

Decision Regarding Findings Report INV-24-13 Concerning the Conduct of Toronto Police Service Board Members Shelley Carroll, Lily Cheng & Amber Morley

Decision By:

Joseph Maiorano, Deputy Inspector General of Policing

I. INTRODUCTION

- [1] This decision addresses an allegation that Shelley Carroll, Lily Cheng and Amber Morley, members of the Toronto Police Service Board (“TPSB”), committed misconduct in relation to the removal of a fellow board member from the TPSB. This allegation was investigated by an inspector with Ontario’s Inspectorate of Policing (“IoP”) who prepared a Findings Report,¹ which is attached to this Decision as Appendix A.
- [2] Following a review of the Findings Report and for the reasons that follow, I find that the subject board members have not committed misconduct in contravention of 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”).²

II. BACKGROUND

- [3] I accept the Investigation Findings of the inspector in the Findings Report. Having accepted these findings, I highlight the following points that inform my decision.
- [4] The subjects of this investigation, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Cheng and Ms. Morley, are members of the TPSB, and are also councillors on Toronto City Council. The complainant is a member of the community who was appointed to the TPSB by resolution of Toronto City Council in 2023.
- [5] In 2024, a series of news stories alleged that a non-profit organization the complainant was associated with had inappropriately paid money to a company the complainant owned, and that the complainant’s company had fabricated employees on its webpage.

¹ Section 123(1) 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.

² This decision is made pursuant to a delegation of authority of the Inspector General of Policing issued under subsection 102(7) of the Act.

[6] The complainant was later removed from the TPSB by resolution of Toronto City Council. In advance of the resolution, the complainant was pressured by both the mayor and Ms. Cheng to step down from the TPSB voluntarily. The complainant declined to do so. Ms. Carroll ultimately brought forward the motion to rescind the complainant's appointment to the TPSB, citing concerns about reputational risk to the board. The motion was seconded by Ms. Morley. There was no quorum issue, permitting this matter to move quickly through municipal council. The resolution passed and the complainant was removed from the TPSB.

[7] The complainant alleges her removal from the TPSB was the result of political pressure. She also believes the subject board members were in a conflict of interest given their dual roles as members of the TPSB and municipal council.

III. ISSUES

[8] The issues for consideration are (1) whether the subject board members committed misconduct by acting while in a conflict of interest or by conducting themselves in a manner that would likely undermine the public's trust in the police service board or police service, and (2) whether other aspects of the complainant's allegations are within the Inspector General's jurisdiction to investigate.

IV. ANALYSIS

1. The subject board members did not commit misconduct.

i. The subject board members were not in a conflict of interest.

[9] The primary issue is whether the three subject board members removed the complainant from the TPSB while they were in a conflict of interest under the Act.

[10] The Code of Conduct defines a "conflict of interest" as "a situation in which a member of a police service board's private interests or personal relationships place, or may reasonably be perceived to place, the member in conflict with their duties as a member of the police service board." Where a member of a police service board is in a conflict of interest, section 20(1) of the Code of Conduct requires the board member to disclose the conflict of interest to the chair of the board or, if the conflict of interest involves the chair, to the Inspector General.

[11] I do not find that the subject board members were in a conflict of interest or violated section 20(1) of the Code of Conduct. The subject board members were clearly not influenced by a “personal relationship” which contemplates a closer form of relationship, such as a familial relationship. Nor is there any evidence that the subject board members had a “private interest” which conflicted with their duties, such as one that would grant them a personal benefit.

[12] Instead, it is alleged that the dual roles of members of a police service board who are also members of municipal council created a conflict of interest. I disagree. The duties of police service board members and members of municipal council, while distinct, are reconcilable. This issue was addressed in *Findings Report Inv-24-34 (Re)*, at paras. 35-43, albeit as it relates to heads of municipal council who also sit on police service boards. I nevertheless find the reasoning persuasive, noting that occupying dual roles is a legal requirement for some board members.³ Additionally, I see nothing in the *Municipal Act, 2001*, SO 2001 c 25, particularly section 224 which establishes the role of council, that conflicts with the duties of members of a police service board.

ii. The conduct of the subject board members was not likely to undermine public trust in policing.

[13] Section 3(1) of the Code of Conduct also requires that “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.”

[14] Again, I do not believe this test has been met. The complainant takes issue with the fact that members of the TPSB, who are also part of Toronto City Council, initiated her removal from the board; however, there was nothing unlawful about this and that was within their right to do. These actions are consistent with the legislative framework which does not prohibit members of municipal council who are also members of police service boards from bringing forward or voting on motions for the removal of fellow board members. The legislation also does not otherwise impose criteria for revoking the appointment of police service board members.

³ Sections 31(4)-(6) of the Act dictate the composition of municipal police service boards in Ontario and requires that at least some members of police service boards are also members of municipal council.

2. The Inspector General has no jurisdiction to investigate the remainder of the complaint.

[15] Although the mayor is mentioned in the Findings Report, the Inspector General does not have jurisdiction over the mayor because the mayor is not a member of the police service board. It is the members of the police service board that are required to adhere to the Code of Conduct. Also, while the complainant seeks to have the motion of city council rescinded, the Inspector General does not have jurisdiction over that process or decisions made by city council.

V. CONCLUSION

[16] I do not find that the subject board members committed misconduct as described in the Code of Conduct. Specifically, I do not find that the subject board members contravened the conflict-of-interest provisions, or that their conduct undermined or was likely to undermine the public's trust in the police service board or the police service maintained by the police service board.

Despite finding no misconduct, the evidence in the Findings Report raises potential issues related to the governance practices of the TPSB. The complainant describes having a meeting with the mayor and Ms. Carroll where she was told that she needed to be a “team player” and align with motions and talking points prepared by support staff. While I do not have enough evidence to determine whether or not this happened, if it did, it is highly troubling. Members of police service boards are bound by fiduciary obligations. They are first and foremost required to exercise their duties faithfully and impartially as board members to ensure compliance with the Act. While considering another's view is not inappropriate, and the consideration of diverse viewpoints is valuable, board members should not simply defer to another person. Decisions that fail to prioritize the Act — and instead relegate it to a secondary consideration or allow the board member to become an appendage for municipal council — are an abdication of duty that may constitute misconduct and also undermine the board's ability to fulfill its independent statutory mandate.

[17] In addition, at least one of the subject board members was concerned about the complainant being unfairly judged but believed revoking the complainant's appointment was necessary to preserve the integrity of the board. The Inspector General may have been of assistance in these circumstances. The Inspector General has powers under the Act to investigate allegations against board members and can direct board members not to exercise their powers or perform their duties while an investigation is ongoing. These authorities offer an alternative mechanism which can help preserve public confidence in a police service board when a serious allegation against a member of the board occurs, while also permitting a fair and transparent investigation into the allegation. The Inspector General also has Police Service Advisors available to police service boards and their members to assist them in navigating these, and similar, circumstances. I encourage board members to engage police service advisory support to ensure actions taken are in accordance with sound governance practices.

