



PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, November 6, at 9:00AM

Livestreamed at: <https://youtube.com/live/Bxk-1WjEzww?feature=share>

The following *draft* Minutes of the hybrid public meeting of the Toronto Police Service Board that was held on November 6, 2025, are subject to approval at its next regularly scheduled meeting.

Attendance:

The following Members were present:

Shelley Carroll, Chair and Councillor
Chris Brillinger, Vice-Chair
Ann Morgan, Member
Lisa Kostakis, Member
Nick Migliore, Member
Amber Morley, Deputy Mayor and Councillor
Lily Cheng, Councillor

The following individuals were also present:

Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police, Toronto Police Service - virtual
Sandy Murray, Interim Executive Director, Toronto Police Service Board
Diana Achim, Board Administrator, Toronto Police Service Board
Jane Burton, Solicitor, City of Toronto – Legal Services Division

Declarations:

There was no declaration of interest under the Code of Conduct for Members of a Police Service Board Regulation and the *Municipal Conflict of Interest Act*.

**This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Toronto
Police Service Board that was held on November 6, 2025**

P2025-1106-0.1. Motions

Chair Carroll moved the following Motion, which was seconded by Deputy Mayor Morley:

THAT the Board add item 16 as a walk-on report titled “Correspondence from City Council – October 2025”

Chair Carroll moved the following Motion, which was seconded by Vice-Chair Brillinger:

THAT the Board reduce the allotted speaking time for all deputants from five to three minutes.

**This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Toronto
Police Service Board that was held on November 6, 2025**

P2025-1106-0.2. Chief’s Monthly Verbal Update

Chief Demkiw, Deputy Chief Johnson, Deputy Chief Pogue and Chief Transformation Officer Stairs provided updates to the Board.

For a more detailed account of the Chief’s update, see the YouTube recording starting at minute 5:23:47 here:

<https://www.youtube.com/live/Bxk-1WjEzww?si=fT4gRBTR-3h2W1CG&t=19424>

The Board received the updates.

**This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Toronto
Police Service Board that was held on November 6, 2025**

P2025-1106-1.0. Board Minutes

Confirmation of the Minutes from the regular public meeting held on September 11, 2025 and of the special public meeting held on October 6, 2025.

Deputations: Derek Moran (in person)
Kris Langenfeld (virtual)
Nicole Corrado (written only)

The Board received the deputations and approved the Minutes.

Moved by: C. Brillinger
Seconded by: N. Migliore

This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Toronto Police Service Board that was held on November 6, 2025

P2025-1106-2.0. *What We Heard* – Insights Informing the Strategic Plan for Policing in Toronto

The Board was in receipt of a report dated October 29, 2025 from Sandy Murray, Interim Executive Director.

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Services Board (Board) receive this report for information.

Deputations: Dave Shellnutt (virtual)
Derek Moran (in person)
Caryma Sa'd (in person)
Demar Kemar Hewitt, Black Legal Action Centre (virtual)
John Sewell (in person) (written submission included)
Kris Langenfeld (virtual)
Nicole Corrado (virtual) (written submission included)
Ester Eisen (written only)
Mir Bahmanyar (written only)

Vice-Chair Brillinger made remarks regarding the report and the consultation process. Board Members asked questions and discussed this matter. For a detailed account of the discussion of the Board, see the YouTube recording starting at minute 6:09:39 here:

<https://www.youtube.com/live/Bxk-1WjEzww?si=DTHWs29KBa2OLxE-&t=22168>

The Board received the deputations and the foregoing report.

Moved by: L. Kostakis

Seconded by: A. Morley

This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Toronto Police Service Board that was held on November 6, 2025

P2025-1106-3.0. Intimate Partner Violence

P2025-1106-3.1. Presentation

The Board was in receipt of a presentation provided by Inspector Roger Caracciolo and Joseph Ariwi, Manager, Analytics and Innovation.

P2025-1106-3.2. Toronto Police Service Intimate Partner Violence Annual Report for 2024

The Board was in receipt of a report dated September 29, 2025 from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendations:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive this report for information.

Board Members asked questions and discussed this matter. For a detailed account of the discussion, see the YouTube recording starting at minute 7:14:48 here:

<https://www.youtube.com/live/Bxk-1WjEzww?si=mIOUPH-UpOwrkMd1&t=26083>

Deputations: Beauvier Duquesnay, Black Lives Matata (virtual)
Marissa Kokkoros, Aura Freedom (virtual)
Harmy Mendoza, WomanACT (virtual)
Sami Pritchard, YWCA (virtual)
Nicole Corrado (written only)
Boris Zemlo (written only)

Councillor Cheng moved the following Motions, which were seconded by Vice-Chair Brillinger:

THAT the Board:

- 1. Forward this report to the City's Economic and Community Development Committee;**
- 2. Recommend that the Economic and Community Development Committee direct the Executive Director, Social Development, in collaboration with local gender-based violence organizations serving identified intimate partner violence (IPV) "hot spots", local gender-based violence organizations serving the Indigenous communities and the Toronto Police Service:**
 - a) Co-develop and implement timely, proactive, community-driven, and culturally responsive IPV response plans tailored to each IPV "hot spot";**
 - b) Co-develop and implement timely, proactive, community-driven, and culturally responsive IPV response plans tailored to address IPV in Indigenous communities in collaboration with the Aboriginal Affairs Advisory Committee and Indigenous IPV serving organizations.**
 - c) Establish clear indicators and mechanisms to monitor progress and evaluate outcomes in IPV "hot spots," as well as outcomes**

for Indigenous communities, families and individuals experiencing and impacted by IPV.

- d) Report back as part of the City's SafeTO updates on the development, implementation, and impact of these IPV "hot spot" tailored plans and plans tailored to Indigenous communities.

3. Direct the Chief of Police to ensure Toronto Police Service collaboration in the City of Toronto's development of the IPV "hot spot" tailored plans, and tailored plans focused on Indigenous communities, with a report back on resulting TPS efforts in the next IPV Annual Report.

THAT the Board direct the Chief of Police to consider including the following in all future Toronto Police Service Annual Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) Reports:

- 1. Officer Training Standards and Evaluation**
 - 1. A clear description of the Course Training Standards for Intimate Partner Violence training;**
 - 2. A clear description of evaluation methods for current IPV training, including learning outcomes, performance objectives and application of learning.**
- 2. Survivor-Centred Feedback and Accountability**
 - 1. A plan to regularly incorporate survivor feedback into officer training, protocols, and policy development;**
 - 2. An assessment of the feasibility and structure of creating a Survivor Advisory Committee to guide this work.**
- 3. Data on IPV Response and Service Connection**
 - 1. The number of referrals made to specialized IPV support services;**
 - 2. The number and percentage of individuals referred to those services;**
 - 3. Identified barriers that prevent survivors from accessing help.**

THAT the Board request the Chief to consider including a report on Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls (MMIWG) as a subsection of the annual IPV report.

The Board approved the Motions, received the deputations, and the presentation, and approved the foregoing report.

Moved by: L. Kostakis
Seconded by: C. Brillinger

This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Toronto Police Service Board that was held on November 6, 2025

P2025-1106-4.0. Update on the Implementation of Auditor General Recommendations

The Board was in receipt of a report dated September 30, 2025 from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive the following report and forward a copy to the City of Toronto (City) Council for information.

Board Members asked questions and discussed this matter. For a detailed account of the discussion of the Board, see the YouTube recording starting at minute 7:52:11 here:

<https://www.youtube.com/live/Bxk-1WjEzww?si=O9yfiDnCSkjd9Phf&t=28329>

Deputations: Nicole Corrado (virtual) (written submission included)

Councillor Cheng moved the following Motion, which was seconded by Deputy Mayor Morley:

THAT the Board request the Chief of Police to include expected project timelines in future Auditor General reports, in a manner and language consistent with expected project timeline reporting by other City partners engaged in the project.

Vice-Chair Brillinger moved the following Motion, which was seconded by Member Kostakis:

THAT the Board request the Inspector General of Policing to provide an update with respect to the development of response time standards.

The Board received the deputation, approved the Motions and the foregoing report.

Moved by: C. Brillinger
Seconded by: L. Kostakis

This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Toronto Police Service Board that was held on November 6, 2025

P2025-1106-5.0 Annual Report on Training & Development – 2024

The Board was in receipt of a report dated August 14, 2025 from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Board receive this report for information.

Board Members asked questions and discussed this matter. For a detailed account of the discussion of the Board, see the YouTube recording starting at minute 8:16:13 here:

<https://www.youtube.com/live/Bxk-1WjEzww?si=pstfF8k7gLRGyuyb&t=29771>

Deputations: Nicole Corrado (virtual) (written submission included)
Miguel Avila-Velarde (in person)

The Board received the deputations and the foregoing report.

Moved by: S. Carroll
Seconded by: C. Brillinger

This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Toronto Police Service Board that was held on November 6, 2025

P2025-1106-6.0 Annual Use of Force Report (2024)

The Board was in receipt of a report dated November 6, 2025 from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Board receive this report for information.

Board Members asked questions and discussed this matter. For a detailed account of the discussion of the Board, see the YouTube recording starting at minute 8:34:11 here:

<https://www.youtube.com/live/Bxk-1WjEzww?si=xhIk2QB7iJFOVq4j&t=30849>

Deputations: Beauvier Duquesnay (virtual)
Nicole Corrado (virtual) (written submission included)
Miguel Avila-Velarde (in person)
Law Union of Ontario (written only)

The Board received the deputations and the foregoing report.

Moved by: C. Brillinger
Seconded by: A. Morley

This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Toronto Police Service Board that was held on November 6, 2025

P2025-1106-7.0 Request for Funds: 2025 Chief's Gala in Support of Victim Services Toronto

The Board was in receipt of a report dated October 9, 2025 from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) approve an expenditure in the amount of \$10 thousand (K) from the Board's Special Fund to support the annual Chief's Gala in Support of Victim Services Toronto (V.S.T.).

The Board approved the foregoing report.

Moved by: L. Kostakis
Seconded by: A. Morgan

This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Toronto Police Service Board that was held on November 6, 2025

P2025-1106-8.0 Facial Recognition System Follow-up- 2025

The Board was in receipt of a report dated November 6, 2025 from Sandy Murray, Interim Executive Director.

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Board receive this report for information.

Deputation: Nicole Corrado (written only)

The Board received the deputation and the foregoing report.

Moved by: C. Brillinger
Seconded by: L. Kostakis

This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Toronto Police Service Board that was held on November 6, 2025

P2025-1106-9.0 Special Constable Appointments and Re-Appointments – November 2025

The Board was in receipt of a report dated September 16, 2025 from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) approve the agency-initiated appointment and re-appointment requests for the individuals listed in this report as special constables for the Toronto Community Housing Corporation (T.C.H.C.), the Toronto Transit Commission (T.T.C.) and the City of Toronto Traffic Agents (C.T.A.).

Board Members asked questions and discussed this matter. For a detailed account of the discussion of the Board, see the YouTube recording starting at minute 8:48:30 here:

<https://www.youtube.com/live/Bxk-1WjEzww?si=6yJMYzy7o4iZHQcg&t=31706>

Deputation: Miguel Avila-Velarde (in person)

The Board received the deputation and the foregoing report.

Moved by: L. Kostakis

Seconded by: A. Morley

This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Toronto Police Service Board that was held on November 6, 2025

P2025-1106-10.0. Receipt of Donation

The Board was in receipt of a report dated September 8, 2025 from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) approve the acceptance of the donation being requested in this report.

Deputations: Nicole Corrado (virtual) (written submission included)
Miguel Avila-Velarde (in person)

The Board received the deputations and approved the foregoing report.

Moved by: S. Carroll

Seconded by: L. Kostakis

This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Toronto Police Service Board that was held on November 6, 2025

P2025-1106-11.0. Semi-Annual Report: Publication of Expenses – January 1 to June 30, 2025

The Board was in receipt of a report dated November 7, 2025 from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Board receive this report for information.

The Board received the foregoing report.

Moved by: C. Brillinger
Seconded by: L. Kostakis

This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Toronto Police Service Board that was held on November 6, 2025

P2025-1106-12.0. Chief's Administrative Investigation Reports

P2025-1106-12.1. Chief's Administrative Investigation into the Custody Death of Complainant 2024.26

The Board was in receipt of a report dated August 1, 2025, from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive the following report.

P2025-1106-12.2. Chief's Administrative Investigation into the Firearms Death of a Person – Complainant 2024.37

The Board was in receipt of a report dated August 1, 2025 from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive the following report.

P2025-1106-12.3. Chief Administrative Investigation of the Custody Injury of Complainant 2024.89

The Board was in receipt of a report dated August 1, 2025, from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive the following report.

P2025-1106-12.4. Chief Administrative Investigation of the Custody Injury of Complainant 2025.01

The Board was in receipt of a report dated August 1, 2025, from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive the following report.

P2025-1106-12.5. Chief Administrative Investigation of the Custody Death of Complainant 2025.02

The Board was in receipt of a report dated September 2, 2025, from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive the following report.

P2025-1106-12.6. Chief Administrative Investigation of the Custody Injury of Complainant 2025.07

The Board was in receipt of a report dated August 1, 2025, from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive the following report.

P2025-1106-12.7. Chief Administrative Investigation of the Custody Injury of Complainant 2025.08

The Board was in receipt of a report dated September 2, 2025, from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive the following report.

P2025-1106-12.8. Chief Administrative Investigation into the Custody Injury of Complainant 2025.09

The Board was in receipt of a report dated September 2, 2025, from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive the following report.

P2025-1106-12.9. Chief Administrative Investigation of the Custody Injury of Complainant 2025.11

The Board was in receipt of a report dated September 2, 2025, from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive the following report.

P2025-1106-12.10. Chief Administrative Investigation of the Custody Death of Complainant 2025.12

The Board was in receipt of a report dated September 2, 2025, from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive the following report.

P2025-1106-12.11. Chief Administrative Investigation into the Vehicle Injuries to Complainant 2025.13

The Board was in receipt of a report dated September 2, 2025, from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive the following report.

P2025-1106-12.12. Chief Administrative Investigation into the Custody Injury of Complainant 2025.15

The Board was in receipt of a report dated September 2, 2025, from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive the following report.

