliance with the Act, including steps taken to ensure the TPS adheres to new legislative requirements. Both complainants signed up to speak to this item.
- [6] On April 29, 2024, the day before the meeting, both complainants received an email reminding them that the TPSB by-laws require deputations to address the same subject matter as the agenda item. This email cautioned that if their deputation was off topic then it would not proceed.

¹ The complainants in INV-24-4 and INV-24-5 are referred to in this decision respectively as Complainant #1 and Complainant #2.

² Section 123 of the Act requires an IoP inspector who completes an investigation of a complaint to report their findings to the Inspector General. This report is redacted to comply with the *Publication of Findings Reports and Directions under Sections 123 and 125 of the Act Regulation*, O Reg 317/24.

³ This decision is made pursuant to a delegation of authority of the Inspector General of Policing issued under subsection 102(7) of the Act.

- [7] On April 30, 2024, prior to deputations being heard at the TPSB meeting, the Executive Director provided remarks reviewing the rules governing presenting deputations according to TPSB by-law No 161. This review included specific examples of violations, types of cautions that could be issued and actions that would be taken if violations persisted.
- [8] After the “Community Safety and Policing Act – Compliance Update” agenda item was introduced, a member of the public began discussing protests and the importance for the board to remain neutral. Ms. Morgan interrupted them, advising them that their comments were not relevant to the agenda item. She further explained that the agenda item related to the enhanced duties of the board and board members under the Act. The member of the public concluded their remarks by expressing dissatisfaction with some of the members of the board.
- [9] When it was Complainant #1’s turn to speak, they similarly began discussing a protest. Complainant #1 was warned to remain on topic several times by Ms. Morgan but continued to violate the board’s procedural deputation by-law by addressing the protest and alleging board member misconduct. Despite multiple interruptions and warnings, the complainant continued to speak about the protest and voiced disapproval of board members, specifically Councillors Amber Morley and Lily Cheng, for supporting a petition related to a protest. After Ms. Morgan directed them to a different avenue for their complaints, Complainant #1 objected – insisting their comments were relevant – and left the podium.
- [10] Complainant #2 also spoke, expressing support for previous speakers’ deputations. They thanked members of the TPS for their work and expressed concerns over a document signed by some of the board members. Complainant #2 stated concerns over the city’s decline and stated more people were obtaining firearms licenses in response to ongoing protests. Ms. Morgan asked Complainant #2 multiple times to remain on topic before thanking them and indicating that the discussion was no longer appropriate at the time.
- [11] The IoP interviewed both complainants during its investigation.
- [12] Complainant #1 said he was repeatedly interrupted during his board deputation. They believed their deputation was on topic and relevant to the topic of community safety. They acknowledged having limited knowledge of TPSB by-laws at the time.
- [13] Complainant #2 similarly stated that, despite remaining on topic, he was repetitively interrupted while attempting to deliver his deputation regarding board member compliance with the Code of Conduct. He asserted that his statement was relevant and that he was unjustly prevented from presenting it by the Chair.

Complainant #2 admitted to having limited knowledge of TPSB by-laws at the time, knowing only the basic rules.

III. ISSUES

[14] The sole issue under my consideration is whether Ms. Morgan committed misconduct with respect to her handling of the complainants' depositions.

IV. ANALYSIS

[15] I find, on a balance of probabilities, that Ms. Morgan did not violate the Code of Conduct.

[16] Sections 3, 6 and 10 are the pertinent sections of the Code of Conduct for the purposes of this decision. These provisions read as follows:

3. (1) A member of a police service board shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines or is likely to undermine the public's trust in the police service board or the police service maintained by the police service board.

(2) A member of a police service board shall not be subject to discipline for a contravention of subsection (1) if, on a balance of probabilities, their conduct was in the good faith performance of their duties as a board member.

6. A member of a police service board shall comply with any rules, procedures and by-laws of the police service board.

10. (1) A member of a police service board shall conduct themselves in a professional and respectful manner in the course of their duties including, without limitation, not using abusive or insulting language in the course of their duties.

(2) A member of a police service board shall not be subject to discipline for a contravention of subsection (1) if, on a balance of probabilities, the member's conduct was in the good faith performance of their duties.

[17] To begin, I note that Ms. Morgan, in her handling of the complainants, followed the TPSB deposition by-law and procedure. She followed the board's deposition protocols, including a script available to be referenced and followed during

community member deputations where there is a violation to the deputation procedural by-laws.

[18] The rules contained in the TPSB deputation by-law, and the deputation procedure, were communicated to the complainants in advance, including the consequences for non-compliance with the bylaw. Both complainants acknowledge receiving an email from the TPSB with general guidelines governing how to present deputations.

[19] The deputation by-law and procedure itself is balanced. They provide the opportunity for a member of the community to present at TPSB meetings, while also ensuring that the meeting is structured to effectively enable board business, in support of community safety, to occur.

[20] Ms. Morgan demonstrated procedural fairness and balance by communicating to the complainant that they were off topic and permitting them the opportunity to continue several times, consistent with the by-law and procedure. Throughout this exchange, Ms. Morgan maintained a neutral and professional tone in both her language and demeanor.

[21] Although the complainants may disagree with the interpretation of the rules with Ms. Morgan, this does not rise to the level of misconduct. Ms. Morgan demonstrated a fair interpretation of the by-law and procedures, acted professionally in all regards, and demonstrated an example of the conduct necessary to manage contentious issue during a board meeting.

V. CONCLUSION

[22] I find, on a balance of probabilities, that Ms. Morgan did not commit misconduct with respect to her handling of the deputations.

Date: December 17, 2025

Original Signed By

Joseph Maiorano
*Deputy Inspector General of
Policing*

FINDINGS REPORT

Toronto Police Service Board Member:
Ann Morgan

**Section 106(1) Board Member
Conduct Investigation**
(INV-24-4)

Submitted to:
Ryan Teschner
Inspector General of Policing of
Ontario

June 30, 2025

Table of Contents

ABOUT THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICING AND THE INSPECTORATE OF POLICING	3
INTRODUCTION.....	4
OVERVIEW OF INVESTIGATION	4
The Complaint	4
The Subject Police Service Board Member	5
Applicable Legislative and Regulatory Provisions	5
SUMMARY OF THE INVESTIGATION CONDUCTED.....	6
Investigative Exhibits: Collected and Reviewed	6
Complainant Interview	6
Subject Police Service Board Member Interview	8
Additional Material Collected and Reviewed.....	10
INVESTIGATION FINDINGS	15

ABOUT THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICING AND THE INSPECTORATE OF POLICING

The Inspector General of Policing drives improved performance and accountability in policing and police governance by overseeing the delivery of adequate and effective policing across Ontario. The Inspector General ensures compliance with the province's policing legislation and standards, and has the authority to issue progressive, risk-based and binding directions and measures to protect public safety. Ontario's Community Safety and Policing Act embeds protections to ensure the Inspector General's statutory duty is delivered independently from government.

The Inspector General of Policing leads the Inspectorate of Policing (IoP). The IoP provides operational support to inspect, investigate, monitor, and advise Ontario's police services, boards and special constable employers. By leveraging independent research and data intelligence, the IoP promotes leading practices and identifies areas for improvement, ensuring that high-quality policing and police governance is delivered to make everyone in Ontario safer.