Date: September 3, 2026

Original Signed By

Joseph Maiorano
*Deputy Inspector General of
Policing*

FINDINGS REPORT

Toronto Police Service Board Members:
Shelley Carroll, Lily Cheng, & Amber Morley

**Section 106(1) Board Member
Conduct Investigation**
(INV-24-13)

Submitted to:
Ryan Teschner
Inspector General of Policing of
Ontario

April 1, 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABOUT THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICING AND THE INSPECTORATE OF POLICING	3
INTRODUCTION.....	3
OVERVIEW OF INVESTIGATION	4
The Complaint	4
The Subject Police Service Board Members	4
Applicable Legislative and Regulatory Provisions	5
SUMMARY OF THE INVESTIGATION CONDUCTED	6
The Written Complaint.....	7
Overview	8
Media Stories	8
Toronto City Council Motion.....	10
Toronto City Council Policies and Procedures	11
Complainant Interview.....	14
Text Messages	16
Witness Police Service Board Staff and Member Interviews	16
Subject Police Service Board Member Interviews	20
INVESTIGATION FINDINGS	26

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

The complainant alleged that the removal of a Toronto Police Service Board member was driven by political motives and that it involved a conflict of interest amongst city council members, Shelley Carroll, Lily Cheng and Amber Morley who also serve on the Toronto Police Service Board.

The Subject Police Service Board Members

Subject One:

Name of Police Service Board: Toronto Police Service Board

Subject Board Member: Shelley Carroll

Length of service (Term): Appointed April 17, 2024. Reappointed effective January 1, 2025 to November 14, 2026, and until a successor is appointed.

Previous Terms on Police Service Board: 2014-2018

Specific Roles Held on Police Service Board: Chair, since January 14, 2025

Previous Substantiated Conduct: No

Appointing Authority: City Council

Subject Two:

Name of Police Service Board: Toronto Police Service Board

Subject Board Member: Lily Cheng

Length of service (Term): Appointed November 23, 2022, reappointed August 10, 2023, to December 31, 2024, and reappointed January 1, 2025, to November 14, 2026, and until a successor is appointed.

Specific Roles Held on Police Service Board: Board Member

Previous Substantiated Conduct: No

Appointing Authority: City Council

Subject Three:

Name of Police Service Board: Toronto Police Service Board

Subject Board Member: Amber Morley

Length of service (Term): Appointed August 10, 2023, to December 31, 2024. Reappointed effective January 1, 2025, to November 14, 2026, and until a successor is appointed.

Specific Roles Held on Police Service Board: No

Previous Substantiated Conduct: No

Appointing Authority: City Council

Applicable Legislative and Regulatory Provisions

1. Section 35(6) of the CSPA provides that every member of a police service board shall comply with the prescribed code of conduct.

2. Ontario Regulation 408/23: Code of Conduct for Police Service Board Members establishes certain conduct requirements for board members, including:

- a) *Section 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*
- b) *Section 4 - A member of a police service board shall comply with the Act and the regulations made under it; and*
- c) *Section 5 - A member of a police service board shall not, by act or omission, conduct themselves in a manner that is likely to cause the board to fail to comply with the Act or the regulations made under it.*

3. Section 31(5) of the CSPA describes the appointment of police service board members for a seven-member board:

- 31 (5) A municipal board that is composed of seven members shall consist of,*
- (a) the head of the municipal council or, if the head chooses not to be or is ineligible to be a member of the board, another member of the municipal council appointed by resolution of the municipality;*
 - (b) two members of the municipal council appointed by resolution of the municipality;*
 - (c) one person appointed by resolution of the municipality, who is neither a member of the municipal council nor an employee of the municipality; and*
 - (d) three persons appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.*

(Emphasis added)

4. Subsection 33(3) of the CSPA affirms that the power to appoint a member of a police service board - by a municipal council or the Lieutenant Governor in Council - includes the power to revoke the appointment and to appoint a replacement.

5. Subsection 29(1) of the CSPA requires that:

29 (1) If the need to appoint a new member of a police service board by resolution of a municipality is reasonably foreseeable, the municipality shall take reasonable steps to promote the availability of the appointment, having regard to the need to ensure that police service boards are representative of the communities they serve.

6. Subsections 33(1) and (2) of the CSPA require that:

Considerations

33 (1) In appointing or reappointing a member of a police service board, the appointing person or body shall consider,

(a) the need to ensure that the police service board is representative of the area it serves, having regard for the diversity of the population in the area;

(b) the need for the police service board to have members with the prescribed competencies, if any; and

(c) any applicable diversity plan.

Police record check

(2) The appointing person or body must consider the results of a potential appointee's police record check that was prepared within the past 12 months before appointing him or her as a member of a police service board.

SUMMARY OF THE INVESTIGATION CONDUCTED

This investigation included interviews with the complainant, the three subject board members (Toronto city councillors), the three board members (provincial appointees), the previous Toronto Police Service Board Executive Director. Toronto Mayor Olivia Chow declined to be interviewed unless written questions were provided in advance and, consequently, was not interviewed. The Mayor is not a member of the police service board, and is not required under statute to provide an interview. Further, the mayor is not subject to the jurisdiction of the Inspector General.

Inspectors also reviewed evidence that included text messages, emails, Toronto City Council policies and procedures, open-source information, mainstream media stories, and the YouTube recording of the June 27, 2024 Toronto City Council meeting.

The Written Complaint

The original complaint, filed by the complainant, read:

Complaint is about; Councillors Shelley Carroll, Lily Chang, and Amber Morley, Mayor Olivia Chow, and the City of Toronto.

The complaint concerns my unjust and politically motivated removal from the Toronto Police Service Board, including:

Conflicts of interest involving Councillors Carroll, Chang, and Morley, who voted on my removal despite their dual roles. Disparity in treatment, as I was removed based on unfounded allegations. The lack of proper process at the council meeting, highlighting procedural flaws.

The incident occurred at Toronto City Council.

Dates 2024

March 5, Meeting with the Mayor, Councillor Carroll, and the Mayor's Chief of Staff.

June 18, Mayor asked Councillor Thompson to request my resignation.

June 24, Board Members and City Councillors voted for my representation on the Canadian Association of Police Governance. Demonstrating their trust in my ability.

June 27, The motion to remove me passed.

I am filing this complaint to address the unjust removal from my position:

Conflicts of interest involving Councillors.

Political pressure from the Mayor and other councillors to force my resignation.

The disparity in treatment, as I was removed based on unfounded allegations.

The failure to address anti-Black racism and the undermining of fairness in governance.

This incident impacted me by unjustly removing me from a role where I contributed to important police governance work. As the co-chair of the ARAP committee, my removal does a disservice to the community by undermining proper representation. For the community, it sets a dangerous precedent that political motivations and conflicts of interest can override fairness and due process.