P2025-1106-12.13. Chief Administrative Investigation into the Custody Injury of Complainant 2025.16

The Board was in receipt of a report dated September 2, 2025, from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive the following report.

Board Members asked questions and discussed this matter. For a detailed account of the discussion of the Board, see the YouTube recording starting at minute 9:05:35 here:

<https://www.youtube.com/live/Bxk-1WjEzww?si=ePcuQeM18Zac4FiF&t=32733>

Deputations: Nicole Corrado (virtual) (written submission included)
Dave Shellnutt (virtual)

The Board received the deputations and the foregoing reports.

Moved by: L. Kostakis
Seconded by: C. Brillinger

This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Toronto Police Service Board that was held on November 6, 2025

**P2025-1106-13.0. Request for Review of a Service Complaint Investigation:
– Professional Standards Case Number – PRS-093892**

The Board was in receipt of a report dated June 2, 2025, 2025 from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board):

- 1) Determine whether to concur with the decision that no further action was required with respect to the complaint, and
- 2) Advise the complainant, the Office of the Independent Police Review Director (O.I.P.R.D.) and the Chief of Police of the disposition of the complaint, in writing, with reasons.

Deputation: Nicole Corrado (virtual and written submission)

Board Members reviewed the confidential materials and appendices provided by the Complainant, as well as her verbal submissions.

Vice-Chair Brillinger moved the following Motion, which was seconded by Member Kostakis:

THAT the Board:

1. **Concur with the Chief's decision that no further action is required with respect to this matter; and**
2. **Notify the Complainant, LECA and Chief Demkiw of the Board's decision.**

The Board received the deputation, the confidential appendices and the materials submitted by the Complainant, and approved the Motion.

Moved by: C. Brillinger
Seconded by: L. Kostakis

This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Toronto Police Service Board that was held on November 6, 2025

**P2025-1106-14.0. Request for Review of a Service Complaint Investigation: –
– Professional Standards (P.R.S.) Case Number – PRS-102706
Inspectorate of Policing (I.O.P.) Complaint Number: 24-3851/INV-25-50**

The Board was in receipt of a report dated November 6, 2025 from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board):

- 3) Determine whether to concur with the decision that no further action be taken with respect to this complaint, and;
- 4) Advise the complainant, the Inspector General of Policing (I.G.), and the Solicitor General of any steps taken in response to this complaint.

Deputations: Kris Langenfeld (virtual)
Nicole Corrado (only)

Vice-Chair Brillinger moved the following Motion, which was seconded by Member Kostakis:

THAT the Board:

- 1. Concur with the Chief's decision that no further action is required with respect to this matter; and**
- 2. Notify the Complainant, the I.G. and the Solicitor General of the Board's decision.**

The Board received the deputations and approved the Motion.

Moved by: C. Brillinger
Seconded by: L. Kostakis

This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Toronto Police Service Board that was held on November 6, 2025

P2025-1106-15.0. Review of Board Advisory Bodies and Public Engagement

The Board was in receipt of this following new business item submitted by Chair Carroll:

As the Toronto Police Service Board advances development of its forthcoming Strategic Plan for Policing in Toronto, and continues to develop the implementation framework for the recommendations of the Ontario Human Rights Commission's *From Impact to Action* report on addressing anti-Black racism, it is timely to review the Board's overall framework for community engagement and advisory structures.

This includes a focused review of the Board's Mental Health and Addictions Advisory Panel (MHAAP) and Anti-Racism Advisory Panel (ARAP), as well as a broader assessment of how the Board engages residents, community partners, and interest groups through its public meetings, deputations, and other consultation mechanisms.

The objective of this review is to ensure that the Board's engagement and advisory structures:

- Reflect the priorities and values of the forthcoming Strategic Plan;
- Support the implementation of commitments arising from the Ontario Human Rights Commission's recommendations on anti-Black racism;
- Are inclusive, accessible, and effective in soliciting and generating community-informed policy guidance; and
- Complement the Toronto Police Service's ongoing transformation work and modernization of its Chief's Community Consultative Committees (CCCs).

The review will identify opportunities to strengthen collaboration, accountability, and community voice across the Board's advisory and engagement ecosystem.

Recommendations:

THAT the Board

1. Direct the Executive Director to undertake a comprehensive review of the Board's advisory bodies and engagement mechanisms, including:
 - a. The Mental Health and Addictions Advisory Panel (MHAAP) and the Anti-Racism Advisory Panel (ARAP);
 - b. The Board's public engagement practices, including the deputation process and other forms of public consultation;
2. Direct the Executive Director to collaborate with the Service's Chief Transformation Officer (CTO) in his review of the Chief's Community Consultative Committees, ensuring alignment with the Service's ongoing community engagement modernization initiatives;
3. Direct the Executive Director report back to the Board by Q2 2026 with recommendations to enhance the effectiveness, representation, and coordination of the Board's advisory and engagement structures, including any proposed updates to mandates, terms of reference, recruitment processes, and reporting relationships; and
4. Temporarily pause recruitment processes and new appointments to its Mental Health and Addictions Advisory Panel (MHAAP) and Anti-Racism Advisory Panel (ARAP) pending the outcome of the review, and the implementation of any resulting recommendations.

Deputations: Derek Moran (in person)
Kris Langenfeld (virtual)
Nicole Corrado (written only)

The Board received the deputations and approved the Motion.

Moved by: C. Brillinger
Seconded by: A. Morley

This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Toronto Police Service Board that was held on November 6, 2025

P2025-1106-16.0. Correspondence from City Council – October 2025

The Board was in receipt of a report dated October 30, 2025 from Sandy Murray, Interim Executive Director.

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Board receive the following report for information.

Chair Carroll moved the following Motion, which was seconded by Vice-Chair Brillinger:

THAT the Board request the Chief consider the correspondence from City Council.

The Board approved the Motion.

Moved by: C. Brillinger
Seconded by: A. Morley

This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Toronto Police Service Board that was held on November 6, 2025

P2025-1106-17.0. Confidential

At the beginning of the meeting, Chair Carroll moved the following Motion, which was seconded by Deputy Mayor Morley.

MOTION

THAT the Toronto Police Service Board adjourn the public portion of its meeting to move *in camera* to discuss the following subject matters in accordance with Section 44(1) and (2) of the *Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019*:

1. **Investigative Matters**
2. **Operational Matters**
3. **Labour Relations Matters**
4. **Human Resources Matters**

The Board adjourned the public portion of the meeting and reconvened the *in camera* meeting for consideration of confidential matters pursuant to Section 44(1) of the *Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019* (C.S.P.A) until 1PM, when it returned to continue the public portion of the meeting.

The following Members attended the in-camera meeting:

Shelley Carroll, Chair and Councillor
Chris Brillinger, Vice-Chair
Ann Morgan, Member - virtual
Lisa Kostakis, Member
Nick Migliore, Member
Amber Morley, Deputy Mayor and Councillor

Next Board Meeting

Regular Public Meeting

Date: December 10, 2025

Location: 40 College Street, Auditorium

Minutes Approved by:

-original signed-

Shelley Carroll
Chair

Members of the Toronto Police Service Board

Shelley Carroll, Chair
Amber Morley, Deputy Mayor & Member
Lily Cheng, Member & Councillor
Nick Migliore, Member

Chris Brillinger, Vice-Chair
Lisa Kostakis, Member
Ann Morgan, Member



1. Confirmation of the Minutes from the regular public meeting held on September 11, 2025 and of the special public meeting held on October 6, 2025



PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, September 11, at 9:00AM

Livestreamed at: <https://youtube.com/live/Sg-kMChs35I?feature=share>

The following *draft* Minutes of the hybrid public meeting of the Toronto Police Service Board that was held on September 11, 2025, are subject to approval at its next regularly scheduled meeting.

Attendance:

The following Members were present:

Shelley Carroll, Chair and Councillor
Chris Brillinger, Vice-Chair
Ann Morgan, Member - virtual
Lisa Kostakis, Member
Nick Migliore, Member
Amber Morley, Deputy Mayor and Councillor

The following individuals were also present:

Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police, Toronto Police Service
Sandy Murray, Interim Executive Director, Toronto Police Service Board
Diana Achim, Board Administrator, Toronto Police Service Board
Jane Burton, Solicitor, City of Toronto – Legal Services Division

Declarations:

There was no declaration of interest under the Code of Conduct for Members of a Police Service Board Regulation and the *Municipal Conflict of Interest Act*.

**This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Toronto
Police Service Board that was held on September 11, 2025**

P2025-0911-0.1. Chair's Opening Remarks

Chair Carroll made the following remarks:

While we started our meeting by paying our respects to the land which we are gathered on, I want to continue by grounding us in the spirit of Truth and Reconciliation. On September 30th, people across the country wear orange for the National Day for Truth and Reconciliation – colloquially known as Orange Shirt Day.

Spanning over a century, the Residential schools, alongside Indian Day Schools were made mandatory for children across the nation, subjecting them to neglect and abuse, leaving impacts still experienced across Indigenous peoples today.

This may feel like a distant part of our history – both geographically and in time. However, Canada's first residential school, the Mohawk Institute, is a short 105 kilometers from where we sit today. Its doors only closed in 1970; and I'd like to mention that the last residential school only closed in 1996. This is recent, and it is real.

While we take time to reflect on the truths of this profound cultural harm, it is equally important to recognize the legacy of this system, which continues to impact Indigenous communities both locally and across the nation. From the loss of language, culture, and identity to systemic inequities in health, education, and child welfare—and, most relevant to those of us gathered here, justice. We cannot begin to understand the social determinants of justice for Indigenous peoples without first understanding the truth about residential schools and the lasting intergenerational impacts that continue to affect many Indigenous families and communities.

*The **Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada** outlined a clear path forward. Reconciliation, they said, requires:*

- Awareness of the past*
- Acknowledge for the harm*
- Atonement for the causes*
- Action for change*

*At its core, reconciliation is about building and maintaining **mutually respectful relationships**—ones rooted in **truth, justice, and healing**.*

That is the work we are called to do. And it's work that this Board must continue to carry forward—not just on September 30, but every day. In our policies, in our priorities, and in our commitment to a safer and more equitable future for all.

This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Toronto Police Service Board that was held on September 11, 2025

P2025-0911-0.2. Moment of Silence

Chair Carroll made the following remarks:

As we gather for our meeting today on September 11, it's important that we take a moment to reflect on the significance of this date.

September 11, 2001, remains one of the most deeply impactful days in modern history. The world watched in shock as thousands of lives were lost—civilians, first responders, and public servants who ran toward danger in the hopes of saving others.

That kind of bravery and selflessness continues to inspire us all. It's in moments like these that we're reminded of the value of public service, the importance of community, and the enduring need to support one another—both here at home and across borders.

Let's take a moment now to reflect and honour the lives lost on that day, and the legacy they leave behind.

A moment of silence was observed.

This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Toronto Police Service Board that was held on September 11, 2025

P2025-0911-0.3. Chief's Monthly Verbal Update

Chief Demkiw and Deputy Chief Pogue provided updates to the Board.

For a more detailed account of the Chief's update, see the YouTube recording starting at minute 4:24:00 here:

<https://www.youtube.com/live/Sg-kMChs35I?si=0mtRrLjKt3QNuF1a&t=15837>

The Board received the updates.

This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Toronto Police Service Board that was held on September 11, 2025

P2025-0911-1.0. Board Minutes

Confirmation of the Minutes from the regular public meeting held on July 17, 2025.

The Board approved the Minutes.

Moved by: S. Carroll
Seconded by: C. Brillinger

This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Toronto Police Service Board that was held on September 11, 2025

P2025-0911-2.0. The Downtown Community Outreach Response and Engagement Team Pilot Project

P2025-0911-2.0. Presentation

The Board was in receipt of a presentation provided by Chief Superintendent Kelly Skinner and Dr. Shovita Padhi, Associate Medical Officer of Health, Toronto Public Health.

P2025-0911-2.0. The Downtown Community Outreach Response and Engagement Team Pilot Project Update

The Board was in receipt of a report dated July 22, 2025 from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendations:

This report contains an update on the Downtown Community Outreach Response and Engagement (CORE) Team Pilot Project. It is recommended that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) approve this report..

Board Members asked questions and discussed this matter. For a detailed account of the discussion, see the YouTube recording starting at minute 5:26:34 here: <https://www.youtube.com/live/Sg-kMChs35I?si=5l2imyGI43Gresm9&t=19593>

Deputations: Daniel Tate, IntegrityTO (in person)
Brook Coatsworth (virtual)
Nicole Corrado (virtual) (written submission included)
Patience Evbagharu (in person)
Kris Langenfeld (virtual)
Andreas Kalogiannides (written only)
Josie Renda (written only)
Ariel Leavitt (written only)

The Board received the deputations, presentation and approved the foregoing report.

Moved by: A. Morley
Seconded by: L. Kostakis

This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Toronto Police Service Board that was held on September 11, 2025

P2025-0911-3.0. Body-Worn Camera 2024 Annual Report

The Board was in receipt of a report dated August 8, 2025 from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Services Board (Board) receive this report for information.

Deputations: Beau Duquesnay, Black Lives Matata (virtual)
Derek Moran (in person) (written submission included)
Kris Langenfeld (virtual)
Nicole Corrado (written submission only)

Board Members asked questions and discussed this matter. For a detailed account of the discussion of the Board, see the YouTube recording starting at minute 6:08:13 here:

<https://www.youtube.com/live/Sg-kMChs35I?si=4yRKlpqVRdcU6hUr&t=22091>

The Board received the deputations and the foregoing report.

Moved by: L. Kostakis
Seconded by: A. Morley

This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Toronto Police Service Board that was held on September 11, 2025

P2025-0911-4.0. Update on Third-Party Delivery of Vulnerable Person Registry (V.P.R.)

The Board was in receipt of a report dated June 16, 2025 from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive this report for information and that a copy of this report be forwarded to the Ombudsman Toronto (Ombudsman).