In March 2023, Ryan Teschner was appointed as Ontario's first Inspector General of Policing with duties and authorities under the Community Safety and Policing Act. Mr. Teschner is a recognized expert in public administration, policing and police governance.

For more information about the Inspector General of Policing or the IoP, please visit www.iopontario.ca.

INTRODUCTION

This is a report to the Inspector General of Policing by an Inspector appointed by the Inspector General, who has completed an investigation under Part VII of the [Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019](#) (CSPA).

OVERVIEW OF INVESTIGATION

The Complaint

Two written complaints were received by the Inspector General of Policing, alleging that Toronto Police Service Board (TPSB) member Ann Morgan contravened the Code of Conduct for Police Service Board Members during a police service board meeting by improperly handling two deputations presented by members of the public.

This complaint relates to TPSB member Ann Morgan in her capacity as Chair of the TPSB during a TPSB meeting. One of her responsibilities in this role is to listen to deputations from members of the public. On April 30, 2024, while the complainant was delivering their deputation, Ann Morgan interrupted them on multiple occasions.

The complainant stated that, despite remaining on topic, he was repetitively interrupted while attempting to deliver his deputation regarding board member compliance with the Code of Conduct. He asserted that his statement was relevant and that he was unjustly prevented from presenting it by the Chair. He described this as a “travesty of the process” and emphasized that such obstruction is unacceptable with an open and transparent public meeting. Additionally, he expressed significant disappointment with the Chair’s interruptions, which hindered him and several others from making important deputations.

The Subject Police Service Board Member

Name of Police Service Board: Toronto Police Service Board

Subject Board Member: Ann Morgan

Length of Service (Term): Appointed March 27, 2021 to March 27, 2024. Reappointed effective April 1, 2024, to April 1, 2026

Previous Terms on Police Service Board: None

Specific Role Held on Police Service Board: Board Chair

Previous Substantiated Conduct: None

Appointing Authority: Solicitor General

Applicable Legislative and Regulatory Provisions

[Section 35\(6\)](#) of the CSPA provides that every member of a police service Board shall comply with the prescribed code of conduct.

[Ontario Regulation 408/23: Code of Conduct for Police Service Board Members](#) (Code of Conduct) sets out a series of conduct requirements persons appointed to police service boards in Ontario.

The sections in the Code of Conduct applicable to the complaint include:

3. (1) A member of a police service board shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines or is likely to undermine the public's trust in the police service board or the police service maintained by the board; and

3. (2) A member of a police service board shall not be subject to discipline for a contravention of subsection (1) if, on a balance of probabilities, their conduct was in the good faith performance of their duties as a board member.

SUMMARY OF THE INVESTIGATION CONDUCTED

As part of the investigation process, interviews were conducted with the complainant and the subject TPSB member, Ann Morgan. Additionally, open-source material relating to the complaint was gathered and reviewed, along with material provided by the subject TPSB member during their interview.

The events of the April 30, 2024 TPSB meeting were verified by viewing the video posted on YouTube by the TPSB. Both the complainant and the subject TPSB member, Ann Morgan, confirmed that the recording accurately represented the meeting.

Investigative Exhibits: Collected and Reviewed

Toronto Police Service Board By-Laws

The relevant Toronto Police Service Board (TPSB) by-laws, rules, and procedures governing community deputations were reviewed. They establish the authority for any member of the public to make a deputation at a public meeting, provided the topic relates to an agenda item and the request is submitted in advance. The by-laws also outline key procedural elements, including time limits for presentations, the requirement for respectful language, and the process for submitting supporting materials. This framework is designed to ensure meaningful community participation in the decision-making process while upholding order and decorum during meetings.

Toronto Police Service Board Meetings-YouTube

Video recordings of the TPSB meetings are made available to the public on the TPSB YouTube channel. The meeting in question, held on April 30, 2024, was reviewed in detail.

Complainant Interview

The complainant attended the April 30, 2024 TPSB meeting to deliver a deputation related to events surrounding the Israel/Gaza conflict and ongoing protests in Toronto. They viewed the agenda item titled *Community Safety and Policing Act Compliance Update* as an opportunity to participate in the democratic process and share their concerns as an engaged resident.

Specifically, they intended to speak about their personal experience at a protest on Parliament Street on March 30, 2024, which they encountered while out walking. They described feeling uneasy and observed that other pedestrians also appeared uncomfortable. The complainant believed their perspective was relevant to the topic of community safety and could provide valuable context.

They understood the importance of staying on topic during deputations and believed they had done so. They were prepared to address compliance issues if asked during the Q&A portion of the meeting. However, they stated that the Chair, Ann Morgan, who was attending via Zoom, repeatedly interrupted them, insisting they stay on topic. The complainant found the interruptions unclear and overwhelming, ultimately leading them to abandon their deputation. They could not recall the Chair's exact words but noted the meeting was recorded.

The complainant confirmed they had no prior interaction with the Chair and that this was their first time giving a deputation. They recalled possibly receiving an auto-generated email with general guidelines, such as the five-minute time limit and the requirement to stay on topic but did not remember receiving specific instructions. They were unsure whether they had submitted a written version of their deputation beforehand but confirmed they had prepared one and assumed it was sent for record-keeping.

They admitted to having limited knowledge of TPSB by-laws at the time, knowing only the basic rules. Since the meeting, they have become more familiar with the procedures related to deputations. They expressed disappointment and a sense of disenfranchisement, feeling that the TPSB demonstrated a dismissive attitude toward civilian input.

They noted that other speakers were also interrupted or rushed, and one individual's remarks were taken out of context and shared on social media. While the complainant remained composed, they were disturbed by the treatment of the next speaker, who became visibly flustered and was misrepresented online.

The complainant emphasized the importance of maintaining the integrity of civilian deputations and ensuring that the process is respectful, inclusive, and welcoming to diverse perspectives. They acknowledged the need to prevent abuse of the process but felt that their experience discouraged future civic participation. They expressed hope that their complaint would prompt the TPSB to reflect on its approach to public engagement and implement improvements, including clearer guidelines on when interruptions are appropriate.

Although offered the opportunity to clarify their submission, the complainant declined, stating they had said all they needed to. Instead, they expressed hope that the TPSB has internal mechanisms for reviewing such incidents and suggested that a regular review process could help improve how meetings are conducted. They believed that even small changes resulting from their complaint would be a meaningful outcome. The complainant verified that all information provided was truthful and signed an acknowledgment to that effect. They declined to name additional witnesses or provide further information.

Subject Police Service Board Member Interview

An interview was conducted with the Subject, Chair Ann Morgan.

Ann Morgan began by outlining her responsibilities, which she indicated have expanded significantly under the CSPA. In addition to presiding over meetings and implementing board policies, she is involved in strategic planning, the hiring and evaluation of senior police leadership, and collective bargaining. She emphasized the evolving nature of the Chair's role and the increasing complexity of board operations.

She described her extensive training prior to and during her tenure, including nearly six months of Ministry-led instruction and onboarding across various departments. She noted that training is ongoing and often includes sessions with external experts and affiliated ministries. Drawing on her background in education and law, she considers herself a lifelong learner and actively assesses the board's educational needs.