By filing this complaint; I seek an investigation into:

The legitimacy of the allegations leading to my removal and improper conduct on the decision to remove me.

The potential conflict of interest involving councillors and their dual roles.

I seek to have the motion rescinded to ensure a fair and transparent process.

Overview

The complainant was appointed to the Toronto Police Service Board (TPSB) by the Toronto City Council on March 29, 2023, for a four-year term, as the “person appointed by resolution of the municipality, who is neither a member of the municipal council nor an employee of the municipality”. At the time, the complainant served as the CEO of the non-profit Black Business and Professional Association (BBPA) and previously as the president of its board of directors.

Beginning in March 2024, a series of CBC news stories raised allegations of financial improprieties at the BBPA. Specifically, the charity allegedly paid \$1.5-2 million to companies owned by two of its board directors. One of the impugned BBPA directors was the complainant and her company, BrandEQ. In June 2024, the CBC published additional allegations that the complainant’s company hosted a web page displaying fabricated employees bearing stock photos. The complainant denied all the allegations.

On June 27, 2024, Toronto City Councillor Shelley Carroll, a current member of the TPSB, tabled a “walk-on” motion at the city council meeting for the rescission of the complainant’s appointment. Councillor Amber Morley, also a current member of the TPSB, seconded the motion. The motion passed with no debate and no reasons.

In the same motion, the city council appointed Chris Brillinger to the TPSB for a term ending November 14, 2026. Mr. Brillinger is an executive at Family Services Toronto, which assists individuals and families facing mental health and socioeconomic challenges. A confidential memorandum accompanied the motion. However, the inspector was denied access to the memorandum and the Inspector General lacks the statutory authority to force its disclosure in the absence of council’s approval.

Media Stories

April 25, 2024 – CBC: Harry Jerome’s daughter wants famed sprinter’s name removed from embattled charity’s awards

Debbie Smith, daughter of legendary Canadian sprinter Harry Jerome, has requested that the Black Business and Professional Association (BBPA) stop using her father’s name and likeness in connection with its annual Harry Jerome Awards. This request came in the form of a cease-and-desist letter sent through her lawyer after she learned of allegations of financial mismanagement within the BBPA. Smith expressed deep concern that the controversy surrounding the organization could tarnish her father’s legacy, stating that it “breaks [her] heart” to see a “black cloud” over his name.

The Harry Jerome Awards, which have celebrated Black excellence in Canada for over 40 years, are scheduled to take place shortly. Smith emphasized that her family has never profited from the use of Jerome's name and that the original agreement with the BBPA was based on good faith. She is demanding that the organization cease using his name until it has addressed and rectified any proven instances of financial mismanagement. The BBPA has not publicly responded to her letter, though its board chair previously denied allegations of fund misappropriation in a message to members.

Brockbank, N. (2024, April 25). *Harry Jerome's daughter wants famed sprinter's name removed from embattled charity's awards*. CBC News.

<https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/harry-jerome-daughter-bbpa-1.7183645>

May 13, 2024 – CBC: Prominent charities serving black business community paid 1.5 million to 2 Board member's companies, records show

CBC Toronto obtained internal financial records from the Black Business and Professional Association (BBPA), revealing that the charity paid over \$1.5 million to companies owned by two of its board members—Nadine Spencer and Roderick Brereton—during their time on the board or while Spencer served as CEO. Notably, more than \$800,000 of these payments were not disclosed as related party transactions to the Canada Revenue Agency (CRA), which is required under Canadian charity regulations. Related party transactions involve payments to individuals or entities not at arm's length from the organization and must be transparently reported.

The revelations have sparked concern among BBPA members, some of whom are calling for the board's resignation and an independent audit of the charity's financial practices. Chandran Fernando, a member of the BBPA, emphasized the need for principled leadership and sound governance. The group's lawyer also alleged that the BBPA submitted inaccurate financial filings to the CRA. Denham Jolly, the BBPA's founder, publicly supported the call for an audit and leadership change, stating that it is essential to restore transparency and accountability.

In response, the BBPA acknowledged the allegations and committed to an independent review. The situation has raised broader concerns about governance and oversight within charitable organizations serving marginalized communities.

Brockbank, N., MacMillan, S., & Lancaster, J. (2024, May 13). *Prominent charity serving Black business community paid \$1.5M to 2 board members' companies, records show*. CBC News. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/concerned-bbpa-members-related-party-transactions-1.7199334>

June 13, 2024 - CBC: Who are these people? They supposedly worked for a Toronto police board members companies

A CBC Toronto investigation revealed that Nadine Spencer's marketing companies, BrandEQ and BrandEQ Black, featured profiles of at least three individuals who appear to be fabricated or misrepresented as employees. One such individual, Mary Ellen Stein, was listed as the Chief Operating Officer and had an active LinkedIn profile and social media presence. However, searches through public records and reverse image searches showed no evidence of her existence, and her photos were found to be stock images used across unrelated websites. Two other supposed employees were also represented using photos of real people who have no connection to Spencer's companies. After CBC contacted Spencer, all references to these individuals were removed from the websites, and Stein's LinkedIn profile was taken down. Through her lawyer, Spencer denied the allegations, stating that the individuals were not fabricated and citing employee confidentiality as the reason for withholding further proof.

Brockbank, N., MacMillan, S., & Lancaster, J. (2024, June 13). *Who are these people? They supposedly worked for a Toronto police board member's companies*. CBC News. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/brandeq-nadine-spencer-employees-1.7232772>

Toronto City Council Motion

The minutes of the June 26, 2024 Toronto City Council meeting record the following:

MM19.39 - Appointment of a Public Member to the Toronto Police Service Board - by Councillor Shelley Carroll, seconded Councillor Amber Morley
Decision Type: ACTION
Status: Adopted
Wards: All

City Council Decision

City Council on June 26 and 27, 2024, adopted the following:

1. City Council rescind the appointment of Nadine Spencer to the Toronto Police Service Board effective immediately.
2. City Council appoint Chris Brillinger to the Toronto Police Services Board, at pleasure of Council, for a term of office ending on November 14, 2026, and until a successor is appointed.

3. City Council direct that Confidential Attachment 1 to the Member Motion MM19.39 by Councillor Shelley Carroll remain confidential in its entirety as it pertains to personal matters about an identifiable individual being considered for appointment to the Toronto Police Service Board.

Confidential Attachment 1 to the Member Motion MM19.39 by Councillor Shelley Carroll remain confidential in its entirety in accordance with the provisions of the City of Toronto Act, 2006, as it pertains to personal matters about an identifiable individual being considered for appointment to the Toronto Police Service Board.

Confidential Attachment - Personal matters about an identifiable individual being considered for appointment to the Toronto Police Service Board.