Board Members asked questions and discussed this matter. For a detailed account of the discussion of the Board, see the YouTube recording starting at minute 6:30:26 here:

<https://www.youtube.com/live/Sg-kMChs35I?si=GqbBedPZ-8B4jFmL&t=23423>

Deputations: Nicole Corrado (virtual) (written submission included)
Kris Langenfeld (virtual)

Vice-Chair Brillinger moved the following Motion, which was seconded by Deputy Mayor Morley:

THAT the Board:

- 1. Authorize the Chief, working with the Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police (OACP), to work with the Board representative(s) on the Canadian Association of Police Governance (CAPG) to engage in joint advocacy on this issue; and**
- 2. Advise the Ministry of the Attorney General of the status of the Vulnerable Persons Registry redevelopment, highlighting the need for a coordinated interjurisdictional approach, and adequate and equitable funding for low-income vulnerable individuals to participate in the Medic Alert VPR province-wide.**

The Board received the deputations, and approved the Motion and the foregoing report.

Moved by: C. Brillinger
Seconded by: A. Morley

This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Toronto Police Service Board that was held on September 11, 2025

P2025-0911-5.0 Correspondence from City Council – June 2025

The Board was in receipt of a report dated July 31, 2025 from Sandy Murray, Interim Executive Director.

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Board receive this report for information.

Board Members asked questions and discussed this matter. For a detailed account of the discussion of the Board, see the YouTube recording starting at minute 6:44:47 here:

<https://www.youtube.com/live/Sg-kMChs35I?si=0knLOxrA9Wb-vZbO&t=24285>

Deputy Mayor Morley moved the following Motion, which was seconded by Chair Carroll:

THAT the Board direct the Chief of Police to:

- a) consider improvements to enforcement of parking, stopping, and standing by-laws, especially those contributing to Vision Zero.**
- b) explore opportunities for collaborative action on speed racing on expressways and nearby streets with the City of Toronto Noise Team and other police services, and report back by May 2026.**
- c) engage with appropriate City divisions and government bodies, such as Parks and Recreation, Ports Toronto, Municipal Licensing and Standards, and the City Manager's Office, on the creation of an action plan to ensure safety along Toronto's waterfront for the summer of 2026.**
- d) explore opportunities for continued and enhanced enforcement action on unsafe use of personal watercraft and illegal leasing and storage of personal watercraft on public property, in collaboration with applicable City divisions.**
- e) request the Chief to review the Auditor General's report and consider initiating an investigation in relation to fraud involving multiple City of Toronto electricity accounts**

Deputation: Kris Langenfeld (virtual)

The Board approved the Motion, and received the deputation and the foregoing report.

Moved by: A. Morley
Seconded by: S. Carroll

This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Toronto Police Service Board that was held on September 11, 2025

P2025-0911-6.0. Toronto Police Service Board – 2026 Meeting Schedule

The Board was in receipt of a report dated August 1, 2025 from Sandy Murray, Interim Executive Director.

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) approve the 2026 meeting schedule as outlined in this report.

The Board approved the foregoing report.

Moved by: L. Kostakis
Seconded by: S. Carroll

This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Toronto Police Service Board that was held on September 11, 2025

P2025-0911-7.0. Special Constable Appointments and Re-Appointments – September 2025

The Board was in receipt of a report dated July 23, 2025 from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) approve the agency-initiated appointment and re-appointment requests for the individuals listed in this report as special constables for the Toronto Community Housing Corporation (T.C.H.C.) and the Toronto Transit Commission (T.T.C.).

The Board approved the foregoing report.

Moved by: C. Brillinger

Seconded by: L. Kostakis

This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Toronto Police Service Board that was held on September 11, 2025

P2025-0911-8.0 Contract Awards to Olin Canada ULC, Lloyd Libke Inc., Rampart International Corp., and M.D. Charlton Ltd. for Ammunition

The Board was in receipt of a report dated April 11, 2025, from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

This report recommends that:

1. Approve a contract award to Olin Canada ULC (Olin) for ammunition in the amount of \$622,000;
2. Approve a contract award to Lloyd Libke Inc. (Lloyd Libke) for ammunition in the amount of \$354,000;
3. Approve a contract award to Rampart International Corp. (Rampart) for ammunition in the amount of \$78,000;
4. Approve a contract award to M.D. Charlton Ltd. (M.D.C.) for ammunition in the amount of \$54,000; and
5. Authorize the Chair to execute all required agreements and related documents on behalf of the Board, subject to approval by the City Solicitor, as to form.

Deputation: Nicole Corrado (written submission only)

The Board received the written deputation and approved the foregoing report.

Moved by: N. Migliore
Seconded by: S. Carroll

This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Toronto Police Service Board that was held on September 11, 2025

P2025-0911-9.0 Budget Variance Reports

P2025-0911-9.1. 2025 Operating Budget Variance for the Toronto Police Service, Period Ending June 30, 2025

The Board was in receipt of a report dated August 21, 2025 from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) forward a copy of this report to the City of Toronto (City) Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer for information and inclusion in the variance reporting to the City's Budget Committee

P2025-0911-9.2. Capital Budget Variance Report for the Toronto Police Service, Period Ending June 30, 2025

The Board was in receipt of a report dated August 8, 2025 from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) forward a copy of this report to the City of Toronto's (City) Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer for inclusion in the City's overall capital variance report to the City's Budget Committee

P2025-0911-9.3. 2025 Operating Budget Variance for the Toronto Police Service Parking Enforcement Unit, Period Ending June 30, 2025

The Board was in receipt of a report dated August 7, 2025 from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) forward a copy of this report to the City of Toronto (City) Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer for information and inclusion in the variance reporting to the City's Budget Committee

P2025-0911-9.4. 2025 Operating Budget Variance Report for the Toronto Police Service Board, Period Ending June 30, 2025

The Board was in receipt of a report dated August 8, 2025 from Sandy Murray, Interim Executive Director.

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive this report and forward a copy to the City of Toronto (City) Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer for information and inclusion in the variance reporting to the City's Budget Committee

Board Members asked questions and discussed this matter. For a detailed account of the discussion of the Board, see the YouTube recording starting at minute 7:02:19 here:

<https://www.youtube.com/live/Sg-kMChs35I?si=8rXvQgRM2qgIMwre&t=25336>

Deputations: Derek Moran (in person) (written submission included)
Miguel Avila (in person)

The Board received the deputations and approved the foregoing reports.

Moved by: S. Carroll
Seconded by: C. Brillinger

This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Toronto Police Service Board that was held on September 11, 2025

P2025-0911-10.0. Semi-Annual Report: Toronto Police Service Board Special Fund Unaudited Statement: January to June 2025

The Board was in receipt of a report dated August 5, 2025 from Sandy Murray, Executive Director.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Board receive the report on the Toronto Police Service Board's Special Fund un-audited statement for the period of January to June 2025.

Chair Carroll moved the following Motion, which was seconded by Vice-Chair Brillinger:

THAT the Board:

Establish the requirement that the Board receives advance notice and invitations for all events and initiatives for which it provides funding through the Special Fund.

The Board approved the Motion and received the foregoing report.

Moved by: S. Carroll
Seconded by: C. Brillinger

This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Toronto Police Service Board that was held on September 11, 2025

P2025-0911-11.0. Establishment of 2026 Budget Committee

The Board was in receipt of a report dated July 31, 2025 from Sandy Murray, interim Executive Director.

Recommendation:

1. The Toronto Police Service Board designate Chair Shelley Carroll, and two additional Board Members, to be selected by the Board, as members of the 2026 Budget Committee; and
2. The Board forward a copy of this report to the City Manager, and to the Deputy City Manager and Chief Financial Officer (CFO)

Member Migliore moved the following Motion, which was seconded by Member Morgan:

THAT the Board amend recommendation 1. to now read:

The Toronto Police Service Board designate Chair Shelley Carroll, Vice-Chair Brillinger, and Member Lisa Kostakis as members of the 2026 Budget Committee.

The Board approved the Motion and received the foregoing report.

Moved by: N. Migliore
Seconded by: A. Morgan

This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Toronto Police Service Board that was held on September 11, 2025

P2025-0911-12.0. Chief's Administrative Investigation Reports

P2025-0911-12.1. Chief's Administrative Investigation into the Custody Injury of Complainant 2024.11

The Board was in receipt of a report dated July 8, 2025, from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive the following report.

P2025-0911-12.2. Chief's Administrative Investigation into the Vehicle Injury of Complainant 2024.54

The Board was in receipt of a report dated July 8, 2025 from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive the following report.

P2025-0911-12.3. Chief Administrative Investigation of the Custody Injury of Complainant 2024.66

The Board was in receipt of a report dated July 8, 2025, from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive the following report.

P2025-0911-12.4. Chief Administrative Investigation of the Vehicle Injury of Complainant 2024.82

The Board was in receipt of a report dated July 8, 2025, from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive the

following report.

P2025-0911-12.5. Chief Administrative Investigation of the Custody Death of Complainant 2024.85

The Board was in receipt of a report dated July 8, 2025, from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive the following report.

P2025-0911-12.6. Chief Administrative Investigation of the Vehicle Injury of Complainant 2024.87

The Board was in receipt of a report dated July 8, 2025, from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive the following report.

P2025-0911-12.7. Chief Administrative Investigation of the Vehicle Injury of Complainant 2024.88

The Board was in receipt of a report dated July 8, 2025, from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive the following report.

P2025-0911-12.8. Chief Administrative Investigation of the Firearm Discharged at a Person - Complainant 2024.90

The Board was in receipt of a report dated July 8, 2025, from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive the following report.

P2025-0911-12.9. Chief Administrative Investigation of the Custody Injury of Complainant 2025.04

The Board was in receipt of a report dated July 8, 2025, from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive the following report.

P2025-0911-12.10. Chief Administrative Investigation of the Custody Death of Complainant 2025.05

The Board was in receipt of a report dated July 8, 2025, from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive the following report.

P2025-0911-12.11. Chief Administrative Investigation of the Custody Injury of Complainant 2025.06

The Board was in receipt of a report dated July 8, 2025, from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive the following report.

Board Members asked questions and discussed this matter. For a detailed account of the discussion of the Board, see the YouTube recording starting at minute 7:10:56 here:

<https://www.youtube.com/live/Sg-kMChs35I?si=x09hQVAhtRHX1lb6&t=25854>

Deputation: Nicole Corrado (virtual)

The Board received the deputation and the foregoing reports.

Moved by: S. Carroll
Seconded by: L. Kostakis

This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Toronto Police Service Board that was held on September 11, 2025

**P2025-0911-13.0. Request for Review of a Service Complaint Investigation: – Professional Standards (P.R.S.) Case Number – PRS-102707
Inspectorate of Policing (I.O.P.) Complaint Number: 24-381/INV-25-49**

The Board was in receipt of a report dated July 29, 2025 from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board):

- 1) Determine whether to concur with the decision that no further action be taken with respect to this complaint, and;
- 2) Advise the complainant, the Inspector General of Policing (I.G.), and the Solicitor General of any steps taken in response to this complaint.

Deputation: Nicole Corrado (written submission only)

Chair Carroll moved the following Motion which was seconded by Vice-Chair Brillinger:

THAT the Board:

- 1. Concur with the Chief's decision that no further action is required with respect to this matter; and**
- 2. Notify the Complainant, I.G. and Solicitor General of the Board's decision.**

The Board received the depositions and approved the Motion.

Moved by: S. Carroll
Seconded by: C. Brillinger

This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Toronto Police Service Board that was held on September 11, 2025

P2025-0911-14.0. Request for Review of a Service Complaint Investigation: – Professional Standards Case Number – PRS-098916

The Board was in receipt of a report dated April 10, 2025 from Myron Demkiw, Chief

of Police.

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board):

- 3) Determine whether to concur with the decision that no further action was required with respect to the complaint, and
- 4) Advise the complainant, the Office of the Independent Police Review Director (O.I.P.R.D.) and the Chief of Police of the disposition of the complaint, in writing, with reasons.

Deputation: Naomi Sayers (in person)
Nicole Corrado (written submission only)

Vice-Chair Brillinger moved the following Motion, which was seconded by Chair Carroll:

THAT the Board:

- 1. Concur with the Chief's decision that no further action is required with respect to this matter; and**
- 2. Notify the Complainant, LECA and Chief Demkiw of the Board's decision.**

The Board received the depositions and approved the Motion.

Moved by: S. Carroll
Seconded by: A. Morgan

This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Toronto Police Service Board that was held on September 11, 2025

P2025-0911-15.0. Recommendation for Board Ratification of Collective Bargaining Settlement with the Toronto Police Senior Officers' Organization dated August 8, 2025

The Board was in receipt of a report dated September 2, 2025 from Shelley Carroll, Chair.

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board):

- 1) Ratify the Collective Bargaining Memorandum of Settlement reached between the Board and the Toronto Police Senior Officers' Organization (S.O.O.) on August 8, 2025; and
- 2) Apply the same monetary settlement, inclusive of wage and benefit enhancements, negotiated with the S.O.O., to Excluded staff.

The Board approved the foregoing report and confidential appendices.

Moved by: C. Brillinger
Seconded by: N. Migliore

This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Toronto Police Service Board that was held on September 11, 2025

P2025-0911-16.0. Confidential

At the beginning of the meeting, Chair Carroll moved the following Motion, which was seconded by Member Migliore.

MOTION

THAT the Toronto Police Service Board adjourn the public portion of its meeting to move *in camera* to discuss the following subject matters in accordance with Section 44(1) and (2) of the *Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019*:

1. **Investigative Matters**
2. **Operational Matters**
3. **Labour Relations Matters**
4. **Human Resources Matters**

The Board adjourned the public portion of the meeting and reconvened the *in camera* meeting for consideration of confidential matters pursuant to Section 44(1) of the *Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019* (C.S.P.A) until 1PM, when it returned to continue the public portion of the meeting.

The following Members attended the in-camera meeting:

Shelley Carroll, Chair and Councillor
Chris Brillinger, Vice-Chair
Ann Morgan, Member - virtual
Lisa Kostakis, Member
Nick Migliore, Member
Amber Morley, Deputy Mayor and Councillor

Next Board Meeting

Regular Public Meeting

Date: October 6, 2025

Location: 40 College Street, Auditorium

Minutes Approved by:

-original signed-

Shelley Carroll
Chair

Members of the Toronto Police Service Board

Shelley Carroll, Chair
Amber Morley, Deputy Mayor & Member
Lily Cheng, Member & Councillor
Nick Migliore, Member

Chris Brillinger, Vice-Chair
Lisa Kostakis, Member
Ann Morgan, Member



SPECIAL PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES

Monday, October 6, 2025, at 9:00AM

Livestreamed at: <https://youtube.com/live/jABmayZY-MA?feature=share>

The following *draft* Minutes of the virtual special public meeting of the Toronto Police Service Board that was held on October 6, 2025, are subject to approval at its next regularly scheduled meeting.