Ann Morgan explained that meeting agendas are typically distributed 10 days in advance, though last-minute changes - often due to late submissions - remain a challenge. Speakers can register to speak up until noon the day before a meeting, and while the process is flexible, the board expects topics to align with the agenda and fall within its jurisdiction. She acknowledged that some confusion can arise, but the board generally takes a generous and inclusive approach.

Reflecting on the April 30, 2024, meeting, Ann Morgan described it as unusually tense and lengthy, with over 30 speakers. She acknowledged that the agenda title may not have clearly conveyed the meeting's purpose and that the omission of a highly anticipated topic contributed to public frustration. She noted that the complainant, a frequent participant and well-spoken community activist, appeared visibly upset during the meeting. While she could not recall the exact moment she may have interrupted the complainant, she believed it was due to remarks straying from the agenda. She

emphasized that she always aims to be respectful, even when firm moderation is required.

Ann Morgan recalled another attendee who became emotional while speaking about safety concerns in their neighborhood. Like the complainant, the other speaker was sincere and frustrated by perceived criticism of the police. She explained that the concerns raised at the meeting were twofold: addressing a petition and expressing dissatisfaction with the level of support for police officers.

She had not reviewed the full 12-hour recording of the meeting [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] but emphasized the importance of balancing structure and flexibility - especially during emotionally charged or lengthy sessions. She noted that while she allows some deviation from the agenda in most meetings, stricter enforcement is sometimes necessary to maintain order and productivity.

Ann Morgan expressed confidence in the board's current deputation protocols, which were revised during her tenure to better reflect fairness and inclusivity. She sees no need for further changes, though she acknowledged that different Chairs may approach the role differently. She values being generous with time when appropriate and believes the process should remain adaptable, especially under the evolving framework of the CSPA.

She also reflected on the challenges of managing public expectations and navigating conflicts of interest. She expressed a desire for clearer legislative guidance and noted that the board is still transitioning from past practices that lacked accountability. She praised the current Chief for being collaborative and transparent and reaffirmed her commitment to oversight and continuous improvement.

Ann Morgan emphasized that she is not motivated by political ambition but by a desire to serve with integrity. She expressed frustration with individuals who misuse the process for personal or political gain and voiced greater respect for those who speak sincerely. She acknowledged the emotional toll of the role but remains committed to conducting meetings with fairness, compassion, and professionalism.

Additional Material Collected and Reviewed

Website - Toronto Police Service Board Meetings

An open-source search revealed a dedicated section on the TPSB website that provides comprehensive information on making a deputation. This section offers various topics for further exploration, including current and past meetings, the meeting schedule, making a deputation, an overview of deputation rules, the procedural by-law, and accommodation requests. Each topic can be clicked on to access more detailed information.

Source: Toronto Police Services Board. (2024, July 8) *Meetings*. Retrieved from <https://www.tpsb.ca/meetings>

Website - Toronto Police Service Board - Making a Deputation

Upon selecting the “Making a Deputation” option, detailed information regarding the rules and process for making a deputation is provided. The TPSB allows any member of the public to make a deputation at its public meetings. To do so, the subject must relate to the agenda item, and the request must be submitted by noon on the business day before the meeting. Requests are made to the board administrator via a form, detailing the matter and including any materials to be presented. Deputations are limited to five minutes, and the Chair may curtail them for improper conduct. Presentations will be live streamed/videotaped as part of the meeting.

Source: Toronto Police Services Board. (2024, July 8) *Making a deputation*. Retrieved from <https://www.tpsb.ca/meetings/making-a-deputation>

Website - Toronto Police Service Board-Overview of Rules for Deputations

Selecting the “Overview of Rules for Deputations” option provides detailed information regarding the guidelines for deputations. It stipulates that the TPSB is committed to meaningful public engagement in consultation, encouraging diverse input and feedback. It further notes that deputations at the board meetings are considered valuable for receiving public input. To ensure meetings are efficient and respectful, the board has established rules in its procedural by-law. Deputations are limited to five minutes, must focus on the agenda item, and avoid comments about individual police officers or board staff. Respectful language is required, and the Chair may conclude deputations if the rules are violated. Complaints about conduct can be directed to appropriate bodies.

Contact information for these bodies is included. Requests to make deputations must be submitted in writing at least 10 business days prior to the meeting.

Source: Toronto Police Services Board. (2024, July 8) *Overview of bylaws for deputations*. <https://www.tpsb.ca/meetings/overview-of-by-laws-for-deputations>

Website - Toronto Police Service Board- Procedural By-Law

By selecting the “Procedural By-Law” option information is provided as to the by-law pertaining to the board and its committees. In particular, TPSB By-Law Number 161 governs the proceedings of the board and its committees. It is established under the *Police Services Act*, which mandates that each municipality with a police force must have a police services board. The by-law sets out rules for conducting meetings, emphasizing principles of accessibility, responsiveness, accountability, fairness, respect, and full debate. It also ensures flexibility in responding to changing circumstances during meetings. The procedural rules are designed to reflect these principles consistently. A link is also included to the full by-law.

It should be noted that the page references the Police Services Act, which has since been replaced by the Community Safety and Policing Act.

Source: Toronto Police Services Board. (2024, July 8) *Procedural by-law*. <https://www.tpsb.ca/meetings/procedural-by-law>

Website - Toronto Police Service Board-April 30, 2024 Agenda

The TPSB website features a section dedicated to meeting agendas for public review. By selecting the April 30, 2024, public agenda, users can access the full agenda. Additionally, there is an option to view individual agenda items, which provides more detailed information on each topic.

Selecting “Community Safety and Policing Act-Compliance Update” opens a public report. This section outlines the steps taken to ensure the Toronto Police Service (TPS) complies with the new *Community Safety and Policing Act*, 2019, which came into force on April 1, 2024. The update includes:

1. **Compliance Measures:** the chief of police is directed to ensure TPS complies with all requirements of the Act and its regulations, and to report any delays in achieving compliance.

2. **Policy Revisions:** the board office has been working on revising existing board policies and developing new ones to align with the Act. This includes changes to the board's name and crest.
3. **Procedural By-law Changes:** the procedural by-law has been updated to improve the handling of board meetings and ensure compliance with the Act. Proposed revisions clarify the process for introducing motions and ensuring board members have sufficient time to review them.
4. **Notice of Revisions:** the report provides notice of the proposed amendments to the procedural by-law, as required by the by-law itself.

The update emphasizes the ongoing efforts to modernize the framework for policing and oversight in Ontario, ensuring that TPS operations are in line with the new legislative requirements.

Source: Toronto Police Services Board. (2024, July 8) *April 30, 2024 – Revised Public Agenda*. <https://www.tpsb.ca/meetings/>

Email correspondence between the Board and the Complainant

The complainant emailed the TPSB to register to present at the April 30, 2024 board meeting. The TPSB provided a copy of this correspondence.

The email chain was initiated by the complainant on April 27, 2024, in which they contacted TPSB administrator, Diana Achim, to register to speak in person on agenda item number three, "Community Safety and Policing Act-Compliance Update". The board's general mailbox responded acknowledging receipt of the registration. The response highlighted the board's procedural by-law, which requires that deputations address the same subject matter as the agenda item. Speakers were reminded to ensure their comments relate to the report listed on the agenda, with the caution that unrelated deputations would not proceed. The email was signed by Board Administrator Diana Achim.