Background Information (City Council)

Member Motion MM19.39

Confidential Attachment 1 - Confidential Information

Motions (City Council)

Motion to Introduce Motion without Notice moved by Councillor Shelley Carroll (Carried)

That Councillor Shelley Carroll be permitted to add to the agenda of today's meeting an urgent Motion without Notice concerning:

Appointment of a Public Member to the Toronto Police Service Board

Reason for Urgency:

So that a new member is appointed and onboarded in time for the next meeting of the Toronto Police Service Board.

Motion to Adopt Item (Carried)

Source: [2024-06-26 Minutes - City Council \(toronto.ca\)](#)

Toronto City Council Policies and Procedures

Toronto City Council - Chapter 27 - Council Procedures - 27-8.4- Motions without notice

A motion without notice, referred to as a "walk-on motion" is a proposal introduced during a Council meeting that wasn't included in the published agenda. To qualify, it must be:

- *Written and signed by both the mover and seconder.*
- *Urgent, with a clear explanation of its urgency.*

Typically, such motions must be submitted to the Clerk by noon on the business day before the Council meeting. The Clerk, in consultation with the Chair, reviews the motion to determine if it meets the urgency criteria. If approved, it is added to the agenda and may be referred to a committee or agency unless Council votes (by two-thirds majority) not to refer it.

Alternatively, a member may introduce a motion without notice during the meeting, but only if:

- It meets the written and urgency requirements.*
- The Chair reviews and approves it.*
- Two-thirds of Council members vote to allow its introduction.*

These motions are then added directly to the order paper and are not referred to a committee.

Exceptions exist for motions related to interim control by-laws under the Planning Act, which can be introduced with a simple majority vote based on advice from the Chief Planner.

Importantly, motions without notice are not allowed at the first meeting of a new Council term or at special Council meetings.

City of Toronto. (2024). *Municipal Code Chapter 27: Council Procedures*.
https://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/municode/1184_027.pdf

Toronto City Council - Public Appointment Policy - Part 8 - Selection Process

The City of Toronto's procedure for appointing members to the Toronto police service board involves a structured and transparent process. First, applications are screened for eligibility by City Clerk staff, who identify incomplete or ineligible submissions. A Staff Review Team then evaluates applications based on board-specific qualifications, diversity disclosures, and potential conflicts of interest. Applicants are ranked and summarized for review.

A nominating panel meets privately to shortlist candidates for interviews, considering qualifications, geographic representation, and diversity. If the applicant pool is insufficient, staff may be directed to recruit further or re-advertise. Shortlisted candidates may be tested, and reference checks are conducted confidentially. All candidates are interviewed using standardized questions, and evaluations consider application strength, test results, interview performance, references, and attendance records for incumbents.

The panel aims to recommend a balanced group of candidates reflecting experience, diversity, and geographic distribution. Final recommendations, including names and biographical summaries, are submitted publicly to City Council. Confidential personal information is only discussed in closed session, in accordance with the City of Toronto Act. City staff also report on how equity objectives have been met during each Council term.

Following appointments, the City Clerk notifies all applicants and provides appointees with information about liability insurance and indemnity coverage. Diversity data collected through voluntary questionnaires is monitored and reported in summary form to assess progress toward Council's diversity goals and identify areas for improvement.

City of Toronto. (2015, July 6). *Public appointments policy: Governing citizen appointments to City agencies and corporations and other bodies* (Part 8: Selection Process). <https://www.toronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/96b7-Public-Appointments-Policy-July-6-2015-acc.pdf>

Municipal Diversity Plan for Appointment to the Toronto Police Service Board- Appointment of Public Members to the Toronto Police Service Board

The Civic Appointments Committee is responsible for shortlisting, interviewing, and recommending public members for appointment to the Toronto Police Service Board, following the City's Public Appointments Policy. A key principle of this policy is ensuring that appointments reflect Toronto's diverse population, including:

- *Women*
- *Young adults (18–30)*
- *Indigenous peoples*
- *People with disabilities*
- *Racialized communities*
- *People of diverse sexual orientations*
- *Residents from all geographic areas of Toronto*

The Public Appointments Secretariat, within the City Clerk's Office, manages the process by conducting broad and targeted outreach to encourage diverse applications. The Secretariat supports the Civic Appointments Committee by preparing reports and coordinating interviews and recommendations for City Council.

Additionally, the City Clerk's Office aligns its efforts with broader equity initiatives, such as:

- *The Reconciliation Action Plan*

- *The Action Plan to Confront Anti-Black Racism*
- *The Access Plan for Two-Spirit, Trans & Non-Binary Youth*

City Council may update these policies or introduce new ones, which will be integrated into the appointments process to further reduce barriers for underrepresented groups.

City of Toronto. (2025, March 5). *Municipal diversity plan for appointments to the Toronto Police Service Board.*

<https://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2025/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-253731.pdf>

Complainant Interview

The complainant was appointed to the Toronto Police Service Board approximately a year and a half prior to her removal, which she described as abrupt and lacking transparency. She emphasized that prior to this, there had been no issues with her performance. She had consistently attended meetings, reviewed materials thoroughly, and contributed meaningfully to both public and private sessions. She described herself as someone who listens, learns, and engages thoughtfully, and had built strong working relationships with fellow board members including Lily Cheng, Amber Morley, and Shelley Carroll.

[Redacted – s. 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24]

The complainant stated that she had a conversation with the mayor in which she explained the controversy and context surrounding the media allegations about her. She noted that members of the public had written to the mayor requesting her removal from the police service board. According to the complainant, this group consisted of three individuals—described as “big players”—who had previously approached the Black Business and Professional Association (BBPA) for support but were rejected during her tenure as CEO, as she felt they were not a good fit. She recalled the mayor acknowledging that “a lot of big players” were targeting the complainant.

The complainant stated that she was pressured to resign by both the mayor and Lily Cheng. Lily Cheng sent the complainant multiple text messages, [redacted – s. 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24], urging her to step down to avoid further public scrutiny. The complainant interpreted these messages as warnings that more harm would follow if she did not resign. She found this deeply distressing, especially given the reputation she had built and the brands she had developed from humble beginnings. She noted that the allegations against her were added to her Wikipedia page, which she believed was a deliberate attempt to damage her credibility.

[Redacted – s. 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24]

She purportedly left the BBPA of her own accord, submitting a formal resignation letter in August 2023 after her contract ended. She had helped hire the new CEO and offered to assist with the transition. The complainant returned to her marketing company, which had previously provided services to the BBPA. She clarified that her \$250,000 annual salary as CEO was approved by the board and her company's \$1.1 million in earnings over six years included substantial pro bono work. She recused herself from all decisions involving her company and followed conflict-of-interest guidelines. She emphasized that she never signed checks to herself and that all financial decisions were made by the board. She believed the controversy surrounding her compensation stemmed from a misunderstanding of the BBPA's structure and a broader disbelief that a Black woman's company could legitimately earn that amount.