Attendance:

The following Members were present virtually:

Shelley Carroll, Chair and Councillor
Chris Brillinger, Vice-Chair
Ann Morgan, Member
Lisa Kostakis, Member
Nick Migliore, Member
Amber Morley, Deputy Mayor and Councillor
Lily Cheng, Member and Councillor

The following individuals were also present:

Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police, Toronto Police Service
Sandy Murray, Interim Executive Director, Toronto Police Service Board
Diana Achim, Board Administrator, Toronto Police Service Board
Jane Burton, Solicitor, City of Toronto – Legal Services Division

Declarations:

There was no declaration of interest under the Code of Conduct for Members of a Police Service Board Regulation and the *Municipal Conflict of Interest Act*.

**This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Special Public Meeting of the
Toronto Police Service Board that was held on October 6, 2025**

**P2025-1006-1.0 Request for Special Funds – 33rd Annual Scholarship and
Awards Gala**

The Board was in receipt of a report dated September 16, 2025 from Sandy Murray,
Interim Executive Director.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that as an exception to its Special Fund Policy, the Board approve
an expenditure, in an amount not to exceed \$25,000, to sponsor the Association of
Black Law Enforcers 33rd Annual Scholarship Awards Gala to support the Toronto
Police Service in its role as the host organization.

Deputation: Kris Langenfeld

The Board received the deputation and approved the foregoing report.

Moved by: C. Brillinger
Seconded by: A. Morley

**This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Special Public Meeting of the
Toronto Police Service Board that was held on October 6, 2025**

**P2025-1006-2.0. Special Constable Appointments and Re-Appointments –
October 2025**

The Board was in receipt of a report dated September 26, 2025 from Myron Demkiw,
Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Board approve the agency-initiated appointment
and re-appointment requests for the individuals listed in this report as special
constables for the Toronto Community Housing Corporation (T.C.H.C.) and the
Toronto Transit Commission (T.T.C.).

The Board approved the foregoing report.

Moved by: L. Kostakis
Seconded by: A. Morgan

**This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Special Public Meeting of the
Toronto Police Service Board that was held on October 6, 2025**

**P2025-1006-3.0. Contract Award to Mega Technical Holdings for the Havis
Docking Solution**

The Board was in receipt of a report dated September 26, 2025 from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendations:

This report recommends that the Board:

1. Approve a contract award to Mega Technical Holdings for the Havis docking solution for service vehicles for a three-year period commencing October 21, 2025, to October 20, 2028, plus two one-year optional extension periods at a total estimated cost of \$5.3 Million (M) over the five-year term;
2. Authorize the Chair to execute all required agreements and related documents on behalf of the Board, subject to approval by the City Solicitor as to form; and
3. Authorize the Chief to exercise the options to extend the contract subject to ongoing business need, continued funding, and satisfactory vendor performance.

The Board approved the foregoing report.

Moved by: A. Morley
Seconded by: A. Morgan

**This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Special Public Meeting of the
Toronto Police Service Board that was held on October 6, 2025**

**P2025-1006-4.0. Response to the Jury Recommendations from the
Coroner's Inquest into the Death of Robyn GARLOW**

The Board was in receipt of a report dated September 26, 2025 from Myron Demkiw, Chief of Police.

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Board receive the following report for information and forward a copy of the report to the Chief Coroner for the Province of Ontario, by the October 27, 2025 deadline.

The Board approved the foregoing report.

Moved by: C. Brillinger
Seconded by: L. Kostakis

**This is an Extract from the Minutes of the Special Public Meeting of the
Toronto Police Service Board that was held on October 6, 2025**

P2025-1006-5.0. Confidential

At the beginning of the meeting, Chair Carroll moved the following Motion, which was seconded by Member Migliore.

MOTION

THAT the Toronto Police Service Board move *in camera* to discuss the following subject matter in accordance with Section 44(1) of the *Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019*:

1. Human Resources Matters

The Board adjourned the public portion of the meeting and moved *in camera* meeting for consideration of a confidential matter pursuant to Section 44(1) of the *Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019* (C.S.P.A).

The following Members attended the in-camera meeting virtually:

Shelley Carroll, Chair and Councillor
Chris Brillinger, Vice-Chair
Ann Morgan, Member - virtual
Lisa Kostakis, Member
Nick Migliore, Member
Amber Morley, Deputy Mayor and Councillor
Lily Cheng, Member and Councillor

Next Board Meeting

Regular Public Meeting

Date: November 6, 2025

Location: 40 College Street, Auditorium

Minutes Approved by:

-original signed-

Shelley Carroll
Chair

Members of the Toronto Police Service Board

Shelley Carroll, Chair
Amber Morley, Deputy Mayor & Member
Lily Cheng, Member & Councillor
Nick Migliore, Member

Chris Brillinger, Vice-Chair
Lisa Kostakis, Member
Ann Morgan, Member



2. What We Heard - Insights Informing the Strategic Plan for Policing in Toronto



PUBLIC REPORT

October 29, 2025

To: Chair and Members
Toronto Police Service Board

From: Sandy Murray
Interim Executive Director

Subject: ***What We Heard – Insights Informing the Strategic Plan for Policing in Toronto***

Purpose: ☒ Information Purposes Only ☐ Seeking Decision

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Toronto Police Service Board (the Board) receive this report.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications arising from the recommendation(s) contained in this report.

Summary:

This report presents key insights from consultations conducted by the Toronto Police Service Board from 2023- 2025. In total, and across two phases of engagement, more than 1000 people shared their experiences and expectations for the future of policing in Toronto. Their feedback will directly inform the Board's forthcoming Strategic Plan for Policing, the first developed under Ontario's *Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019* (the "Act"). The report highlights urgent themes, including rebuilding trust, improving accountability, enhancing communication, and fostering cultural change. Recommendations include measurable progress indicators, expanded community partnerships, and trauma-informed engagement strategies.

Discussion:

Background

Under Ontario's new governing policing legislation, the *Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019* (the "Act"), all police service boards across the province are legislatively required to create a strategic plan. The Board determined that the development of our Strategic Plan for Policing in Toronto must be grounded in the experiences, challenges and concerns of our Service Members, and our community members.

The consultations referenced in this report were conducted as part of the Board's strategic planning process under the *Act*. This initiative aimed to gather diverse perspectives to shape a modern, inclusive, and accountable police service. The process emphasized transparency, reciprocal dialogue, and cultural responsiveness.

The consultations included community members from across Toronto, equity-deserving groups (including Indigenous, Black, and 2SLGBTQ+ communities), community organizations, advocacy groups, and Toronto Police Service Members — both uniform and civilian. City partners, local businesses, and service agencies also took part.

Across every engagement and consultation, one message stood out: **trust must be rebuilt — within the Service, and between police and the public**. Communities want safety built on fairness, accountability, and respect. Service Members want leadership that supports, listens, and leads with integrity. Both groups called for lasting cultural change and genuine partnership, not symbolic gestures.

While some of what we heard was difficult, it came from a place of hope — a belief that progress is possible when we face hard truths together. This report is not an end point, but a call to action to ensure those voices drive the change ahead.

The feedback and input we heard can be summarized under the following themes:

Trust and Accountability

- Public trust in the Service is strained; Members also feel disconnected from leadership.
- Accountability must be consistent and transparent, both externally and internally.

Communication and Connection

- People want open, human communication, not bureaucratic messaging.
- Clear, honest updates and follow-through are essential to rebuild confidence.

Engagement and Representation

- Consultations must evolve into ongoing, reciprocal dialogue.
- Indigenous, Black, and Queer communities need culturally grounded, trauma-informed engagement.

Culture and Wellness

- Members described burnout and toxic workplace dynamics that hinder morale.
- Wellness must move from messaging to meaningful, accessible support.

Staffing and Development

- Chronic shortages and unclear promotion systems undermine morale.
- Members want fair advancement and investment in internal talent.

Collaboration and Partnership

- Communities want authentic co-design of safety solutions.
- Strong support for expanding the Neighbourhood Community Officer Program.

Transparency and Measurement

- Progress must be measurable and public.
- Participants want clear indicators, timelines, and regular reporting on reform.

The What We Heard report is a foundational step toward a more accountable, inclusive, and community-driven police service. The Board will incorporate these insights into the Strategic Plan for Policing in Toronto, which will be considered by the Board in 2026, and commit to transparent implementation, ongoing engagement, and measurable progress. Rebuilding trust will require sustained effort, but the collective will for change is strong.

Conclusion:

It is recommended that the Board receive this report for information.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandy Murray
Interim Executive Director

Attachments:

What We Heard




WHAT WE HEARD

*Insights Informing
the Strategic Plan for
Policing in Toronto*

Table of Contents

Acknowledgement of the Land	1
Introductory Letter from the Chair	2
Executive Summary – What We Heard	3
Introduction	5
How Did We Get Here?	7
Who We Heard From	9
Key Themes and Insights	11
External Themes Raised by Community Members	12
Shared Themes by Community Members and Service Members	17
Internal Themes Raised by Toronto Police Service Members	22
An Acknowledgment of Where We Have the Most Work to Do	28
What's Next	32



In Honour of the Land and Its First Peoples

The Toronto Police Service Board acknowledges that the City of Toronto exists on the traditional and treaty lands of the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation, as affirmed through Treaty No. 13 (1805), commonly known as the Toronto Purchase and the Anishnabeg of the Williams Treaty (1923). These treaties cover much of what is now the Greater Toronto Area, which covers the same lands where the Toronto Police Service and the Toronto Police Service Board operates today.

In addition to the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation, this land has also been the traditional and ancestral lands of the Anishnabeg, the Haudenosaunee, and the Huron-Wendat peoples. Today, this land is home to many First Nations, Inuit, and Métis community members - people who live, grow, and raise future generations here, continuing deep connections to the land that stretch back thousands of years. Indeed, as part of the consultation for this report, we sought to listen to and hear from Indigenous community members.

By acknowledging this history and the enduring presence of Indigenous Peoples, the Toronto Police Service Board reaffirms its commitment to reconciliation, respectful engagement, and the upholding of treaty responsibilities in its work. Understanding this history is essential to the Board's commitment to reconciliation. It reminds us that our presence and responsibilities on this land are shaped by treaty relationships and inherent rights that must be respected and upheld.



Introductory Letter from the Chair

Over the past ten years, Toronto and its policing landscape have both changed profoundly. We've lived through difficult moments, faced hard truths, and taken steps - sometimes halting, often hard-won - toward greater accountability, compassion, and connection. This *What We Heard* report captures that evolution. It reflects not only how far we have come, but how much further we still need to go.

On behalf of the Toronto Police Service Board, I want to extend my deepest thanks to everyone who shared their time, perspectives, and lived experiences with us. Your honesty, your frustrations, and your hopes form the backbone of this report. Listening to you - residents, community partners, Service Members - has been humbling, sometimes uncomfortable, but always necessary.



This process has revealed both pride and pain. We heard stories of dedicated officers serving with integrity and care, and of community partners working tirelessly to make neighbourhoods safer and stronger. We also heard about the deep wounds that remain - the legacy of systemic racism, a decade of austerity and cuts, and the real consequences of an organizational culture that has not always lived up to its highest ideals. Acknowledging these truths is not a setback; it is the foundation of real progress.

The last decade has also shown what is possible. We have strengthened civilian oversight, expanded the understanding of community safety, and taken important steps toward equity, mental-health responsiveness, and reconciliation. We also recognize that some of the issues outlined in this report have already been identified by the Chief as his key priorities. But the work is far from done. The conversations reflected here remind us that change must be sustained, measured, and rooted in trust.

The voices in these pages call for a policing culture that listens deeply, acts transparently, and values partnership over posture. They call on us - Board, Service, and community alike - to keep showing up for one another with honesty and respect.

This report is not an ending, but a commitment. What we heard will guide the forthcoming *Strategic Plan for Policing in Toronto* and continue to shape how policing evolves in Toronto. Thank you for holding us to account and for believing that together, we can build a city where safety and trust truly belong to everyone.

With gratitude,

Councillor Shelley Carroll
Chair, Toronto Police Service Board

Executive Summary – What We Heard: Insights from Policing Consultations

What we heard captures more than 1200 voices – community members, advocates, service providers, business leaders, and Toronto Police Service Members – who shared their experiences and expectations for the future of policing in our city.

Their feedback is the foundation for the Toronto Police Service Board's forthcoming *Strategic Plan for Policing in Toronto*, the first to be developed under *Ontario's Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019*. This process was rooted in one shared goal: to listen honestly, act transparently, and build a police service that reflects the communities it serves.

Across every conversation, one message stood out: **trust must be rebuilt**, both within the Service, and between police and the public.

Communities want safety built on fairness, accountability, and respect. Service Members want leadership that supports, listens, and leads with integrity. Both groups called for lasting cultural change and genuine partnership, not symbolic gestures.

While some of what we heard was difficult, **it came from a place of hope**. We heard a belief that progress is possible when we face hard truths together. This report is not an end point, but a call to action to ensure those voices drive the change ahead.



What We Heard

Trust and Accountability

- Public trust in the Service is strained; Members also feel disconnected from leadership.
- Accountability must be consistent and transparent, both externally and internally.

Communication and Connection

- People want open, human communication, not bureaucratic messaging.
- Clear, honest updates and follow-through are essential to rebuild confidence.

Engagement and Representation

- Consultations must evolve into ongoing, reciprocal dialogue.
- Indigenous, Black, and Queer communities need intentional, culturally grounded, trauma-informed engagement.

Culture and Wellness

- Members described burnout and toxic workplace dynamics that hinder morale.
- Wellness must move from messaging to meaningful, accessible support.

Staffing and Development

- Chronic shortages and unclear promotion systems undermine morale.
- Members want fair advancement and investment in internal talent.

Collaboration and Partnership

- Communities want authentic participation in safety solutions.
- Strong support for expanding the Neighbourhood Community Officer Program.

Transparency and Measurement

- Progress must be measurable and public.
- Participants want clear indicators, timelines, and regular reporting on advancements and transformation.

A Shared Path Forward

This report is both an acknowledgment and a promise that the Board has heard and will act. The voices within *What We Heard* will directly shape the next *Strategic Plan for Policing in Toronto*, and guide future policies, training, and engagement practices.