Script of Warnings to be issued to Speakers During Board Meetings

In her interview, Ann Morgan stated that she was provided with a script to follow when addressing violations of deputation rules. Upon request, this document was shared by TPSB Administrator Diana Achim. The script outlines a step-by-step protocol for issuing warnings to speakers who breach procedural by-laws.

According to the script, if a speaker violates the rules, they are first informed of the specific provision breached and asked to cease the prohibited behavior. If the conduct

continues, they are warned that their deputation may be terminated and instructed to withdraw. Continued non-compliance results in the deputation being formally concluded, and the individual is asked to return to their seat. If improper conduct persists, the individual may be removed from the meeting under the *Trespass to Property Act*. Should they refuse to leave, the meeting may be recessed or adjourned. The procedural by-law defines improper conduct and sets out general expectations for public behavior during meetings. Speakers are prohibited from:

- Speaking disrespectfully about any person
- Using offensive language
- Discussing topics unrelated to the agenda
- Commenting on the conduct of police officers or making complaints against members of the Toronto Police Service or Board
- Disobeying procedural rules or the Chair's rulings

YouTube recording of April 30, 2024 Toronto Police Service Board Meeting

A video recording of the April 30, 2024, TPSB meeting in its totality was located through an open-source online search. The TPSB maintains a YouTube channel in which all recordings of board meetings are housed and available to the public.

The video was viewed in its entirety, with particular attention given to the sections on deputations, especially that of the complainant.

Prior to deputations, the video depicts TPSB Executive Director Dubi Kanegisser providing the following remarks:

The board has processes in place to ensure that it functions as an effective governance body. These processes, which include a Procedural By-law, have been established to ensure board meetings are efficient and effective, and to allow for the contribution of submissions by members of the public, in a respectful and orderly manner.

As part of its governance responsibilities, the board views its role as facilitating valuable and meaningful input and has always encouraged the regular inclusion of deputations and submissions by members of the public. board meetings, however, are not venues for dialogue; rather they provide an opportunity, in public, for community input and board deliberation on the matters it is considering.

As set out in the Procedural By-law, a deputant will not be permitted to speak disrespectfully of any person, use offensive words or language, speak on any subject not on the agenda, or any other than the subject for which they have received approval, or otherwise disobey the rules of procedure.

A number of requests for deputation for today's meeting were denied by the Chair because they did not meet these requirements.

I would like to remind the members of the public who have signed up to give deputations, that if your deputation speaks to a matter other than the subject of the agenda item for which you are speaking, you will be considered in violation of our rules of procedure.

If your deputation violates our rules of procedure, or you are otherwise disruptive, you will be advised.

Subsequent violations may result in a deputation being ruled to be concluded, an individual being expelled from the meeting, the meeting being recessed, and, in extreme cases, an individual being charged under the Trespass to Property Act.

Following Executive Director Kanengisser's remarks, speakers were then invited to present their deputations.

After agenda item #3, titled "Community Safety and Policing Act-Compliance Update" was introduced, one speaker attempted to address public protests and emphasized the importance of board members remaining neutral. Ann Morgan interrupted, informing the speaker that his comments were not relevant to the agenda item, which she explained pertained to the report on the enhanced duties of the board and board members under the CSPA. The speaker concluded by stating, "We have members of this board who supported people and supported violent acts, and I'll leave it at that."

The complainant is then introduced as a speaker on Item #3, titled "*Community Safety and Policing Act – Compliance Update*," and speaks for approximately 3 minutes and 23 seconds.

In the video clip, the complainant identified themselves as a resident of Ward 13 and reported witnessing a pro-Palestinian march on Parliament Street during their daily walk on Saturday, March 30, 2024. Observing from the sidelines, they noted that the crowd converged at Dundas Street, obstructing access and posing safety concerns due to individuals precariously hanging off pickup trucks.

As the complainant began discussing the protest, Ann Morgan interrupted to remind them to remain focused on the agenda item concerning board compliance. Despite multiple interruptions and warnings, the complainant continued to speak about the protest and voiced disapproval of board members, specifically Councillors Amber Morley and Lily Cheng, for supporting a related petition. Ann Morgan attempted to redirect the complainant to a more appropriate venue for his concerns, but the complainant accused her of obfuscation, insisted their comments were relevant, and abruptly left the podium after thanking her for her time.

Throughout the exchange, Ann Morgan maintained a neutral and professional tone in both her language and demeanor.

Source: TPSB Toronto. (2024, April 30). *Toronto Police Services Board meeting – April 30, 2024* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BPhGc7FJP3o>

INVESTIGATION FINDINGS

I make the following findings, relying on the material and information collected during the investigation and now contained in this report:

- 1. On April 27, 2024, the complainant registered to present a deputation at the April 30, 2024, TPSB meeting in relation to Agenda Item #3, Community Safety and Policing Act - Compliance Update.**
 - a. According to the April 30, 2024, meeting agenda publicly available on the TPSB website Item 3 of the agenda, “Community Safety and Policing Act - Compliance Update” pertains to an update on the board’s compliance with the *Community Safety and Policing Act*, 2019. It includes steps taken to ensure the Toronto Police Service adheres to the new legislative requirements that came into force on April 1, 2024.
 - b. The complainant was interviewed by IOP investigators on July 16, 2024. During the interview the complainant indicated they attended the TPSB meeting intending to present a deputation regarding events in the city related to the Israel/Gaza conflict and ongoing protests. The complainant explained this topic was relevant to community safety but acknowledged that they might have

overlooked addressing the compliance aspect.

- c. During the complainant's deputation when warned to remain on topic by Chair Ann Morgan they argue that their deputation is on topic and they are heard stating, "this is about board member conduct".

2. The complainant's deputation addressed board member conduct, a topic identified as prohibited for deputations.

- a. The Overview of Rules of Deputation on the TPSB website clearly states that comments regarding the TPSB Board Office staff are prohibited.
- b. In a YouTube video clip of the April 30, 2024, TPSB meeting, the complainant described witnessing a pro-Palestinian march on Parliament Street on March 30, 2024. During their deputation, they began discussing the protest and expressed concern over the support shown by board members, including Councillors Amber Morley and Lily Cheng, for a petition they interpreted as endorsing violent actions.
- c. In the course of the complainant's deputation when warned to remain on topic by Chair Ann Morgan they argue that their deputation is on topic and they are heard stating, "this is about board member conduct."

3. The complainant was provided with multiple exposures to the TPSB rules governing presenting deputations.

- a. On April 29, 2024, an email was sent from the TPSB general mailbox to the complainant, acknowledging receipt of their registration to speak at the April 30, 2024, TPSB meeting. The email included a caution, stating that according to board by-law deputations must address the same subject matter as the agenda item. The complainant was encouraged to ensure their deputation related to the report listed on the agenda. It was noted that if the deputation did not pertain to listed items, it would not proceed.
- b. The TPSB website includes a page dedicated to information pertaining to TPSB meetings including information specific to deputations. It includes the following information:
 - i. Information about the rules and process of making a deputation. The TPSB allows members of the public to make a deputation in it's public

meetings, provided the subject relates to an agenda item and the request is submitted by noon on the business day before the meeting.