The complainant felt that her time, skills, and contributions to the police service board were undervalued, and that her removal from the police service board reflected a lack of consideration for equity. As a Black woman serving on both the Anti-Racism Committee and the Police Governance Committee, she felt her unique perspective was dismissed. She noted that Lily Cheng, while racialized, could not speak to her lived experience, and that her removal silenced a critical voice.

The complainant described a meeting with mayor Chow on March 5, 2024, which was presented as a casual "get-to-know-you" session but included Shelley Carroll and the mayor's chief of staff. During the meeting, the complainant reminded them that she had been appointed by council while the previous mayor, John Tory, was in office. Mayor Chow reportedly advised the complainant that she needed to be a "team player." The mayor explained that motions and talking points were prepared by a support team and that city appointees were expected to align with them. The complainant was offered staff support to assist with her role, but declined, stating that she was an independent decision-maker. She emphasized that while she did not have policing expertise, she deeply understood the community and its relationship with policing, and could not be coerced into supporting motions she did not believe in.

The complainant explained that her decision not to support a motion brought forward by Amber Morley was based on principle. While she could not recall the exact details of the motion, she believed it related to operational matters, which she felt fell outside the Board's mandate. The motion was introduced at the last minute, leaving insufficient time to review its implications.

The complainant had raised concerns with the Board Chair and Executive Director, suggesting that members should meet in advance to discuss complex issues. She emphasized that her opposition was not an act of defiance, but a reflection of her commitment to informed and responsible governance.

On the morning of June 27, 2024—the day of the Council meeting—she contacted the mayor at 7:00 a.m. and reminded her of their previous conversation, in which the mayor had encouraged her to fight and promised support. The mayor appeared surprised that the complainant was not going to resign. The complainant believes that her refusal to step down prompted a rushed and unprecedented motion, which was introduced without proper process. She questioned the urgency, stating, “I didn’t steal, I didn’t kill anyone—so what was the rush?” She also found it suspicious that a replacement was appointed immediately afterward, suggesting that the individual had been selected in advance without due process.

The complainant expressed concern about Shelley Carroll’s conflict-of-interest in bringing the motion forward, given her dual role as a board member and city councillor, and her prior support for the complainant’s appointment to another committee. The complainant believes the city’s control over board appointments undermines the democratic process, especially if appointees are expected to vote in alignment with the mayor’s preferences. The complainant warned that while this may appear to be a single vote against one person, it reflects a broader shift in power and influence that could have far-reaching implications.

The complainant concluded by stating that her career is not about personal advancement but about empowering young Black girls to see themselves in leadership roles. [Redacted – s. 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] she sees her journey as proof that success is possible despite adversity. The complainant’s motivation for serving on the police service board was to set an example for Black youth. She stated that the mayor’s offer to help shape her career was irrelevant—her path is already defined, and she remains committed to leading with integrity.

Text Messages

Text Messages of Lily Cheng and Complainant

[Redacted – s. 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24]

Witness Police Service Board Staff and Member Interviews

1. Interview of [redacted – s. 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24]

The witness served as Executive Director of the Toronto Police Service Board [redacted – s. 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24]. In that role he advised the Board, worked most closely with the Chair Ann Morgan, and interacted with all members, including the complainant. [Redacted – s. 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] stated he was unaware of any Board discussions—formal or informal—pre-dating the complainant’s removal, though he knew of general concerns about public controversy and understood from the complainant that the Mayor and Councillor Shelley Carroll had urged her to resign, which she refused. He

emphasized he was not party to those conversations. He added that the Board received no advance information from the municipality before the removal motion; he learned of it by a staff call roughly ten minutes before it was added to the agenda and alerted the Chair and the complainant accordingly.

Structurally, he described the Board at the time as comprising three provincial and three municipal appointees plus a community appointee; the provincially appointed members were Ann Morgan, Lisa Kostakis, and Nick Migliore, and the municipal appointees included Shelley Carroll, Amber Morley and Lily Cheng. He observed unusually intense media attention on issues involving the complainant and the Black community and suspected, based on community conversations, that the coverage may have been amplified; however, he could not recall specifics and acknowledged much of this was hearsay. He was aware of mayoral dissatisfaction with some votes where the complainant aligned with provincial appointees rather than municipal ones; according to the complainant, she was told to be a “team player” and warned she could be removed if she did not vote as expected.

2. Interview of Ann Morgan

Ann Morgan served as Chair of the Board in 2024 and is now a provincial appointee in her second term, which runs to May 2027. Over this period, Lisa Kostatis and later Nick Migliore served as provincial appointees, Shelley Carroll became Chair in 2024, and Chris Brillinger assumed the role of Vice-Chair. [Redacted – s. 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] She described the complainant as an exemplary member—highly active in community events and philanthropic work—and noted that after the complainant’s removal, they remained in occasional contact. The complainant advised that an independent audit related to external allegations had cleared her of misconduct, making only governance recommendations; she believes the complainant can furnish that report if requested.

She reported mounting political pressure in early 2024. In February and March, the mayor allegedly pressed the complainant to “be a team player” and vote the right way and later urged her to step down once allegations surfaced. Lily Cheng allegedly sent messages, [redacted – s. 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24], encouraging the complainant to resign [redacted – s. 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24]. She believes these events formed part of a broader pattern: changes to procedural bylaws, Jon Burnside’s removal, the complainant’s removal, consolidation of a voting majority, and ultimately her own removal as Chair. [Redacted – s. 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24].

On May 31, 2024, the Board unanimously nominated the complainant to the Canadian Association of Police Governance, a national governance body—an outcome she says contradicts any suggestion of performance concerns. Yet the complainant's removal at City Council followed shortly thereafter, reportedly with little notice, minimal attendance, no stated reasons on the record, and Chris Brillinger announced as the replacement without prior notice. She said Shelley Carroll frequently referenced the mayor's views while steering Board outcomes.

3. Interview of Lisa Kostakis

Lisa Kostakis stated that she is currently a Board member. In 2024, she served as Vice-Chair of the Toronto Police Services Board (TPSB) and sat on the Mental Health Advisory and Advocacy Panel (MHAP). Lisa Kostakis is a provincial appointee under the Solicitor General, appointed in August 2020, reappointed in 2023, and believes her next renewal may occur around late September 2026.

Lisa Kostakis stated that she and the complainant were colleagues on the TPSB and also crossed paths at Toronto Police-related and non-profit sector events. She was not aware of any discussions or issues relating to the complainant's removal prior to it occurring, noting that the complainant was a City appointee and TPSB members have no role in City appointment decisions. She advised they learned of the removal through a City Council vote and she had no prior notice. She heard second-hand comments from City Council members but was uncertain whether they fully understood what they were voting on. The news was a shock to her.

She explained that Board members also participate in external policing associations such as the Ontario Association of Police Service Boards (OAPSB) and the Canadian Association of Police Service Boards (CAPG). She stated that the day before the complainant's removal, the same councillors- Shelley Carroll, Lily Cheng and Amber Morley- who voted for the removal had voted to appoint the complainant as the TPSB representative to the national association . [Redacted – s. 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24].