Rebuilding trust will take time and consistency, but Toronto's residents and Service Members have shown that the will to change is strong. Together, they have charted a path toward a police service that is accountable, inclusive, and grounded in respect for every community it serves.





Introduction

Much of *What We Heard* will require sustained, long-term effort, particularly around culture change and organizational transformation. Real change takes time, but it is already underway.

We recognize the reality of “consultation fatigue.” People have shared their perspectives again and again, hopeful for progress, only to be disappointed when little changed. We are committed to ensuring that *What We Heard* drives real and meaningful change. It reflects the honest and courageous voices of our community and Service Members. These are voices that must be heard, respected, and acted upon.

The report's primary purpose is to meaningfully inform the Board's *Strategic Plan for Policing in Toronto (Strategic Plan)*, which establishes the foundation for adequate and effective policing aligned with community needs and the *Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019 (CSPA)*. This is a pivotal moment. The Board is developing its first *Strategic Plan* under the *CSPA*. The *Strategic Plan* will define priorities, objectives, and performance measures that promote safety, equity, and accountability across Toronto.

Along with meeting the requirements as outlined in the legislation, the *Strategic Plan* will aim to proactively address and meet the expectations of diverse communities, ensuring equity, inclusion, and meaningful engagement across all groups.

To those who spoke with us: **your voices matter**. The Board is committed to transforming this feedback into real, measurable steps toward safer, more inclusive communities.

We heard that accountability matters, from the public who expect transparency, and from Service Members, who want leadership that is present, responsive, and connected to their daily work. Members also shared that while wellness is a stated priority, there remains a gap between corporate messaging and their lived experience.

Community members voiced strong support for the Neighbourhood Community Officer (NCO) program as a model of effective community policing, but emphasized the need for more officers and longer tenures to strengthen relationships and trust.

We heard that Service Members care deeply about their work and are committed to serving Torontonians with professionalism and compassion. Yet many face burnout, heavy workloads, and the strain of doing more with less under growing public scrutiny.


The consultations revealed a shared call for accountability, transparency, care, and connection. Communities asked for openness; Service Members called for responsive leadership. Despite pressures, there remains a deep

commitment to service, compassion, and professionalism. Rebuilding trust means embedding community voices, especially those that have been historically marginalized, into how policing is shaped and delivered.

While *What We Heard* includes difficult feedback, it also reflects a powerful shared desire for progress and partnership. We remain committed to supporting the Service as it continues to evolve and serve all Torontonians with integrity.

This report is not a checkbox. It is a commitment and a call to action to guide priorities, shape decisions, and hold us accountable to the people we serve.

**This is
*What We Heard.***



"Policing priorities must be shaped not just by institutions, but by the lived experiences of the communities they serve. When we centre community voices, especially those historically marginalized, we move closer to safety that is equitable, accountable, and rooted in trust."

- Vice-Chair Chris Brillinger

How Did We Get Here?

Under the *CSPA*, all police service boards must develop a strategic plan that outlines how they will deliver adequate and effective policing tailored to local needs. The plan must include clear objectives, priorities, and performance measures, and cover everything from crime rates and community satisfaction to interactions with youth, racialized groups, Indigenous communities, and individuals with mental health or varying neurodevelopmental abilities. It also needs to address resource planning, facilities, and technology. These plans must be reviewed every four years and made publicly available.

The Board could have easily met these requirements and produced a standard and compliant document. But instead, we recognized an opportunity to be honest with ourselves about our current practices and the way in which we carry out our governance mandate.

- *Do we consult enough?*
- *Have we heard from a variety of communities that represent the diversity of our city?*
- *Have we reached out to those who have been marginalized, and truly listened to their voices as a meaningful part of our policy development processes?*

The answer was a humbling *no*. It was as a result of this honest and humble introspection that we made the decision to ensure that the consultative process for the *Strategic Plan* would be a wide-ranging opportunity to engage with a variety of interest-holders, including Service Members.

We wanted to hear about the experiences, challenges and concerns from those who work with, and support, the Service. We also wanted to hear about what's working well, what we should be doing more of, and ways to better work together.

Finally, we wanted to better understand the ways that we can continue to build and strengthen trust in the Service. As we undertook this comprehensive consultative process, it became clear that it wouldn't be enough to simply produce a *Strategic Plan*. Many of the people that we consulted, both internally and externally, did so at what they felt was great risk to themselves. Whether it was a police officer being worried about reprisal, a community member who was concerned about being seen to work with police, or simply those who had participated in countless consultations over the years that they believed had been fruitless, the common thread among them was they needed to know *that they would be heard, that their concerns would be taken seriously, and that this process would be different than the others*.

We quickly understood that sharing *What We Heard* was just as important as the *Strategic Plan* itself. It amplifies the voices of those we consulted – voices often missing from these discussions. Importantly, it also holds us accountable to the process and to the hundreds of people who shared their time, pain, and hopes to ensure their police service is compassionate, effective, and trustworthy.

Purpose of the Report

This report serves several purposes. Primarily, *What We Heard* will inform the Board's *Strategic Plan for Policing in Toronto*, helping define priorities and objectives as the civilian governance and oversight body of the Service. It outlines key themes that emerged through consultation, which will be addressed through responsive objectives in the *Strategic Plan*. *What We Heard* and the *Strategic Plan* should be read together as complementary pieces of one ongoing effort.

Scope and Limitation

The consultations were led by the Board Office's small but dedicated Engagement Team. Despite limited capacity, they carried out city-wide consultations, often balancing planning, facilitation, follow-up, and analysis that required tight coordination and long hours.

Much of this work involved intense emotional labour. Engaging vulnerable communities that have experienced harm or trauma requires

empathy, patience, and a deep commitment to listening. Holding space for difficult conversations and managing expectations demanded an openness essential to genuine engagement.

The team found creative ways to extend their reach through partnerships and digital tools, tailoring outreach to meet the needs of diverse interest-holder groups. Reopening communication with historically underserved communities took time and care. While not everyone could be reached, the process laid essential groundwork for future dialogue.

We are committed to connecting with those we were unable to engage this time in future efforts. We recognize that this consultation marks the beginning of a more inclusive, city-wide conversation. Though demanding, the process succeeded in gathering diverse perspectives and reflecting the authentic voices of our city.

It is our hope that the authenticity of this process will shine through clearly throughout this report.

"Our strategic plan is not just a document, it's a reflection of what we heard from communities and Service Members alike. By grounding our priorities in these consultations, we ensure that the Board's direction is informed, inclusive, and responsive to the real needs of Toronto."

- Chair Shelley Carroll



Who We Heard From

Consultation and engagement were established early on as the cornerstone of this process. Work began in 2023 with a strong commitment to listening, learning, and building collaboratively. Midway through, the process paused for one year due to staffing transitions. We ensured that we continued the work with care and consistency.

As a result, the consultation unfolded in two phases. This approach allowed for continuity while adapting to staffing realities. Phase Two built on the foundation of Phase One, guided throughout by principles of transparency, inclusion, and respect.

Between February and September 2023, the Board Office led internal and external consultations with support from the Strategic Planning Unit and Senior Officers. Internally, seven focus groups and a Service-wide survey gathered input from uniform and civilian Service Members, highlighting concerns around staffing, career development, compensation, wellness, morale, training, communication, scheduling, and community engagement. Members also raised issues related to public safety, proactive policing, technology, crisis response, and gun and gang violence.

Externally, ten focus groups and an online survey engaged participants from community organizations, justice partners, schools, healthcare institutions, and advocacy groups. Feedback focused on improving mental health response, enhancing partnerships, strengthening traffic safety, addressing gun and gang violence, and increasing community engagement. Additional concerns included budget allocation, accountability, communication, recruitment

diversity, officer training, school safety, and system efficiencies. These findings will be used to inform the *Strategic Plan* and ensure both community and operational perspectives are reflected.

Phase Two began in January 2025, led by our Engagement Team, which designed tools and strategies to reflect the diverse needs of those they hoped to engage. Internally, over 150 Service Members participated in 15 focus groups, representing every Command, rank, and area. Additional consultations included interviews with 42 individuals through the Toronto Police Association and Senior Officers' Organization, and meetings with six Internal Support Networks involving 95 Members. In total, 287 uniform and civilian Service Members were consulted.

The Engagement Team also met with community members who work closely with the Board and Service, including the Board's Anti-Racism Advisory Panel (ARAP) and Mental Health and Addictions Advisory Panel (MHAAP), Community Police Liaison Committees (CPLCs), Community Consultative Committees (CCCs), and Auxiliary Members. These groups offered unique insights as both community members and volunteers familiar with Service operations.

Public consultations were held city-wide, and Board Members facilitated engagements with a variety of groups, including business leaders, security professionals, 2SLGBTQIA+ organizations, service providers who support survivors of intimate partner and gender-based violence, newcomer agencies, and local radio stations.



The Engagement Team also partnered with the City of Toronto's Community Safety and Wellbeing Unit, and worked with the leaders of its Community Safety and Wellbeing Plan, SafeTO. The SafeTO office helped to organize meetings with community members, City partners, and Community Safety Tables across Toronto.

Additionally, the Board's Indigenous Engagement Advisor led culturally-grounded consultations with several service providers to gather insights into organizational relationships with police and the safety needs of the communities they serve. In addition to team engagements, the Advisor conducted approximately 25 one-on-one interviews with a variety of Indigenous individuals, including Elders and youth, to explore participants' lived experiences and systemic safety concerns. These conversations prioritized the creation of safe, non-colonial spaces to facilitate honest dialogue, which help inform the understanding of the social determinants of justice affecting First Nations, Inuit, and Métis peoples.

The Engagement Team consulted approximately 450 members of the public. To broaden input, a feedback form was circulated internally and externally, inviting open-ended responses on community safety, engagement, perceptions of the Service, and recommendations for the *Strategic Plan*. In total, we received 358 responses.

In total, and across both phases and a variety of platforms, we heard from over 1200 community and Service Members.

Key Themes and Insights

As consultations unfolded, we heard a wide range of perspectives shaped by diverse experiences and priorities. Across conversations, several consistent themes emerged: the need for inclusive engagement, greater transparency, and stronger pathways for collaboration. We heard that building trust requires more than dialogue. It demands sustained action, accountability, and openness to change. These reflections helped to define both the challenges and opportunities that lie ahead.

We heard that many of the issues raised, such as trust in the Service, communication, engagement gaps, and culture change, are interconnected and shared across internal and

community experiences. Internal discussions highlighted operational pressures, workforce development, technology, wellness, and morale as key factors shaping Members' day-to-day realities. Community partners spoke about response times, collaboration, and the impact of systemic racism, emphasizing the need for continued work to address anti-Black and anti-Indigenous bias.

Together, we heard a strong call for a continued evolution in policing that connects sustained internal transformation with external trust-building, ensuring that the Service's culture, systems, and partnerships evolve to meet the needs of the communities it serves.



External Themes Raised by Community Members

Safety and Security

We heard from many community members that safety and security remain major concerns in their everyday lives. Rising crime, disorder, and antisocial behaviour have left many feeling uneasy. People voiced concerns about break-ins, car thefts, and random acts of violence. While some acknowledged reports that gun violence has decreased, their lived experiences tell a different story. Ongoing concerns about homicides, shootings, carjackings, hate crimes and violence in public spaces persist. Many also expressed alarm over the decreasing age of both perpetrators and victims of violence. Many cited deep frustration about the lack of investment in youth programs, employment opportunities, and broader supports. We also heard concerns that the justice system is too lenient, with consequences for crime seen as insufficient to deter further harm.

We also heard calls for more police officers and a return to core policing activities. Community members told us they want to see laws enforced more consistently, and violent incidents addressed with urgency. We heard that some feel the streets are unsafe, and there is a perception that minor traffic enforcement actions do not adequately address road safety concerns. Specific neighbourhoods in the city were mentioned as needing urgent attention due to its residents feeling unsafe.

We heard that greater police visibility is important. We heard that, if ignored, even small, recurring issues can create a lasting sense of unease. We heard that people want to feel safe in their own neighbourhoods and that police presence should be reassuring, not intimidating.

Calls for proactive policing also showed up frequently, with community members telling us that they want proactive policing, not just reactive responses. They also called for a clear message that our city stands behind the officers who dedicate themselves to protecting it. Overall, we heard a strong desire for policing that is responsive, respectful, and focused on making communities feel truly safe.

Intimate Partner Violence, Gender-Based Violence and Crimes Committed Against Women

In meeting with community organizations on the frontlines of supporting survivors of intimate partner violence (IPV) and gender-based violence (GBV), we heard that crimes against women must be consistently treated as an emergency and explicitly named as an epidemic that requires coordinated, prevention-focused efforts that move beyond acknowledgement to action.

We heard that the Service and Board must dedicate time to develop an integrated, year-round strategy on this issue. This plan should include community and Indigenous-led components, address systemic causes such as colonialism, patriarchy, and racism, and ensure accountability through clear metrics and ongoing evaluation.

We heard that training must be trauma-informed, frequent, and co-designed with community experts and survivors. Participants emphasized understanding coercive control, femicide risk factors, and the ways

abusers manipulate systems that sometimes criminalize survivors.

We heard concerns about limited collaboration and inconsistent front-line practices that erode trust. Participants called for clear policies and multidisciplinary approaches where police work alongside specialized community professionals. Service providers stressed being trusted as experts, noting, *"If you are looking for trust, you must trust us."*

We heard a strong call to address missing and murdered Indigenous women, girls and Two-Spirit cases, accept missing persons reports regardless of jurisdiction, and build stronger relationships beyond the jurisdiction of Toronto to more effectively address human trafficking. We heard that better data is critical to tracking femicide, filicide, and human trafficking, strengthening accountability, and evaluating progress. We heard that community partnerships must be genuine and sustained, and that engagement needs clearer structures and logistical support.

We heard particular concerns from human trafficking service representatives, who identified a critical need for the Service and partners to establish clear procedures for addressing unit takeovers, where trafficked individuals, typically women and children, are forced to live in a residential unit that has been occupied or controlled by traffickers, often without the legal tenant's consent. We heard that the absence of such a procedure has significant implications, including challenges in *Gladue* reporting (a legal principle that requires courts to consider the unique circumstances of Indigenous peoples during sentencing) and gaps in organizational reporting, leading to barriers in securing funding.