- ii. Information on TPSB's commitment to public engagement in the procedural by-law governing deputations. Deputations are limited to five minutes, must focus on the agenda item, use respectful language, and avoid comments about individual police officers or board staff.
 - iii. Information on the TPSB By-Law Number 161, which governs the proceedings of the board and its committees, emphasizing principles of accessibility, responsiveness, accountability, fairness, respect, and full debate. The page references the Police Services Act, now replaced by the Community Safety and Policing Act, and includes a link to the full by-law.
- c. During the complainant's interview with IoP investigators they verbalized their understanding of the rules pertaining to presenting deputations which included remaining on topic with the selected agenda item. The complainant also acknowledged receiving an email from the TPSB with general guidelines governing presenting deputations.
- d. The complainant recalled during the interview with IoP investigators that the Chair, Ann Morgan, may have mentioned staying on topic with selected agenda items at the April 30, 2024, board meeting they attended.
- e. Prior to deputations being heard, Executive Director Dubi Kanengisser reviewed the rules governing presenting deputations according to TPSB by-law 161. This review included specific examples of violations, types of cautions that could be issued and actions that would be taken if violations persisted.
- f. Prior to the complainant's deputation, another individual attempted to speak under Agenda Item #3, "Community Safety and Policing Act – Compliance Update," raising concerns about recent protests and the perceived support of violent individuals by certain board members. Chair Ann Morgan interrupted the speaker, advising that the comments were not relevant to the agenda item and provided clarification on its intended scope. During the complainant's interview with IoP investigators, they referenced witnessing Ann Morgan interrupt other speakers during the course of their presentations.

- g. During the complainant's deputation, Chair Ann Morgan interrupted multiple times, issuing several warnings that the deputation was off-topic. She also clarified the agenda item to highlight the discrepancies.

4. Ann Morgan's response to the complainant during the April 30, 2024, TPSB meeting was consistent with TPSB by-laws and established procedures.

- a. The TPSB website section titled, "Overview of Rules for Deputations" outlines the rules from the board's procedural by-law including a five-minute time limit, the requirement to stay on topic, prohibitions against comments on the conduct of police officers or board staff, and the necessity to be respectful. It also informs of the Chair's right to interrupt deputations to provide warnings of violations and may also conclude a deputation if these rules are violated.
 - b. The TPSB script developed for the purpose of addressing deputation violations outlines the following steps to be taken:
 - i. Advise the deputant of the violated rule and ask them to stop.
 - ii. Ann Morgan's initial interruption of the complainant advises them that they are not speaking on a relevant item. She specifically states, "I'm asking you that as per board report that has been made available to the public to speak only specifically on the compliance the board is responsible for." The complainant replies, "I understand." Ann Morgan further specifies, "and not on the protests."
1. Warn the deputant that continued violation will conclude their deputation.
- i. The complainant continues to speak about two TPSB members signing a petition that they perceive as criticizing Toronto Police Service members. Ann Morgan issues another warning and advises the complainant that if they have a complaint they can be directed to the appropriate entity after the meeting.
 - ii. At complainant's persistence to continue discussing the topic that has been identified as prohibited, Ann Morgan attempts to interrupt them and advise this is a matter the board does not have jurisdiction over.

2. Rule the deputation concluded if the violations persist.
 - i. When the complainant continues to discuss a prohibited topic despite multiple warnings, Ann Morgan directs that the clock be stopped on the deputation effectively concluding it.

FINDINGS REPORT

Toronto Police Service Board Member:
Ann Morgan

**Section 106(1) Board Member
Conduct Investigation**
(INV-24-5)

Submitted to:
Ryan Teschner
Inspector General of Policing of
Ontario

June 30, 2025

Table of Contents

ABOUT THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICING AND THE INSPECTORATE OF POLICING	3
INTRODUCTION.....	4
OVERVIEW OF INVESTIGATION	4
The Complaint.....	4
The Subject Police Service Board Member	5
Applicable Legislative and Regulatory Provisions	5
SUMMARY OF THE INVESTIGATION CONDUCTED	6
Investigative Exhibits: Collected and Reviewed	6
Complainant Interview	9
Subject Police Service Board Member Interview	10
Additional Material Collected and Reviewed.....	11
INVESTIGATION FINDINGS	15

ABOUT THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICING AND THE INSPECTORATE OF POLICING

The Inspector General of Policing drives improved performance and accountability in policing and police governance by overseeing the delivery of adequate and effective policing across Ontario. The Inspector General ensures compliance with the province's policing legislation and standards, and has the authority to issue progressive, risk-based and binding directions and measures to protect public safety. Ontario's Community Safety and Policing Act embeds protections to ensure the Inspector General's legal role is delivered arm's-length of government.

The Inspector General of Policing leads the Inspectorate of Policing (IoP). The IoP provides operational support to inspect, investigate, monitor, and advise Ontario's police services, boards and special constable employers. By leveraging independent research and data intelligence, the IoP promotes leading practices and identifies areas for improvement, ensuring that high-quality policing and police governance is delivered to make everyone in Ontario safer.

In March 2023, Ryan Teschner was appointed as Ontario's first Inspector General of Policing with duties and authorities under the Community Safety and Policing Act. Mr. Teschner is a recognized expert in public administration, policing and police governance.

For more information about the Inspector General of Policing or the IoP, please visit www.iopontario.ca.

INTRODUCTION

This is a report to the Inspector General of Policing by an Inspector appointed by the Inspector General, who has completed an investigation under Part VII of the [Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019](#) (CSPA).

OVERVIEW OF INVESTIGATION

The Complaint

Two written complaints were received by the Inspector General of Policing alleging that Toronto Police Service Board (TPSB) member Ann Morgan contravened the Code of Conduct for Police Service Board Members during a police service board meeting by improperly handling two deputations presented by members of the public. This report relates to one of these complaints, and Findings Report INV-24-4 relates to the other.

The complaint addressed in this report alleged that TPSB member, Ann Morgan served as moderator during a TPSB meeting. One of her responsibilities in this role is to listen to deputations from members of the public. On April 30, 2024, while the complainant was delivering their deputation, Ann Morgan interrupted them on multiple occasions. The complainant stated that, on April 30, 2024, they participated in a TPSB deputation to address a sensitive issue affecting their community. During their remarks, they were repeatedly interrupted by Chair Ann Morgan, which they felt prevented them from fully articulating their message. [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24]

The Subject Police Service Board Member

Name of Police Service Board: Toronto Police Service Board

Subject Board Member: Ann Morgan

Length of Service (Term): Appointed March 27, 2021 to March 27, 2024. Reappointed effective April 1, 2024, to April 1, 2026

Previous Terms on Police Service Board: None

Specific Role Held on Police Service Board: Board Chair

Previous Substantiated Conduct: None

Appointing Authority: Solicitor General

Applicable Legislative and Regulatory Provisions

[Section 35\(6\)](#) of the CSPA provides that every member of a police service board shall comply with the prescribed Code of Conduct.