She stated the Board did not receive any information from the municipality before the complainant's removal, at least none she was aware of as Vice-Chair.

She stated that shortly before the removal, the complainant expressed concerns about receiving phone calls and texts — including from the mayor — regarding having an assistant present at Board meetings to support the complainant. She sensed the communications were inappropriate and pressured the complainant. [Redacted – s. 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24]. She believes she may have discussed these concerns with fellow board members, Ann Morgan and Nick Migliore. She stated that the complainant identified Lily Cheng and Amber Morley, and possibly Shelley Carroll and the mayor, as involved in the communications.

She stated that no concerns or complaints had ever been raised about the complainant's conduct or performance. She described the complainant as engaged, objective, well-prepared, and respected, both within the Board and the broader community. The complainant contributed valuable expertise and perspective, particularly as a minority member, and was active on advisory committees such as the anti-racism committee.

[Redacted – s. 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] She stated there are seven Board members — four City and three Provincial — and that at times the Board appeared divided along “City/mayoral” versus “provincial” lines. She noted that last-minute motions sometimes appeared without proper communication, though still technically permissible. She also has broader concerns about governance and procedural practices following changes in City representation. She clarified that the mayor is not a Board member but may sit or appoint a representative; she believed Shelley Carroll was the mayor's representative, with Lily Cheng and Amber Morley as City appointees and the complainant as the community appointee.

She stated that the complainant told her that communications she received felt pressuring and possibly intended to encourage resignation, and that the complainant used the word “bullied.” She recalled the complainant describing the behaviour as intimidating and possibly bordering on harassment. Their conversations occurred mostly by phone, with occasional in-person discussions, and she emphasized she avoids texting for sensitive matters due to risk of misinterpretation.

[Redacted – s. 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] She noted that the complainant was open in communicating her views and likely responded directly to Lily Cheng and the mayor when she disagreed, though she was not privy to those one-on-one exchanges.

She stated she has broader concerns about governance and procedure on the Board.

[Redacted – s. 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] She stated she cannot speak to City Council processes but has observed procedural issues in how the Chair, Shelley Carroll, is currently operating.

4. Interview of Nick Migliore

Nick Migliore stated that he is currently a Toronto Police Services Board member and a provincial appointee. He explained that there are three provincial appointees on the Board and that he also sits on the HR Committee, which consists of himself, the Vice-Chair, and the Chair. He estimated he has been on the Board for approximately a year and a half, noting that Ann Morgan was the Chair when he joined. At that time, the Board had a different composition, and he believes the Mayor later made changes. He could not recall his exact start date but believed the complainant had already been

serving on the Board as the City representative. He noted that the complainant has since been replaced by Chris Brillinger.

[Redacted – s. 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24]

He stated there were no discussions prior to the complainant's removal. Board members were simply advised that the complainant had been removed or replaced, and he was not involved in, or aware of, any discussions leading up to the decision. As a newer Board member at the time, he assumed the City was making changes to its appointments. He was not aware of the reasoning and was not privy to any internal conversations.

He stated he became aware of the complainant's removal through an announcement at the Board level, although he could not recall the exact circumstances. He said the Board did not receive any information from the City beforehand, and no reasons were provided. He understood that the City had the prerogative to replace its appointees, including the community representative.

He stated he had heard general rumours regarding the complainant, including issues related to the complainant's business website, but he did not know the specifics and emphasized that he received no official explanation from the City. He also stated he was not aware of any rumours directly related to the complainant's removal.

He stated he does not recall any concerns about the complainant's conduct or performance on the Board, nor any complaints about them. From his perspective, the complainant was professional, active, engaged, and appeared to be a bright and capable Board member. He recalled nothing negative about their performance.

Subject Police Service Board Member Interviews

1. Interview of Shelley Carroll

An interview was conducted with Shelley Carroll regarding her relationship with the complainant and her involvement in the complainant's removal from the police service board.

Shelley Carroll currently serves as Chair of the Toronto Police Service Board. She was appointed to the Board by Toronto City Council in May 2024. Shelley Carroll previously served on the board from 2014 to 2018 as a city council appointee.

Shelley Carroll noted that since the proclamation of the CSPA, the board has operated with a strong sense of consensus. She acknowledged that Lily Cheng and Amber Morley are newly elected councillors and fellow city appointees [Redacted – s. 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24].

Shelley Carroll does not know the complainant well, having only met her upon joining the board in May 2024. She recalled attending a meet-and-greet with the complainant and the mayor, during which the mayor questioned the complainant's voting record and alignment with provincial appointees. Shelley Carroll described the meeting as generally cordial, though tensions rose when the mayor raised concerns about the complainant's voting record, noting that the complainant appeared to consistently align with provincial appointees. In response, the complainant reaffirmed her commitment to serving the interests of the city.

Shelley Carroll emphasized that city appointees must balance support for the police service with fiscal responsibility, and that their decisions should reflect the best interests of the city. She acknowledged the challenge of navigating dual roles as a city councillor and board member and stressed the importance of maintaining clear boundaries between the two.

Shelley Carroll brought forward a motion to rescind the complainant's appointment, citing concerns about reputational risk to the Board rather than the outcome of Board votes. She explained that the complainant was under media scrutiny for alleged financial misconduct during her tenure as CEO of the Black Business and Professional Association (BBPA), a matter that had received increasing coverage from major media outlets.

Carroll noted that media scrutiny intensified shortly after she joined the Board and continued to escalate. Open-source information indicated that the investigation was initiated by BBPA members, who called for a third-party financial and operational audit. Additionally, CBC Toronto conducted an independent review of internal financial records.

At this time, there is no indication that a criminal investigation has been launched.

Carroll identified three key developments that influenced her decision to bring forward the motion to rescind the complainant's appointment: the initial financial misconduct allegations involving the complainant; public controversy sparked by Harry Jerome's daughter requesting the removal of her father's name from the BBPA's awards due to its association with the organization; and allegations that, while serving as CEO of the BBPA, the complainant hired a marketing firm in which she held a controlling interest. That same firm allegedly misrepresented its staff online using fictitious identities and stock photos.

Shelley Carroll stated that these events raised serious concerns and led her to consult the mayor, informing her of her intention to bring forward a motion.

Shelley Carroll emphasized that her decision was based on safeguarding public trust and minimizing reputational risk to both the board and city council. Her concerns were based on the regularity and tone of media coverage, not on the veracity of any evidence relating to the allegations. She had no direct communication with the complainant before or after the motion but was aware that the mayor had spoken with the complainant, advising her to consider resignation.

Shelley Carroll explained that she chose to introduce the motion as a walk-on item to avoid leaks and further media attention. She emphasized that City Hall is prone to leaks and that walk-on motions, while rare, are permitted under strict procedural review by the Clerk and Speaker. She noted that with 25 members on Council, it would have been impractical to brief each one individually on the sensitivity of the matter.