Finally, we heard that communication tools and public awareness efforts are underused with

participants encouraging proactive outreach to prevent violence and increase understanding across communities.

Specific Concerns from Newcomer Communities

We heard that newcomer communities face unique barriers navigating systems of safety and support. Urban design sometimes conflicts with first responder access, affecting safety and trust in public spaces. We heard that the Toronto Community Crisis Service (TCCS) offers a more compassionate, non-criminalizing response, and that collaboration between TCCS and police has improved confidence among newcomers. We heard deep concern about rising racism and hate-motivated incidents, with calls for clearer action and definitions of hate symbols.

We heard that many newcomers feel that Community Police Liaison Committees (CPLCs) often lack diversity, consistency, and openness to criticism. Participants called for clearer standards and genuine inclusion of newcomer voices. Newcomers want relationships that recognize power imbalances, cultural differences, and community resource limitations.

We heard that many newcomers feel that officers need to learn to make space for others by listening, sharing leadership, and engaging with humility. Trust with newcomer communities, in particular, must be built patiently and consistently. We also heard that system navigation remains difficult for newcomers, with confusing processes and communication gaps. Finally, we heard that the Service's dual role as both law enforcement and community service creates confusion for some newcomers about how and when each approach is used.


Neighbourhood Community Officer (NCO) Program

We heard strong endorsement for the expansion of the NCO Program, with many people emphasizing its vital role in fostering trust through consistent, relationship-based policing, particularly in communities with a history of strained relations with law enforcement. Over and over, we heard robust support for the program's growth, noting its effectiveness in allowing officers sufficient time to build meaningful relationships within the city. We heard that residents support having NCOs holistically integrated into all of the important parts of their communities, including in schools, places of worship, and community centres.

Not all feedback was positive, with some people describing the NCO program as inconsistent and insufficient in addressing broader systemic issues. Others questioned

how NCOs were assigned and how neighbourhoods where they worked were selected. We heard a frustration that many NCOs work directly with community organizations, but not necessarily the residents of the neighbourhoods to which they were assigned, creating a structural barrier to accessing them. We heard that there is a need for intentional, sustained engagement that goes beyond programmatic efforts.

In addition, concerns were raised regarding staffing shortages, which often resulted in NCOs being reassigned to emergent front-line duties or not completing their three-year tenure. We heard that, to ensure the program's success, it is essential that officers are allocated dedicated time to develop and sustain community relationships.



Organizational Collaboration

During consultations, many community members shared frustration related to their experiences working alongside the Service. Some had engaged through formal structures like advisory roles or committees, while others participated in informal or issue-specific collaborations. Regardless of the format, a consistent theme emerged: the collaboration sometimes did not feel genuine.

Community partners spoke about feeling tokenized. They described offering insights and expertise, only to see it overlooked or dismissed. Many had raised the same concerns for years without feeling truly heard. They reflected on the time and energy spent trying to drive change, often with little impact.

Rather than experiencing reciprocal relationships, partners often described one-way communication. The Service would present completed initiatives and seek feedback after decisions had already been made. Instead of being invited to co-design solutions, partners were asked to react to finalized work, leaving many feeling excluded from meaningful decision-making and disconnected from community initiatives.

We heard that partners want to be treated as equal contributors, not symbolic participants. They called on the Service and the Board to reflect on what partnership truly means, emphasizing shared responsibility, mutual respect, and recognition that effective policing requires community leadership and input. Meaningful collaboration is essential to building trust and improving safety, with

relationships that are reciprocal and based on shared ownership, particularly with sectors like health, housing, justice, and social services.

We heard calls for the police service to use its influence to advocate for funding and support for these areas, and for reallocating some functions to community organizations with expertise. Participants emphasized the need for culturally appropriate, multilingual, and accessible engagement practices. Future strategic plans, they said, must be built on genuine partnerships, grounded in listening, relationship-building, and co-created solutions.

Support for cross-sector collaboration was strong, with community organizations being viewed as valuable partners. At the same time, respondents acknowledged that staffing levels and time constraints often make it difficult to prioritize relationship-building. Resource disparities were also raised: while police infrastructure is well-funded, essential community services, such as shelters, outreach programs, and other social supports often remain under-resourced. Participants urged the Service to adopt a more collaborative approach to advocacy, recognizing that public safety depends on a well-supported ecosystem of services.

Across all feedback, the message was clear: listening, respect, and accountability are the foundation of successful engagement, collaboration, and community trust.

The Future of Policing

Throughout the consultations, participants encouraged us to look forward and reflect on how policing might evolve in a rapidly changing world. They asked us to consider how the Service could adapt alongside broader shifts in society, the workforce, and community expectations.

We heard a strong call to explore new models of service collaboration. Many participants pointed to initiatives like the Toronto Community Crisis Service (TCCS), among others, as promising examples. They urged a rethinking of traditional police roles and encouraged further exploration of removing certain responsibilities from police,

envisioning a system where police work in closer partnership with complementary services, such as security professionals, special constables, and community organizations.

In light of a growing police budget, participants asked us to think creatively and responsibly. They emphasized the need to explore alternative approaches and partnerships that could enhance safety, reduce costs, and better reflect the values and needs of Toronto's diverse communities.



Themes Shared Jointly by Community Members and Service Members

Pride and Gratitude

Throughout the consultations, the Engagement Team asked Service Members what they valued most about their work and what motivated them to show up every day, despite the challenges they faced. They also asked community members about their working relationships with the Service and what was functioning well. Responses varied, but a common theme emerged: a shared commitment to helping others and contributing to public safety.

Officers spoke about the honour and privilege of serving their communities, protecting the public from harm, and effectively bringing people to justice. Many described a strong sense of purpose in being able to make a difference in the lives of others. Community members and organizations echoed this sentiment, emphasizing the importance of collaboration with the Service.

They highlighted successful partnerships, particularly with Neighbourhood Community Officers (NCOs), and shared examples of impactful work that had strengthened local safety efforts.

Across both groups, there was a clear appreciation for the opportunity to support communities and contribute to meaningful change. Whether through front-line service or collaborative initiatives, participants spoke with pride about their ability to make a positive impact and help those in need.

This enduring commitment to making a positive difference reflects why both Service and community members continue to show up, even

in the face of hurt, frustration, and daily challenges. It is also a powerful reflection of the shared values that must continue to guide the important work ahead.

Trust in the Toronto Police Service

Through hundreds of conversations with Service Members and members of the public, one message came through with clarity: trust in the institution is under strain. Many residents expressed genuine appreciation for the work officers do, but others shared feelings of disconnection and concern. They spoke about long response times, inconsistent accountability, and a lack of transparency. Some questioned whether misconduct is properly addressed. These concerns have contributed to widespread skepticism and, in some cases, a loss of confidence in the Service.

Internally, Service Members voiced similar frustrations. They described unclear leadership, and human resources practices that felt unfair and demoralizing. Both uniform and civilian Members spoke about feeling undervalued and underappreciated, with some expressing a growing sense of disillusionment toward an organization they joined to uphold the law. They emphasized a need for tangible support and a desire to feel confident that the Service stands behind them. This call for visible backing reflects a deeper longing for trust, respect, and stability within the organization.

We heard that for some, trust in the Service is being undermined by systemic issues, internal

dissatisfaction, and community concerns. Fairness, accountability, and respectful engagement were consistently identified as essential to rebuilding relationships. Internally, some Service Members described feeling unsupported, citing leadership failures, inconsistent messaging, and a workplace culture marked by bullying and discrimination. Hiring, promotion, and complaint processes were often viewed as opaque and biased, further eroding morale and trust.

From the community, we heard concerns about unaddressed misconduct and poor communication. A lack of transparency in oversight reinforced the perceptions of some that police are not held to the same standards as the public. Many emphasized the need for clearer communication, stronger leadership accountability, and an expansion of the Neighbourhood Community Officer program to foster relationship-based policing.

Racism, colonialism, and discriminatory practices were also identified as major barriers, particularly for members of Indigenous, Black and Queer communities. We heard calls for increased cultural awareness, treaty knowledge, and greater sensitivity in police interactions. Across both internal and external voices, the message was clear: policing must continue to evolve in order to restore credibility and confidence in the Toronto Police Service.

Corporate Messaging and Information-Sharing

We heard that poor communication remains a major source of frustration both within the Service and across communities. Community members spoke of feeling excluded from

important conversations and questioned why budgets continued to grow while response times remained slow. We heard that information shared by police often feels distant, overly formal, and disconnected from lived experience, leaving many unsure how the Service supports vulnerable communities.

Internally, we heard similar concerns. Some Members described communication as fragmented, reactive, and focused more on managing perception than building understanding. Some said they felt overwhelmed by shifting messages and unclear direction, leading to confusion about priorities and disconnection from leadership. We heard a strong desire for clear, consistent updates, accessible information about roles and responsibilities, and communication that fosters collaboration rather than blame.

Across both internal and external perspectives, we heard calls for honest, timely, and human communication. Ultimately, those we engaged wanted communication that builds trust, strengthens relationships, and supports a more connected and responsive police service.



Engagement and Gaps in Engagement

We heard deep frustration from both community members and Service Members about how engagement has been approached. While Neighbourhood Community Officers were praised for establishing genuine connections, broader efforts were often seen as superficial, with limited opportunities for meaningful collaboration. Many felt decisions had been made before consultations began, creating a sense that the Service was not genuinely open to change.

We heard concerns about Liaison Officers not being members of the communities they serve, leading to disconnect and disappointment. Participants questioned how officers could effectively support communities without understanding their histories or lived experiences. Internally, Members also felt excluded from key decisions and overlooked despite valuable insights they could bring.

Across groups, we heard calls for engagement rooted in honesty, respect, and shared accountability. Participants emphasized the need for deeper, more inclusive dialogue, especially with Indigenous, Black, and Queer communities, and for an engagement strategy that prioritizes authentic relationships over appearances.

To strengthen trust and visibility, we heard recommendations for more direct interaction between Board Members, Service Members, and communities through ride-alongs, Divisional visits, and local gatherings. Including underrepresented Members, retirees, and those on leave was also seen as a way to bring broader perspectives to decision-making.

We heard strong support for culturally appropriate, multilingual, and accessible engagement practices, along with ongoing community meetings, youth outreach, and a

visible presence in underserved neighbourhoods. Overall, there was a clear desire for the Service to move beyond enforcement toward transparent, inclusive engagement that truly reflects the city's diverse voices.

Response Times

A consistent source of frustration we heard from community members was response times. People shared stories of calling 911 during crises, sometimes as victims, witnesses, or in urgent need, and being placed on hold. Others waited up to eight hours on the non-emergency line - some never received a reply, with others receiving a call back days later. Many felt this was unacceptable for a large, publicly funded service.

We heard that these delays went beyond operational issues, eroding trust. Community members described feeling frustrated and abandoned during vulnerable moments, questioning resource allocation and the Service's ability to fulfill its basic responsibility to respond in emergencies.

We heard similar concerns from Service Members. Officers spoke about chronic short staffing and the pressure of overwhelming call volumes, making it difficult to prioritize effectively. 911 Call Operators described the emotional toll of trying to reassure callers while knowing officers could not be dispatched quickly.

Overall, we heard that both Service Members and the public want the Service to respond with care and urgency, but shared experiences show that staffing and resource limits compromise its ability to meet response standards and support the community.

Organizational Consistency

We heard repeated frustration with the Service's lack of operational consistency. Community members described promising pilot programs that were quietly discontinued without explanation, leaving them doubtful about the Service's commitment to lasting change. They also spoke about frequent, unannounced transfers of key personnel, such as Unit Commanders, Inspectors, Neighbourhood Community Officers, and Liaison Officers, without proper transition. We heard that these changes disrupted relationships, stalled initiatives, and eroded trust in the Service's ability to support sustained, community-based work. Many felt the system prioritized internal structures over public needs.

Service Members voiced similar concerns. Senior Officers reflected on the emotional toll of being reassigned from communities and teams they had supported for years. Leaving behind files, initiatives, and relationships was difficult, and some questioned why their efforts were so easily set aside.

They also noted the lack of a consistent approach to tenure. While Neighbourhood Community Officers were assigned for a minimum of three years, other roles requiring continuity did not receive the same consideration. This inconsistency left many feeling undervalued and uncertain about the Service's commitment to long-term community work.

The combination of inconsistency, turnover, and reassignment was seen as a major barrier to continuity and succession planning. Community partners were often left frustrated, forced to rebuild relationships and re-establish trust with new Service Members unfamiliar with local priorities.

This pattern was widely viewed as a systemic flaw that disrupted progress, weakened relationships, and undermined confidence in the Service's ability to deliver lasting, community-driven outcomes. Both community and Service Members called for greater stability, transparency, and intentionality in role assignments and transitions.

Culture Change, Transformation and Evolution

Throughout our consultations, we heard a clear and consistent call for cultural change within the Service. Despite public commitments to transformation, progress is seen by some as slow. Participants described a workplace culture that can feel toxic, divisive, and resistant to change. We heard concerns about harassment, bullying, and microaggressions, and that leadership is often perceived as hesitant or risk-averse. Many leaders in the organization said they do not feel empowered to make decisions and fear being blamed if those decisions are unpopular, creating an environment that erodes trust, increases frustration, and lowers morale.

We heard reflections on deeper institutional culture and entrenched norms. While open exclusion has declined, a lingering fear of reprisal for reporting misconduct remains for many of the Members from whom we heard. The organization continues to be shaped by traditional hierarchies that limit inclusion and innovation. The paramilitary structure, though effective in emergencies, was seen as overly bureaucratic in daily operations, restricting communication and adaptability. We heard that the traditional top-down culture no longer resonates with younger generations. Many

new recruits view policing as a job rather than as a lifelong calling, and value transparency, wellness, and purpose over hierarchy. We heard that many want to understand the reasoning behind decisions, expect open communication, and reject the “suck it up and carry on” mentality.

From the public, we heard similar concerns about mistrust, systemic bias, and a lack of visible accountability. Repeated incidents of misconduct and social media narratives reinforce skepticism, especially among youth and newcomer communities.

We heard suggestions for improvement: embedding modernization principles across all levels, increasing transparency, and evolving systems to strengthen accountability.