[Ontario Regulation 408/23: Code of Conduct for Police Service Board Members](#) was reviewed having regard to the allegations made in the complaint and the following sections were deemed to be relevant:

3. (1) A member of a police service board shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines or is likely to undermine the public's trust in the police service board or the police service maintained by the board;

*3. (2) A member of a police service board shall not be subject to discipline for a contravention of subsection (1) if, on a balance of probabilities, their conduct was in the good faith performance of their duties as a board member;
and*

4. A member of a police service board shall comply with the Act and the regulations made under it.

SUMMARY OF THE INVESTIGATION CONDUCTED

As part of the investigation process, interviews were conducted with the complainant and the subject TPSB member, Ann Morgan. Additionally, open-source material forming the basis of the complaint was gathered and reviewed, along with material provided by the subject TPSB member during their interview.

The events of the April 30, 2024, TPSB meeting were verified by viewing the video posted on YouTube by the TPSB. Both the complainant and the TPSB member, Ann Morgan, confirmed that the recording accurately represented the meeting, including the complainant's deputation and all other presentations made on that date.

Investigative Exhibits: Collected and Reviewed

Toronto Police Service By-Laws

An open-source review was conducted to examine all relevant Toronto Police Service Board (TPSB) by-laws, rules, and procedures governing community deputations. These documents affirm that any member of the public may make a deputation at a public meeting, provided the topic relates to an agenda item and the request is submitted in advance. The by-laws also outline key procedural elements, including time limits for presentations, the requirement for respectful language, and the process for submitting supporting materials. This framework is designed to ensure meaningful community participation in the decision-making process while upholding order and decorum during meetings.

YouTube recording of April 30, 2024 Toronto Police Service Board Meeting

A video recording of the April 30, 2024, TPSB meeting in its totality was located online. The TPSB maintains a YouTube channel in which all recordings of board meetings are housed and available to the public.

The video was viewed in its entirety, with particular attention given to the sections on deputations, especially that of the complainant.

Prior to deputations, the video depicts TPSB Executive Director Dubi Kanegisser providing the following remarks:

“The board has processes in place to ensure that it functions as an effective governance body. These processes, which include a Procedural By-law, have been established to ensure board meetings are efficient and effective, and to allow for the contribution of submissions by members of the public, in a respectful and orderly manner.

As part of its governance responsibilities, the board views its role as facilitating valuable and meaningful input and has always encouraged the regular inclusion of deputations and submissions by members of the public. Board meetings, however, are not venues for dialogue; rather they provide an opportunity, in public, for community input and board deliberation on the matters it is considering.

As set out in the Procedural By-law, a deputant will not be permitted to speak disrespectfully of any person, use offensive words or language, speak on any subject not on the agenda, or any other than the subject for which they have received approval, or otherwise disobey the rules of procedure.

A number of requests for deputation for today’s meeting were denied by the Chair because they did not meet these requirements.

I would like to remind the members of the public who have signed up to give deputations, that if your deputation speaks to a matter other than the subject of the agenda item for which you are speaking, you will be considered in violation of our rules of procedure.

If your deputation violates our rules of procedure, or you are otherwise disruptive, you will be advised.

Subsequent violations may result in a deputation being ruled to be concluded, an individual being expelled from the meeting, the meeting being recessed, and, in extreme cases, an individual being charged under the Trespass to Property Act.”

Following Executive Director Kanengisser’s remarks speakers were then invited to present their deputations.

After agenda item #3, titled “Community Safety and Policing Act-Compliance Update” was introduced, one speaker attempted to address public protests and emphasized the importance of board members remaining neutral. Ann Morgan interrupted, informing the speaker that his comments were not relevant to the agenda item, which she explained pertained to the report on the enhanced duties of the board and board members under

the CSPA. The speaker concluded by stating, *“We have members of this board who supported people and supported violent acts, and I’ll leave it at that.”*

Another speaker is then introduced as a speaker on Item #3, titled *“Community Safety and Policing Act – Compliance Update,”* and speaks for approximately 3 minutes and 23 seconds.

Another speaker spoke raising concerns about a recent protest and criticizing board members, specifically Councillors Amber Morley and Lily Cheng, for supporting a related petition. Despite repeated interruptions from Ann Morgan for straying off topic, the speaker continued speaking before leaving the podium following a tense exchange. The complainant was then introduced as also speaking under agenda item #3 titled *“Community Safety and Policing Act – Compliance Update.”*

During the deputation on Item #3, the complainant expressed support for the sentiments shared by previous speakers and criticized a letter signed by some members of the board, describing it as *“disgusting.”* The complainant thanked the Toronto Police Service members for their work and acknowledged the challenges they face, stating that public undermining of their efforts was *“gross.”* The complainant voiced concern about the city’s perceived decline, attributing it to the board being *“hamstrung at every turn.”* When attempting to share a personal observation about community members increasingly seeking firearms licenses in response to ongoing protests, Ann Morgan attempted to interrupt, asking the speaker to remain on topic. Despite this, the complainant raised their voice and continued, stating that *“everyone in my community is getting armed,”* which they believed should be alarming. Ann Morgan instructed to “stop the clock” and again asked the speaker to refrain from discussing unrelated topics. The complainant continued briefly, reiterating support for previous speakers before Ann Morgan concluded the exchange, thanking them but indicating the discussion was no longer appropriate at that time.

Throughout the exchange, Ann Morgan maintained a neutral and professional tone in both her language and demeanor.

Source: TPSB Toronto. (2024, April 30). *Toronto Police Services Board meeting – April 30, 2024* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BPhGc7FJP3o>

Complainant Interview

The complainant, a Toronto resident and self-identified concerned citizen, attended a TPSB meeting in late April 2024 to speak on what they believed was a critical community safety issue. As a first-time participant with no prior experience in public forums or knowledge of TPSB by-laws, they approached the deputation in good faith, motivated by concerns over rising violent crime and what they perceived as insufficient police response to certain public protests.

The complainant stated that they did not receive specific or personalized instructions for their deputation beyond a general email outlining the topic and time limit. They acknowledged the possibility of overlooking details during registration and admitted to not reading all materials thoroughly, assuming they understood the purpose of the meeting. They believed that registering simply required providing their name and were unsure if they had been asked to submit the content of their remarks in advance.

During their deputation, the complainant began discussing recent incidents of crime in areas they frequent and expressed concern about public safety. They interpreted the agenda item on “compliance” as referring to the police’s responsibility to maintain safety and order. However, they were repeatedly interrupted by Chair Ann Morgan and advised that their comments were off topic. These interruptions left them flustered and confused about the scope of the agenda item, ultimately preventing them from fully articulating their message.

They emphasized that their remarks were not related to pro-Palestinian protests, but rather focused on the broader issue of public safety. They clarified that their argument was anti-gun, highlighting that when individuals feel compelled to resort to personal self-defence, it reflects a breakdown in institutional trust. Their intention was to underscore the importance of strong, reliable civic institutions—not to incite fear or promote firearms.

[redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24]

They stressed that their complaint was not intended to cause trouble or seek punishment, but to promote understanding and accountability. They acknowledged that everyone can have difficult days and made clear they were not questioning the Chair’s intentions. However, they felt that the handling of their deputation—particularly the repeated interruptions—undermined their ability to communicate effectively [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24]

In hindsight, the complainant regretted not preparing a written statement, noting that improvising under pressure made them more vulnerable to misinterpretation. They reflected on how Toronto once felt like a safer city, recalling a time when they didn't feel the need to lock their doors. They concluded by emphasizing the importance of allowing speakers the space to speak fully and coherently [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24]

Subject Police Service Board Member Interview

An interview was conducted with the TPSB Chair, Ann Morgan.

Ann Morgan began by outlining her responsibilities, which she indicated have expanded significantly under the CSPA. In addition to presiding over meetings and implementing board policies, she is involved in strategic planning, the hiring and evaluation of senior police leadership, and collective bargaining. She emphasized the evolving nature of the Chair's role and the increasing complexity of board operations.

She described her extensive training prior to and during her tenure, including nearly six months of Ministry-led instruction and onboarding across various departments. She noted that training is ongoing and often includes sessions with external experts and affiliated ministries. Drawing on her background in education and law, she considers herself a lifelong learner and actively assesses the board's educational needs.

Ann Morgan explained that meeting agendas are typically distributed 10 days in advance, though last-minute changes—often due to late submissions—remain a challenge. Speakers can register to speak up until noon the day before a meeting, and while the process is flexible, the board expects topics to align with the agenda and fall within its jurisdiction. She acknowledged that some confusion can arise, but the board generally takes a generous and inclusive approach.

Reflecting on the April 30, 2024, meeting, Ann Morgan described it as unusually tense and lengthy, with over 30 speakers. She acknowledged that the agenda title may not have clearly conveyed the meeting's purpose and that the omission of a highly anticipated topic contributed to public frustration. While she could not recall the exact moment she may have interrupted the complainant, she believed it was due to remarks straying from the agenda. She emphasized that she always aims to be respectful, even when firm moderation is required.

She acknowledged that she had not reviewed the full 12-hour recording of the meeting [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] but emphasized the importance of balancing structure and flexibility—especially during emotionally charged or lengthy sessions. She

noted that while she allows some deviation from the agenda in most meetings, stricter enforcement is sometimes necessary to maintain order and productivity.

Ann Morgan expressed confidence in the board's current deputation protocols, which were revised during her tenure to better reflect fairness and inclusivity. She sees no need for further changes, though she acknowledged that different Chairs may approach the role differently. She values being generous with time when appropriate and believes the process should remain adaptable, especially under the evolving framework of the CSPA.

She also reflected on the challenges of managing public expectations and navigating conflicts of interest. She expressed a desire for clearer legislative guidance and noted that the board is still transitioning from past practices that lacked accountability. She praised the current Chief for being collaborative and transparent and reaffirmed her commitment to oversight and continuous improvement.

Ann Morgan emphasized that she is not motivated by political ambition but by a desire to serve with integrity. She expressed frustration with individuals who misuse the process for personal or political gain and voiced greater respect for those who speak sincerely. She acknowledged the emotional toll of the role but remains committed to conducting meetings with fairness, compassion, and professionalism.

Additional Material Collected and Reviewed

Online- Toronto Police Service website -Toronto Police Service Board Meetings

An online search revealed a dedicated section on the TPSB website that provides comprehensive information on making a deputation. This section offers various topics including current and past meetings, the meeting schedule, making a deputation, an overview of deputation rules, the procedural by-law, and accommodation requests. Each topic can be clicked on to access more detailed information.

Source: Toronto Police Services Board. (2024, July 8) *Meetings*. Retrieved from <https://www.tpsb.ca/meetings>

Online- Toronto Police Service website- Toronto Police Service Board-Making a Deputation

Upon selecting the “Making a Deputation” option, detailed information regarding the rules and process for making a deputation is provided. The TPSB allows any member of the public to make a deputation at its public meetings. To do so, the subject must relate to the agenda item, and the request must be submitted by noon on the business day before the meeting. Requests are made to the board administrator via a form, detailing the matter and including any materials to be presented. Deputations are limited to five minutes, and the Chair may curtail them for improper conduct. Presentations will be live streamed/videotaped as part of the meeting.

Source: Toronto Police Services Board. (2024, July 8) *Making a deputation*. Retrieved from <https://www.tpsb.ca/meetings/making-a-deputation>

Online- Toronto Police Service website- Toronto Police Service Board-Overview of Rules for Deputations

Selecting the “Overview of Rules for Deputations” option provides detailed information regarding the guidelines for deputations. It stipulates that the TPSB is committed to meaningful public engagement in consultation, encouraging diverse input and feedback. It further notes that deputations at the board meetings are considered valuable for receiving public input. To ensure meetings are efficient and respectful, the board has established rules in its procedural by-law. Deputations are limited to five minutes, must focus on the agenda item, and avoid comments about individual police officers or board staff. Respectful language is required, and the Chair may conclude deputations if the rules are violated. Complaints about conduct can be directed to appropriate bodies. Requests to make deputations must be submitted in writing at least 10 business days prior to the meeting.

Source: Toronto Police Services Board. (2024, July 8) *Overview of bylaws for deputations*. <https://www.tpsb.ca/meetings/overview-of-by-laws-for-deputations>

Online- Toronto Police Service website- Toronto Police Service Board- Procedural By-Law

By selecting the “Procedural By-Law” option, information is provided as to the by-law pertaining to the board and its committees. In particular, TPSB By-Law Number 161 governs the proceedings of the board and its committees. It is established under the *Police Services Act*, which mandates that each municipality with a police force must have a police services board. The by-law sets out rules for conducting meetings, emphasizing principles of accessibility, responsiveness, accountability, fairness, respect, and full debate. It also ensures flexibility in responding to changing circumstances during meetings. The procedural rules are designed to reflect these principles consistently. A link is also included to the full by-law.

It should be noted that the page references the Police Services Act but this act has since been replaced by the Community Safety and Policing Act.

Source: Toronto Police Services Board. (2024, July 8) *Procedural by-law*. <https://www.tpsb.ca/meetings/procedural-by-law>

Online- Toronto Police Service website- Toronto Police Service Board-April 30, 2024 Agenda

The TPSB website features a section dedicated to meeting agendas for public review. By selecting the April 30, 2024, public agenda, users can access the full agenda. Additionally, there is an option to view individual agenda items, which provides more detailed information on each topic.

Selecting “Community Safety and Policing Act-Compliance Update” opens a public report. This section outlines the steps taken to ensure the Toronto Police Service (TPS) complies with the new *Community Safety and Policing Act*, 2019, which came into force on April 1, 2024. The update includes:

1. **Compliance Measures:** the chief of police is directed to ensure TPS complies with all requirements of the Act and its regulations, and to report any delays in achieving compliance.
2. **Policy Revisions:** the board office has been working on revising existing board policies and developing new ones to align with the Act. This includes changes to the board’s name and crest.

3. **Procedural By-law Changes:** the procedural by-law has been updated to improve the handling of board meetings and ensure compliance with the Act. Proposed revisions clarify the process for introducing motions and ensuring board members have sufficient time to review them.
4. **Notice of Revisions:** the report provides notice of the proposed amendments to the procedural by-law, as required by the by-law itself.