She acknowledged that the board could have operated with a vacancy and allowed a prospective appointee to attend meetings publicly without voting rights. However, she felt urgency due to having a highly qualified candidate—Chris Brillinger—ready to step in. [Redacted – s. 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24]

Shelley Carroll expressed confidence in Chris Brillinger's qualifications and community credibility. She stated that when she considered reaching out to him, she prioritized competence over optics [redacted – s. 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24]. The mayor responded positively and contacted Chris Brillinger immediately, also seeking stability. Shelley Carroll acknowledged that the process moved quickly but maintained that Chris Brillinger was the best fit for the role. She noted that Chris Brillinger is widely respected for his work in family services.

Shelley Carroll stated that the motion was circulated earlier on the day of the council meeting, though she could not recall the exact number of hours in advance.

Shelley Carroll stated that her conversations with Amber Morley over Lily Cheng regarding seeking support in the motion to rescind the complainant's appointment were based on proximity rather than political alignment [redacted – s. 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24].

Shelley Carroll admitted to speaking with a few councillors outside the board prior to introducing the motion, primarily to gauge sentiment and prepare them for the discussion. She emphasized that the mayor did not pressure her to act and was initially unaware of the media reports. Shelley Carroll initiated the conversation to confirm her concerns and seek support.

[Redacted – s. 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] Shelley Carroll emphasized that her only agenda is good governance. She believes that when governance is clear and well-structured, positive outcomes follow. She has taken on a leadership role due to the inexperience of many new councillors and the evolving nature of City Hall under a new mayor.

2. Interview of Lily Cheng

An interview was conducted with Lily Cheng regarding her relationship with the complainant and her involvement in the complainant's removal from the police service board.

[Redacted – s. 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] Lily Cheng communicated with the complainant on June 27, 2024—the day Lily Cheng became aware that a motion regarding the complainant was scheduled to be brought forward to Council. She contacted the complainant in a personal capacity, expressing concern that the process might be difficult. Lily Cheng suggested that the complainant consider taking a leave of absence or resigning to avoid a potentially public and challenging experience. Her intention was to offer support as a fellow human being [Redacted – s. 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24]

She acknowledged that informal conversations took place prior to the decision to remove the complainant. However, she recalled the mayor briefly entered her office at City Hall to mention that the motion was forthcoming. She noted that such visits are rare, given the number of City Councillors. Lily Cheng expressed concern about the difficulty of the situation and asked whether she could speak with the complainant beforehand. Although not personally close to the complainant, Lily Cheng noted that they sat beside each other during board meetings and given the public nature of the allegations, she empathized with the challenges the complainant might be facing. Lily Cheng requested time to speak with the complainant in hopes of encouraging the complainant to step down voluntarily, thereby avoiding a formal and potentially distressing process.

Lily Cheng did not feel pressured by the mayor regarding the motion. She stated that Council members are free to vote independently, and that no coercion was involved. She explained that while councillors sometimes defer to the mayor's position, the vote was democratic and unpressured.

Lily Cheng noted that the complainant appeared to struggle with understanding the process, questioning why she could be removed without a formal procedure. Lily Cheng explained that board appointments are governed by Council decisions and do not follow employment protocols. She emphasized that all appointments and removals are at the discretion of Council.

Regarding the appointment of Chris Brillinger as the complainant's replacement, Lily Cheng stated that she was not involved in the selection process. She was informed that Chris Brillinger had contributed significantly to public service [redacted – s. 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24].

Lily Cheng explained that while the typical appointment process involves interviews and a selection committee, this is not always the case. She stated that the individual who walked on the motion would likely have been involved in the selection. Either the mayor or a councillor can propose a candidate, but the final decision rests with Council. Lily Cheng was unaware whether Chris Brillinger underwent an interview process.

Lily Cheng described the mayor's role in police service board meetings as "indirect", with a designated staff member attending the public portions. She explained that the mayor sends staff to monitor proceedings because policing is an important issue to her, stating, "She's the mayor of the city—she cares about what's happening in policing."

[Redacted – s. 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] Lily Cheng ultimately supported the motion because she felt it was not ideal for a police service board member to be the subject of sustained negative media attention. She distinguished this from the experience of elected officials, who are subject to different accountability structures. Lily Cheng reiterated that Council's role is not to conduct trials, but to engage in democratic decision-making. She emphasized that the vote was free and unpressured, though she acknowledged that councillors sometimes defer to the mayor's position when considering motions.

Although Lily Cheng was not formally asked to speak with the complainant, she felt it was important to do so. She wanted to offer the complainant an opportunity to step down voluntarily, in hopes of sparing the complainant further public attention. Lily Cheng does not know whether the mayor asked anyone else to speak with the complainant or whether such a request would be considered unusual.

Lily Cheng admitted to sending the complainant a text message encouraging her to consider resignation. [Redacted – s. 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24].

3. Interview of Amber Morley

An interview was conducted with Amber Morley regarding her relationship with the complainant and her involvement in the complainant's removal from the police service board.

Amber Morley currently serves as a city councillor, deputy mayor, and the mayor's designate on the police service board. She was appointed to the TPSB in August 2023 following a re-canvassing of Councillors' interests by the newly-elected mayor. Amber Morley clarified that she is both a council appointee and the mayor's designate, noting that while some mayors choose to serve on the board directly, others appoint a designate. She believes the previous mayor served on the board during his term, whereas the current mayor opted to appoint her.

She emphasized that her primary concern is always her constituents. In her role on the board, she considers the impact of her decisions on the public, the service members, and the integrity of the board itself. She views her responsibilities as rooted in trust-building and transparency, particularly given the board's mandate to ensure adequate and effective policing.

[Redacted – s. 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24]Amber Morley referenced media reports from approximately a year prior involving the complainant's role on the board of the Harry Jerome Foundation. Allegations included misappropriation of funds and directing resources to her own company. Although no criminal investigations were launched, media reports suggested troubling findings including discrepancies in staff listings on the complainant's website.

Amber Morley initially advocated for a cautious approach, emphasizing the importance of due process and the presumption of innocence. As a Black woman, she felt it was important to ensure that the complainant was not unfairly judged. However, as additional allegations surfaced and public scrutiny intensified, she agreed that action was necessary to preserve the integrity of the board and public trust.

She confirmed that she had multiple conversations with the mayor and other council members regarding the situation. While the mayor never issued a direct order, Amber Morley acknowledged that strategic discussions took place about priorities and vision. She felt that the mayor's concerns were valid, given the nature of the allegations and their potential impact on the city's reputation.

Amber Morley seconded the motion to rescind the complainant's appointment, acknowledging that it was a difficult and uncomfortable decision. She recalled discussions about the optics of her involvement, particularly as the only Black woman on the city council. Despite these concerns, she felt that the decision was not about race or gender, but about doing what was right. She emphasized that leadership requires making difficult decisions in the interest of integrity and public confidence.