Participants supported reframing reform to emphasize innovation, service delivery, and community impact. From the public, we heard interest in transformative approaches such as expanded de-escalation training, improved mental health crisis response, and greater investment in community-based alternatives.

Overall, we heard that meaningful cultural change requires openness, transparency, and sustained collaboration both within the Service, and with the communities it serves.

Evaluation and Metrics

We heard that to build trust and ensure accountability, the Service must strengthen how it tracks progress and measures results. These elements were seen as critical to demonstrating that organizational transformation is not just aspirational, but actively underway.

Public participants told us that updates on progress should be easy to understand, focused on outcomes, and readily accessible. They stressed the need for plain language

communications that clearly show what has changed, what remains to be done, and how the Service is responding to community concerns. We also heard that the Service must improve how it gathers and uses community feedback to better understand public needs, expectations, and satisfaction. This feedback should be treated as essential data, not just anecdotal input.

Internally, Service Members spoke about the need for better tools to monitor workplace trends and support informed decision-making. They highlighted gaps in data collection and analysis, particularly around resignations among underrepresented racialized groups. We heard that both quantitative data, such as emergency response times and crime solve rates, and qualitative insights from lived experiences, are needed to paint a full picture of organizational health and performance.

Participants also pointed to the importance of centralizing key data streams. Race-based data, use-of-force reports, and crime trends should be integrated to support equity-based reporting and more consistent analysis. Community members emphasized that progress on recommendations from oversight bodies must be publicly tracked. They suggested setting multi-year milestones and monitoring them throughout the life of the *Strategic Plan* to ensure accountability and momentum. Participants emphasized the importance of setting clear goals, establishing timelines, and embedding transparent reporting directly into the *Strategic Plan*.

Taken together, these insights reflect a shared desire for a change that is measurable, transparent, and responsive. Whether from within the Service, or across the city, participants made it clear that data must be used not just to inform decisions, but to build trust, demonstrate progress, and ensure that change is both real and lasting.

Internal Themes Raised by Toronto Police Service Members

Staffing, Recruitment and Retention

We heard that staffing shortages are a serious concern across the Service. Members noted that, despite hiring resuming after a decade-long freeze, staffing levels remain below previous benchmarks. Shortages affect front-line response, as well as specialized functions like court preparation, evidence handling, and investigative support. We heard about the strain of meeting growing demands with fewer resources.

Recruitment and retention were recurring themes. We heard that attracting and keeping new hires has become increasingly difficult. Many recruits now leave within a few years, creating instability and raising concerns about maintaining a workforce committed to the work. Chronic shortages contribute to high turnover, low morale, and operational fatigue. Members described excessive workloads, unsafe officer-to-population ratios, and a very junior workforce, including leadership teams with limited experience.

We heard that many Members feel undervalued and unsupported. Inadequate compensation, limited recognition, and a rising cost of living contribute to departures. Long commutes after demanding shifts were described as exhausting and often unsafe. Members called for competitive pay, better benefits, retention incentives, and recognition of their contributions. While some supported increasing recruitment, others emphasized the importance of maintaining high standards, stressing that public trust depends on hiring individuals genuinely committed to service.

We heard strong support for strategic workforce planning, with initiatives focused on improving

recruitment, retention, and front-line sustainability. These steps were seen as essential to building a healthier workplace, improving service delivery, and ensuring long-term organizational resilience.

Promotional Processes

Promotions were raised as a significant concern during consultations. Despite several changes to the promotional process over the years, trust in the system remains low. Service Members expressed frustration with practices they viewed as unfair, where personal connections appeared to carry more weight than qualifications or performance. Many felt the process lacks transparency and continues to favour individuals with informal advantages rather than those who demonstrated leadership and merit. A large number of Members believe that promotions and hiring decisions were predetermined.

We heard widespread concerns about fairness, consistency, and integrity within the promotional process itself. Members were frustrated by the constant changes to how promotions are handled. They shared that no two promotional cycles in recent years had followed the same approach, which made it difficult to prepare and created confusion across the organization. The process was often described as biased and inequitable, with favouritism and nepotism influencing outcomes. These perceptions contributed to low morale, decreased participation in the process, and a lack of trust in leadership.

Many Members said they chose not to apply for promotions, believing the outcome had already been decided. This sentiment was common

among both officers and civilian Members, though it appeared to be felt most acutely by civilians and officers seeking advancement to senior ranks. In response, we heard strong recommendations to establish promotional processes that were transparent, standardized, and inclusive. Members called for leadership to support career mobility through merit-based advancement, and to address systemic bias in hiring, training, and career development. They emphasized the need for clear criteria, consistent procedures, and fair access to opportunities.

Workforce Management and Development

Workplace development and succession planning came up often during consultations. Civilian Members shared deep frustration about the lack of clear pathways for growth. Advancement opportunities were frequently seen as being given to external candidates, or to officers who had transitioned into civilian roles. Many civilians felt overlooked and excluded from training, coaching, and mentorship. They expressed a strong desire for a meaningful path forward that recognized their contributions and invested in their future within the organization.

Concerns about access to professional development were widespread. We heard that opportunities for growth were often limited and reserved for hand-picked individuals, with no clear or transparent criteria. Career progression pathways, particularly for civilian Members, were described as unclear or, in some cases, non-existent. Participants pointed to roles with no natural progression, and very few promotional opportunities available.

We also heard strong calls to continue civilianizing the Service. District Special

Constables shared that they often felt underutilized, despite their intended role as a resource to alleviate front-line pressures. Although they wear uniforms and were brought in to support front-line officers, they said that they are not always given meaningful opportunities to contribute. In cases where they were assigned to pilot or special programs, we heard that these initiatives were often short-lived. Their unique role was seen as undervalued and in need of better integration into day-to-day operations.

A recurring concern was the Service's reliance on external consultants who some Members felt lack a deep understanding of the organization. Some Members felt that this approach signals a lack of trust in internal talent and capability, leaving them frustrated and disconnected. We also heard support for initiatives like conducting a Service-wide organizational census to benchmark diversity and strengthening succession planning to create clear and equitable leadership pathways.

Overall, we heard that these efforts were essential to rebuilding trust, improving inclusivity, and ensuring that career progression within the Service was based on competence, fairness, and transparency.

Professional Standards

We heard a number of concerns about Professional Standards during consultations. We heard that many Service Members viewed the investigative process as heavy-handed and overly punitive. Many believed that while the allegations appeared valid on the surface, they often lacked substance. Members described a lengthy investigative process, sharing that, in many cases, after months of reputational harm and personal stress, charges were quietly withdrawn or

unsubstantiated, leaving Members to question the purpose of the investigation, and the impact it had on their careers and well-being.

Members noted that investigations often resulted in serious mental health consequences for those under investigation. Investigations were said to take far too long, adding to anxiety and uncertainty. Members shared that many chose to leave the Service rather than endure a Professional Standards investigation, which they felt was more focused on embarrassment than on coaching, mentorship, or professional development.

We also heard concerns about fairness and consistency in how complaints and investigations were handled. Allegations of inconsistent treatment contributed to a broader sense of exclusion and mistrust. Members described the process as lacking transparency and accountability, with disciplinary outcomes that were not applied evenly across the organization.

We heard that the current approach to Professional Standards was undermining morale, trust, and Member wellness. Members shared the need for a more balanced and supportive model that still holds individuals accountable, but also prioritizes learning, development, and Member well-being.

Technology

We frequently heard concerns about technology and its underutilization within the Service. Many Members felt that existing programs were outdated, and newer tools were not being used to their full potential. We heard examples of Members continuing to rely on manual methods of data collection, including handwritten notes and spreadsheets, rather than using available applications designed for those purposes.

Members spoke about programs such as NG-911 systems and electronic memo books, noting that these technologies were not integrated in ways that allowed them to work efficiently together. The lack of interoperability was seen as a missed opportunity to improve workflow and reduce duplication.

Many Members pointed to neighbouring police services and questioned why similar technologies were not available within our Service. They described the inefficiencies caused by outdated systems as more than just inconvenient. These gaps were seen as barriers to productivity and service quality. Members believed that by updating and properly implementing available technologies, the Service could significantly improve its operations and better support its people.



Wellness

We heard an acknowledgement that, over the past decade, the Service has made significant progress in advancing Member wellness and comprehensive mental health support. We know that the tragic loss of a number of officers to suicide has been a profound catalyst for change within the Service, leading to the development of many important wellness initiatives. One such initiative is the addition of the *Because of the Line of Duty* classification to the Service's Honour Wall, to pay tribute to Service Members who have died due to injury or trauma sustained during the course of their policing duties.

We heard that programs addressing psychological health, peer support, early intervention, and trauma-informed care have expanded substantially. The Service has also strengthened access to confidential supports, improved training for supervisors, and fostered a more open dialogue about mental health. Together, these efforts reflect a deep and sustained commitment to the well-being of all Members.

However, we heard that there is still much to be done in this important area. We heard that Service Members view wellness in two ways: as a broader organizational culture of care, and as their personal experiences with the Wellness Unit. Across both areas, we heard frustration, disappointment, and disconnect.

We heard that there is a gap between corporate messaging and lived reality. While Members are encouraged to prioritize their health, staffing shortages and denied time-off requests often make this impossible. Many felt unsupported when seeking help, highlighting that the systems in place do not enable care.

We heard that interactions with the Wellness Unit are often discouraging. High turnover among case workers has meant that some Members have had

to restart processes repeatedly. Some have to coordinate their own cases to access accommodations. Support was described as limited, retraumatizing for those experiencing work-related trauma, and insufficient for caregivers.

We heard that wellness initiatives are unevenly applied across the Service. Some Divisions had active Wellness Committees, while others had none. Members involved in committees often filled gaps themselves, despite limited support, and questioned why wellness supports were not organizationally mandated. We heard that long-term leave and return-to-work processes often compromise recovery and dignity. The Wellness Unit often struggled to find suitable accommodations, leaving Members unable to contribute fully, despite willingness and staffing needs.

We heard clearly that wellness needs to move beyond messaging, and become meaningful, accessible, and supported by systems that reflect the realities of Members' work.



Morale and Organizational Support

We heard significant concerns about low morale across the organization by both civilian and uniform Members. This reflected a range of experiences shaping how people felt about their work and their place within the Service.

Staffing shortages were a major factor. Members described heavy workloads, covering gaps, and resulting burnout. Many felt disconnected, discouraged, and uncertain about their future.

We heard concerns about a lack of organizational support. When problems arise, blame often falls on front-line Members, while supervisors and managers are seen as less accountable. This creates pressure and uncertainty about whether the Service stands behind them.

We heard that Members feel scapegoated for broader issues, especially around training and performance. They want a culture where mistakes are treated as learning opportunities, with continued access to support and future opportunities.

Workplace culture was closely tied to morale. Harassment, discrimination, bullying, and microaggressions were described as persistent, creating fear and eroding trust, safety, and mental health.

We heard calls for better internal communication that acknowledges positive contributions alongside criticism. Supportive environments were often tied to strong supervisors and collaborative teams.

We heard support for a comprehensive Culture and Wellbeing Strategy to enhance

psychological safety, respond to recommendations, and monitor culture over time. Confidential surveys were recommended to ensure feedback informs decision-making.

Time Management

We heard widespread concerns about time management across the Service. Members described difficulty accessing earned time off, with staffing shortages creating pressure to forgo time off, even when needed most.

We heard from newer Members who felt that the only way to get time off from work was by using their sick bank, clearly not its intended purpose. They worried this practice could have long-term consequences, leaving them without support in the future.

We heard frustration about the mandate to work Regular Days Off exchange (RDOs) for large events, where officers could be asked to work on scheduled days off without overtime compensation. Members described this as unfair and demoralizing, especially amid burnout, low morale, and staffing shortages.

We heard that days off are considered essential for recovery, yet RDOs where members were pulled back into work created strain for front-line officers. Members highlighted the contradiction between this practice and the Service's messaging around wellness, leaving them feeling undervalued and frustrated. We heard a clear call for a culture where time off is respected, rest is protected, and wellness is reflected in meaningful systems that recognize the human cost of this work.

Internal Support Networks

We met with a range of Internal Support Networks (ISNs), Member-led resource groups within the Service. We heard frustration and a sense of being invisible, undervalued, and dismissed. Despite their commitment and expertise, ISN members felt their work was not always taken seriously.

We heard that ISNs often support recruitment and inclusion efforts voluntarily, acting as ambassadors for the Service and safe spaces for community and Member dialogue. They strongly value this role but feel excluded from developing meaningful solutions, even when the Service is addressing issues their communities have raised.

We heard that ISN members feel that they are rarely included in operational work, despite their knowledge of community dynamics, historical context, and emerging issues. Members expressed disappointment at being overlooked in assisting with investigations, recruitment, procedures, community engagement and strategic planning, including the development of the Service's Equity Strategy.

We heard calls for proper recognition and support. Members described relying on their own fundraising for events, and said contributions to initiatives and partnerships often went unacknowledged. Many felt more valued by their communities than by the Service. Overall, we heard a strong desire for respect, recognition, and meaningful inclusion, with ISNs being seen as trusted partners rather than symbolic representatives.

Specific Units and Areas with Unique Concerns

We heard from a range of units and areas across the Service, each sharing distinct challenges

and experiences. These included Communications (911 Call Centre), the Parking Enforcement Unit, the Auxiliary Program, Specialized Units, and members of the Community Police Liaison Committees (CPLCs) and the Chief's Community Consultative Committees (CCCs).

We heard that Communications Operators face chronic stress due to rising call volumes, staffing shortages, and limited support. Recruitment and training take at least 18 months, yet many new hires leave shortly after, upon realizing the enormity and stress of the job. This attrition, combined with job stress-related leaves, makes staffing difficult. Operators called for improved facilities, more staff, updated onboarding, and upgraded technology to manage calls and improve response times.

We heard that Parking Enforcement Members often feel undervalued and overlooked. High turnover, inadequate office space, and frequently disrupted work areas have left many feeling dismissed and disrespected.

We heard that Special Units struggle with staffing shortages impacting investigations, training, evidence handling, and work-life balance. Despite repeated requests, support is insufficient, leaving teams stretched thin.

We heard that Auxiliary Members want meaningful engagement but feel underutilized. Standardized approaches were recommended to ensure consistent recognition.

We heard that CPLCs and CCCs value collaboration but face limited resources. Dedicated support from the Service for outreach, materials, and communications was suggested to strengthen community connections.