The update emphasizes the ongoing efforts to modernize the framework for policing and oversight in Ontario, ensuring that TPS operations are in line with the new legislative requirements.

Source: Toronto Police Services Board. (2024, July 8) *April 30, 2024 – Revised Public Agenda*. <https://www.tpsb.ca/meetings/>

Email correspondence between the Board and the Complainant

The complainant acknowledged email correspondence with the TPSB to register to present at the April 30, 2024, board meeting.

TPSB provided a copy of this correspondence.

The email chain was initiated by the complainant on April 27, 2024, when they contacted TPSB administrator, Diana Achim to register to speak in person on agenda item number three, “Community Safety and Policing Act-Compliance Update”. The board’s general mailbox responded acknowledging receipt of the registration. The response highlighted the board’s procedural bylaw, which requires that deputations addressed the same subject matter as the agenda item. Speakers were reminded to ensure their comments relate to the report listed on the agenda, with the caution that unrelated deputations would not proceed. The email was signed by Board Administrator Diana Achim.

Script of Warnings to be Issued to Speakers During Board Meetings

In her interview, Ann Morgan stated that she was provided with a script to follow when addressing violations of deputation rules. Upon request, this document was shared by TPSB Administrator Diana Achim. The script outlines a step-by-step protocol for issuing warnings to speakers who breach procedural by-laws.

According to the script, if a speaker violates the rules, they are first informed of the specific provision breached and asked to cease the prohibited behavior. If the conduct

continues, they are warned that their deputation may be terminated and instructed to withdraw. Continued non-compliance results in the deputation being formally concluded, and the individual is asked to return to their seat. If improper conduct persists, the individual may be removed from the meeting under the *Trespass to Property Act*. Should they refuse to leave, the meeting may be recessed or adjourned.

The procedural by-law defines improper conduct and sets out general expectations for public behavior during meetings. Speakers are prohibited from:

- Speaking disrespectfully about any person
- Using offensive language
- Discussing topics unrelated to the agenda
- Commenting on the conduct of police officers or making complaints against members of the Toronto Police Service or Board
- Disobeying procedural rules or the Chair's rulings

INVESTIGATION FINDINGS

I make the following findings, relying on the aforementioned material and information collected during the investigation and summarized in part above:

- 1. On April 27, 2024, the complainant registered to present a deputation at the April 30, 2024, TPSB meeting in relation to Agenda Item #3, Community Safety and Policing Act - Compliance Update.**
 - a. According to the April 30, 2024, meeting agenda publicly available on the TPSB website Item 3 of the agenda, "Community Safety and Policing Act - Compliance Update" pertains to an update on the board's compliance with the *Community Safety and Policing Act*, 2019. It includes steps taken to ensure the Toronto Police Service adheres to the new legislative requirements that came into force on April 1, 2024.
 - b. The complainant was interviewed by IoP investigators on July 16, 2024. During the interview the complainant stated that they understood the term "compliance" in the agenda item title to refer to police fulfilling their responsibilities to ensure public safety and security. They further explained that when they were interrupted and informed that their comments were off topic, they became confused about the intended focus of the agenda item. The complainant also acknowledged the possibility that they may have misunderstood the agenda item's intent.

2. The complainant's deputation addresses police members fulfilling their responsibilities, a topic that is unrelated to agenda item #3, - "Community Safety and Policing Act - Compliance Update."

- a. The Overview of Rules of Deputation on the TPSB website clearly states that comments made within the deputation must remain relevant to the specific agenda item for which the speaker has registered to speak.
- b. On April 27, 2024, the complainant submitted a request to deliver a deputation at the April 30, 2024, TPSB meeting, specifically in relation to Agenda Item #3: Community Safety and Policing Act – Compliance Update.
- c. According to the agenda for the April 30, 2024, meeting, publicly available on the TPSB website, Item 3 provides an update on the board's compliance with the Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019. The item outlines the measures implemented to ensure the Toronto Police Service aligns with the legislative requirements that took effect on April 1, 2024.
- d. The complainant was interviewed by IoP investigators on July 16, 2024. During the interview, they indicated that the topic of their deputation was intended to address police fulfilling their duties within the community to maintain safety and security.

3. The complainant was provided with multiple exposures to the TPSB rules governing presenting deputations.

- a. On April 29, 2024, an email was sent from the TPSB general mailbox to the complainant, acknowledging receipt of their registration to speak at the April 30, 2024, TPSB meeting. The email included a caution, stating that according to board by-law deputations must address the same subject matter as the agenda item. The complainant was encouraged to ensure their deputation related to the report listed on the agenda. It was noted that if the deputation did not pertain to listed items, it would not proceed.
- b. During the complainant's interview with IoP investigators, they confirmed receiving the aforementioned email from the TPSB. However, they acknowledged possibly overlooking the instructions, admitting they had not read the instructions in detail. Instead, they assumed they understood its contents, recalling only that

they had been informed about the need to stay on topic and adhere to the time limit for the deputation.

- c. The TPSB website includes a page dedicated to TPSB meetings which states members of the public are allowed to make a deputation in its public meetings, provided the subject relates to an agenda item.
- d. The complainant also recalled during their interview that the Chair, Ann Morgan, may have been signaling that he was off topic with selected agenda items at the April 30, 2024, TPSB meeting they attended.
- e. Prior to deputations being heard, Executive Director Dubi Kanengisser reviewed the rules governing presenting deputations according to TPSB by-law 161. This review included specific examples of violations, types of cautions that could be issued and actions that would be taken if violations persisted.
- f. Prior to the complainant's deputation, two other individuals attempted to speak under Agenda Item #3, "Community Safety and Policing Act – Compliance Update," raising concerns about recent protests and the perceived support of violent individuals by certain board members. Chair Ann Morgan interrupted each of these speakers, advising that the comments were not relevant to the agenda item and provided clarification on its intended scope.
- g. During the complainant's deputation, Chair Ann Morgan interrupted multiple times, issuing warnings that the deputation was off topic.

4. Ann Morgan's response to the complainant during the April 30, 2024, TPSB meeting was consistent with TPSB by-laws and established procedures.

- a. The TPSB website section titled, "Overview of Rules for Deputations" outlines the rules from the board's procedural by-law including a five minute time limit, the requirement to stay on topic, prohibitions against comments on the conduct of police officers or board staff, and the necessity to be respectful. It also informs of the Chair's right to interrupt deputations to provide warnings of violations and may also conclude a deputation if these rules are violated.
- b. The TPSB script developed for the purpose of addressing deputation violations outlines the following steps to be taken:
 - 1. Advise the speaker of the violated rule and ask them to stop.

2. Warn the speaker that continued violation will conclude their deputation.
 3. Rule the deputation concluded if the violations persist.
- c. Ann Morgan's initial interruption of the complainant advises them that they are not speaking on a relevant item. She specifically states, "I'm going to ask you to stop speaking on other topics." When the complainant continues to discuss a prohibited topic despite warnings, Ann Morgan directs that the clock be stopped on the deputation effectively concluding it.



777 Bay Street, 7th Floor
Toronto, ON M5G 2C8
Tel: +1-416-873-5930 or 1-888-333-5078
www.iopontario.ca

Improving policing performance to make
everyone in Ontario safer.

Ce rapport est aussi disponible en français