She noted that the motion was introduced as a walk-on item, which is not uncommon but was unusual for a matter of this nature. She speculated that political considerations may have influenced the timing, possibly to avoid heightened media attention. She confirmed that the motion was drafted in collaboration with the mayor's office.

[Redacted – s. 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24]She acknowledged that Chris Brillinger may not have gone through the standard civic appointments process and speculated that the appointment may have been made under the Premier's "strong mayor" powers. While she could not confirm this with certainty, she noted that if the process had not been valid, the Clerk's office would not have allowed it to proceed.

Amber Morley admitted that she often places trust in those with more experience, particularly the mayor, and that her enthusiasm for Chris Brillinger's appointment may have led her to overlook procedural questions. She emphasized that maintaining a full complement on the board is important and that she trusted the process in place.

She reiterated that she takes her oath of office seriously and strives to act with principle and integrity. She acknowledged that politics can sometimes complicate decision-making but emphasized that her focus remains on serving the public and upholding the standards of the board. She concluded that while the situation was challenging, the decision to act was necessary to maintain public trust and the credibility of the police service board.

INVESTIGATION FINDINGS

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

- 1. Shelley Carroll stated that in May 2024, the mayor invited her to a meeting with the complainant, during which both Shelley Carroll and the complainant recalled the mayor questioning why the complainant's votes didn't align with city council's agenda or other councillors on the TPSB.**
- 2. The complainant stated that her voting was questioned during the May 2024 meeting with the mayor and Shelley Carroll, specifically regarding her refusal to support a motion brought forward by Amber Morley at a police services board meeting.**
 - She explained that her decision was based on principle, citing the motion's last-minute introduction, lack of time to assess its implications, and concerns that it crossed into operational territory beyond the board's mandate.
 - The complainant had raised these issues with the Chair and Executive Director, advocating for pre-meeting discussions on complex matters.
 - The complainant stated her stance reflected a commitment to informed governance, not defiance.
- 3. During the meeting, the complainant stated she was reminded of her appointment by the previous mayor and urged to be a "team player."**
 - The mayor noted that motions and talking points were prepared by a support team, and city appointees were expected to align with them.

- Although offered staff support, the complainant declined, asserting her independence in decision-making.
 - She acknowledged her lack of policing expertise but emphasized her deep understanding of the community's relationship with policing, stating she could not be pressured into supporting motions she did not believe in.
4. **The complainant stated that she had a conversation with the mayor in which she explained the controversy and context surrounding the media allegations.**
 - The complainant noted that members of the public had written to the mayor requesting her removal from the police service board.
 - According to the complainant, this group consisted of three individuals—described as “big players”—who had previously approached the BBPA for support but were rejected during her tenure as CEO, as she felt they were not a good fit.
 - The complainant recalled the mayor acknowledging that “a lot of big players” were targeting the complainant.
 5. **The complainant was removed from the board one month later following the May 2024 meeting with the mayor and Shelley Carroll.**
 6. **Shelley Carroll acknowledged there is a general expectation for city council members serving on the board to align their votes with the broader city council agenda.**
 7. **The complainant expressed concerns that while this may appear to be a single vote against one person, it reflects a broader shift in power and influence that could have far-reaching implications.**
 8. **The motion to rescind the complainant's appointment to the board (MM19.39) was introduced as a “walk-on” item by Shelley Carroll and seconded by Amber Morley.**
 9. **Shelley Carroll asked Amber Morley to second her motion [redacted – s. 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24].**
 10. **Amber Morley acknowledged her vote in rescinding the complainant's appointment was partly due to following those more experienced than her and clarified she was referencing the mayor.**
 11. **Amber Morley noted that while walk-on motions are not uncommon, using one for this matter was unusual.**

- She speculated that political considerations—such as avoiding media attention—may have influenced the timing, and confirmed the motion was drafted in collaboration with the mayor’s office.

12. Lily Cheng vaguely recalled the mayor briefly stopping by her office to mention the upcoming motion, noting such visits are rare.

- She confirmed informal conversations occurred beforehand regarding the motion to rescind and expressed concern, asking if she could speak with the complainant prior to the decision.

13. Lily Cheng sent a series of text messages to the complainant [redacted – s. 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] encouraging the complainant to resign from the Board to avoid further public scrutiny.

- Lily Cheng stated these messages were an act of compassion.
- The complainant however interpreted these messages as warnings that more harm would follow if she did not resign.

14. [Redacted – s. 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24]

15. The motion included notice to rescind the complainant’s appointment, a proposal to appoint a replacement, Chris Brillinger and a confidential attachment.

16. A confidential attachment accompanied the motion.

- The official motion notice described the attachment as containing personal matters about an identifiable individual being considered for appointment to the Toronto police service board.
- Due to its confidential status, investigators from the IoP were not granted access to the attachment.

17. Shelley Carroll explained that the urgency of the motion stemmed from growing public concern and media coverage involving the complainant.

- While she initially supported the complainant’s continued role following allegations of financial misconduct, a second wave of claims—related to misrepresentation of her business—prompted Shelley Carroll to act, citing reputational risk and the need to protect the Board’s integrity.
- Shelley Carroll confirmed that no evidentiary documents were presented to her regarding the allegations made against the complainant and that her concerns were based on the regularity and tone of media coverage.

18. Allegations against the complainant stemmed from a CBC investigation, with no indication of criminal charges or investigations.

- Since the complainant's removal from the Board in June 2024, media coverage of the matter has ceased.

19. The Civic Appointments Committee shortlists, interviews, and recommends public members for the Toronto police service board under the City's Public Appointments Policy, which prioritizes diverse representation.

- The Public Appointments Secretariat, part of the City Clerk's Office, manages outreach and supports the committee, aligning its efforts with broader equity initiatives such as the Reconciliation Action Plan, the Action Plan to Confront Anti-Black Racism, and the Access Plan for Two-Spirit, Trans & Non-Binary Youth.

20. While City Council has the authority to appoint members "at its pleasure," both the Public Appointments Policy and the Municipal Diversity Plan emphasize that appointments should follow established procedures and equity principles.

- Although exceptions are permitted with justification, they are not standard practice. The customary appointment process—typically lengthy—was not followed in Chris Brillinger's case. Shelley Carroll claimed that adhering to the standard process is discretionary.

21. Shelley Carroll independently identified Chris Brillinger as a replacement for the complainant [Redacted – s. 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24].

22. No explanation was provided as to the urgency of the motion to replace the complainant with Chris Brillinger as it was acknowledged there was no urgency to fill the position as it would not impact the functioning of the Board.

23. Amber Morley admitted that she often places trust in those with more experience, particularly the mayor, and that her enthusiasm for Chris Brillinger's appointment may have led her to overlook procedural questions.

24. Chris Brillinger was appointed to the TPSB on June 27, 2024 to replace the complainant and on January 14, 2025 he was appointed as Vice Chair.

25. [Redacted – s. 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24]

26. [Redacted – s. 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24]

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