An Acknowledgment of Where We Have the Most Work to Do

We acknowledge that there are certain groups with whom our relationship is particularly broken or lacking. This was reinforced throughout the consultative process. Black, Indigenous, and Queer communities in Toronto each carry distinct but interconnected histories of harm at the hands of police, which have led to a profound and enduring trust deficit.

For Black communities, generations of systemic racism and discriminatory practices have reinforced the perception of policing as a system of control rather than protection. Indigenous communities have endured centuries of colonial policing that sought to regulate, displace, and criminalize their cultures, leaving deep scars of dispossession and systemic injustice.

Queer and Trans communities have long experienced policing as a source of surveillance, exclusion, and indignity, rather than safety and respect. While the histories are different, the outcome is the same: a severe erosion of trust in policing institutions.

We recognize that separate, culturally responsive approaches to engagement that centre the voices, leadership, and lived realities of each community are the only way forward. We want to acknowledge and thank the members of these communities who, despite their own pain, frustration, and negative lived experiences with police, have chosen to sit with us, share their truths, and push for change in the hope of finding a way forward.

African, Black, and African-Caribbean Communities of Toronto

We heard from many members of Toronto's Black communities who shared longstanding concerns about their relationship with the Service. These conversations reaffirmed that deep-rooted historical issues continue to shape this relationship and remain unaddressed.

We heard consistent concerns about trust, representation, and collaboration. Systemic issues such as racial profiling, excessive use of force, and discriminatory practices were identified as major barriers to safety and meaningful engagement. For some, the trauma of past interactions has permanently fractured trust, leaving them reluctant to call 911 in an emergency or assist in police investigations. Rebuilding this trust, they said, requires a fundamental shift in how the Service engages with Black communities.

We heard about the history and lasting impact of over-policing and hyper-surveillance, from colonial enforcement to present-day patrols, including carding, the former Toronto Anti-Violence Intervention Strategy (TAVIS), and negative experiences with School Resource Officers. These experiences were deeply personal, often affecting families and communities, not just individuals.

We heard that the Service's lack of understanding of its historical relationship with Black communities hampers meaningful

progress. These perspectives aligned with longstanding advocates, advisory panels, and direct engagement with young Black men, all calling for urgent action on systemic anti-Black racism.

We heard similar frustrations from Black Members within the Service, who noted unequal treatment, biased practices, and a culture where anti-Black racism persists. They expressed disappointment at unfulfilled commitments and a lack of confidence in meaningful change.

We heard that the path forward must be shaped by those most affected. Community-led solutions, with Black Service Members and communities central to planning, are essential. Rebuilding trust requires sustained, intentional action to dismantle harmful practices and create systems that reflect the expectations of Black communities.

First Nations, Inuit and Métis Members of Diverse Urban Indigenous Communities of Toronto

There is no doubt that the relationship between police and Indigenous communities remains one of the most fractured and complex. In recognition of its historically inadequate engagement, the Board appointed its first Advisor of Indigenous Engagement in May 2024 to lead the development of culturally appropriate outreach and engagement strategies. The goal was to build stronger, trust-based relationships across Toronto and ensure Indigenous voices are meaningfully reflected in the Board's governance and oversight practices.

Over the past year, the Advisor has led extensive consultations with youth, Elders, Two-Spirit individuals, justice advocates, educators, and service providers. These conversations have informed both this report and the development of the *Strategic Plan*. In total, the Advisor engaged with approximately 25 individuals and numerous organizational representatives serving First Nations, Inuit, and Métis peoples.

Participants shared deep concerns about trust, representation, and meaningful change. We heard that distrust in policing is rooted in historical and ongoing trauma, profiling, harassment, and misuse of force. Indigenous officers were seen as potential bridges, but their roles often feel tokenistic within the colonial policing system. There were strong calls for trauma-informed, culturally grounded training and hiring practices that include lived experience and assessments of cultural understanding.

Many participants expressed that current engagement efforts feel superficial. They emphasized the need for trust, consistency, and a genuine understanding of Indigenous ways of being, knowing, and doing, alongside respect for traditional governance and treaty relationships. We heard calls to move beyond symbolic gestures, such as land acknowledgements, towards meaningful and sustained partnerships. Skepticism was also voiced in relation to both apologies and rigid procurement processes that fail to reflect Indigenous realities.

Concerns were raised about the authenticity of Indigenous representation within the Service.

Participants questioned whether Indigenous officers can fully and safely express their identity and cultural values within a paramilitary structure. We heard calls for the development of a process to ensure authentic representation to address false claims of Indigeneity, particularly when such claims are used to advance careers or occupy roles specifically designated for Indigenous individuals.

We heard that community roles such as the Aboriginal Liaison Officer requires legitimate representation which they emphasized, must come with lived experience and a deep commitment to an understanding of the communities and nations they serve.

Across all consultations, the message was clear: lasting change must be systemic, community-led, and rooted in Indigenous-defined measures of success. A dedicated and distinct approach to Indigenous engagement is required, one that evolves with community needs and is not limited to supplementary programs that merely propose to fill gaps. The *Strategic Plan* engagement process reaffirmed the Board's commitment to true reconciliation and the vitality of a forthcoming Reconciliation Framework that centres Indigenous voices and supports its oversight and governance responsibilities.

Participants emphasized the importance of accountability and reflection, urging the need for a comprehensive assessment of the Service and Board's reconciliation efforts to date. We heard that this assessment must be followed by action-oriented direction, supported by

monitoring and evaluation standards that are developed and defined in partnership with community.

True reconciliation demands a fundamental shift in how the Board and the Service understand and engage with Indigenous communities. It requires a commitment to justice, healing, and respect, and a willingness to listen, learn, and act.

Two-Spirit, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, Intersex, Asexual, and Other Sexually and Gender-Diverse Communities of Toronto

During consultations, members of Two-Spirit, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, Intersex, Asexual, and other Sexually and Gender-Diverse (Queer) communities in Toronto spoke about deep, enduring mistrust of police, rooted in a history of targeted harm and systemic neglect. Participants referenced the numerous Bathhouse Raids, which left lasting trauma and helped galvanize the modern Queer rights movement. We heard that more recent incidents, including Project Marie and the police response to the Bruce McArthur murders, have reinforced the perception of many that police prioritize criminalizing Queer communities over protecting them.

We heard from Queer Members within the Service who described being maligned, silenced, or tokenized, highlighting the challenges of being visible in an institution that has historically marginalized their communities.

Within Trans communities, mistrust was especially pronounced. Many declined to participate, citing fear and past harm. Those who engaged spoke of harassment, misgendering, and systemic neglect as victims of crimes. An incident involving a leak of the Gender Diversity and Trans Inclusion training video was cited as particularly harmful, exposing identities without consent, and highlighting for community members the very real risks and exposure to harm in working with the Service.

We heard that these experiences leave many members of Queer and Trans communities with little reason to view police as protectors.

Policing was often described as a source of surveillance, humiliation, and violence. Participants emphasized that trust cannot be rebuilt through symbolic gestures. Instead, they called for sustained accountability, structural change, and genuine partnerships with affected communities.

The depth of concern and historical context surrounding this issue point to the need for a tailored, community-led approach to engagement, ongoing dialogue, and responsive action. Participants emphasized that the responsibility to repair trust rests with the Service.



What's Next

So, what's next? We know that *what* we heard is important. We are immensely grateful to all of those who came forward to share their views, their experiences and their expectations for a better future of policing in Toronto. We know that some of these conversations were difficult and at times, retraumatizing. We know that voicing some of what we heard took great courage and strength. We thank everyone we spoke to and heard from for your candour, your openness, your bravery and your authenticity.

How we heard was also important. We learned that, as a Board, we need to continuously create safe spaces for people, the community as well as Service Members, to speak to us. We heard we need to meet people where they are and listen to them thoroughly and meaningfully. This means we need to shift our traditional methods of engagement, thinking outside the box to design more effective means of dialogue in the future. We heard that methods and means of communication and engagement cannot be unilaterally imposed by the Board or the Service. We need to work towards a mutually dynamic process, with community taking a leading role in developing this process.

Who we heard from – and who we did *not* – is also important. We know there are significant

gaps in engagement, and rationale for those gaps, much of which is rooted in history and trauma. We need to define and refine how we engage in that important context. We know that the onus is, and must always be, on the Board and Service to fill in those gaps. If we are not reaching certain communities, not reaching them effectively, or not understanding them properly, the responsibility to fix this falls on us.

As we noted at the outset of this report, *What We Heard* will be directly incorporated into *the Strategic Plan for Policing in Toronto*, to be considered by the Board in the spring of 2026. Those from whom we heard may see their suggestions, recommendations, insights and input in the themes, objectives, priorities, quantitative and qualitative performance objectives of our *Strategic Plan*, in clear and explicit ways.

In addition, it is our hope and intention that *What We Heard* will also inform revisions to our processes, training, Board Policies, Service procedures, consultation protocols, and engagement initiatives. These voices, these ideas will affect other areas, including the way we do business, the way we run meetings, the language and terminology we employ, evaluation mechanisms, and our accountability measures.



**This is
*What We Heard.***






3. Intimate Partner Violence




3.1. Presentation

Toronto Police Service

November 2025




Intimate Partner & Family Violence Occurrences




- 2.73% increase from 2023 to 2024




Intimate Partner & Family Violence Occurrences by Category




Intimate Partner & Family Violence Occurrences: Rate per 100,000





In 2024, the top 5 divisions were:

- D12 (978.4)
- D31 (811.4)
- D51 (708.8)
- D41 (645.2)
- D22 (614.2)



2024 Rate of Intimate Partner Violence by Neighbourhood

Intimate Partner & Family Violence: Open Data Release

In response to the Board motion received in November 2024, and to provide increased transparency, Analytics & Innovation has prepared an open dataset for Intimate Partner and Family Violence to accompany the *2024 Annual Intimate Partner Violence Report*.

Open
Dataset



Data
Analytics



StoryMap



Supporting
Documentation





Intimate Partner Violence in the City of Toronto

Intimate Partner Violence data is now available
for download on the Public Safety Data Portal

Toronto Police Service








Intimate Partner & Family Violence - Overview

REPORTING PERIOD (2014 - 2024)

Total	Intimate Partner Violence	Family Violence	Unclassified
20,389	18,122	730	1,537
2.8%	0.9%	25.6%	19.6%
% Change Previous Year			
557	156	149	252
Absolute Change Previous Year			



FILTERS

Filter by Year Reported

2024

Month Reported

All

Division

All

Category

All

Premise Type

All

Historical

All

Clear all slicers

Data Available up to:
December 31, 2024

Report Last Updated:
October 9, 2025

I.P.V.: Collaboration through SafeTO

- Participation in the City of Toronto-funded I.P.V./Gender-Based Violence (G.B.V.) Community Working Group Work Plan
- In July 2025, the Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) hosted members of the City of Toronto-funded I.P.V./G.B.V. Community Working Group at the Toronto Police College
- Shared analysis via T.P.S./SCALE to identify relevant trends and insights regarding occurrences and incidents of I.P.V./G.B.V.
- November 2025 - Scheduled roundtable meeting with community partners

I.P.V.: Our Community Engagement Strategy

- Community Partnerships & Engagement Unit collaborates with Divisions to facilitate community engagement sessions focused on I.P.V.
- Collaborative participation from key partner agencies, such as SafeTO and Victim Services Toronto
- Prioritized I.P.V. Awareness Campaign within the top five divisions for Service-wide recognized I.P.V. Awareness Month
- Dedicated Service I.P.V. Coordinator



3.2. Toronto Police Service Intimate Partner Violence Annual Report for 2024



PUBLIC REPORT

September 29, 2025

To: Chair and Members
Toronto Police Service Board

From: Myron Demkiw
Chief of Police

Subject: Toronto Police Service 2024 Annual Intimate Partner Violence Report

Purpose: ☒ Information Purposes Only ☐ Seeking Decision

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive this report for information.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications arising from the recommendation contained in this report.

Summary:

The Intimate Partner Violence (I.P.V.) Annual Report for 2024 provides a comprehensive overview of the Toronto Police Service's (Service) whole of service approach to investigating incidents of I.P.V., supporting victims/survivors of I.P.V. and the implementation of strategies to prevent I.P.V., by utilizing statistical data.

Discussion:

Background

This report marks the first Annual Report to be produced by the Service with respect to the Service's response to I.P.V. The report provides insight on the Service's training, education and community outreach activities.

Relevant Board Policies and Compliance:

At its meeting on November 12, 2024, the Board passed the following motion:

The Board directs the Chief to:

1. Continue to engage in a multi-sectoral discussion in collaboration with SafeTO and Gender-Based Violence (GBV) organizations, and to work through SafeTO Collaborative Analytics and Learning Environment (SCALE) to:
 - a) develop a collaborative data collection framework to strengthen how data is collected, analyzed and reported, in order to support Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) survivors, and,
 - b) strengthen consultation and collaboration regarding Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) training and outcome based measurements; And
2. Host a roundtable discussion with representatives of both the Service and the GBV community to discuss improvements in collaboration with the aim of reducing the number of incidents.

Data Optimization

Data reported from the Service's Analytics & Innovation Unit is based on I.P.V. occurrences between January 1, 2024 and December 31, 2024. In 2024, there were 18,122 I.P.V. occurrences reported during that time. In November 2025, the Service will release the Intimate Partner Violence Dashboard to the Public Safety Data Portal. The Dashboard will further promote transparency and better understanding of I.P.V. crime data.

Intimate Partner Violence Investigative Training

The Service's I.P.V. investigative model is a decentralized model, where occurrences are investigated at local divisions. These I.P.V. investigations are supported by the Divisional I.P.V. Coordinator, in collaboration with the Service's I.P.V. Coordinator.

Comprehensive training is provided to officers, taking a victim-centered approach, using Trauma-Informed training and case management by specially trained officers for all I.P.V. occurrences. Investigative and front-line training is delivered by the Toronto Police College (T.P.C.) and supported by the Service's I.P.V. Coordinator.

Reporting and Community Engagement

The Service has maintained and continues to build effective partnerships with I.P.V. community organizations. Through the Community Partnerships and Engagement Unit (C.P.E.U.), SafeTO and the I.P.V. Coordinator, the Service liaises and partners with numerous organizations, participating in I.P.V. focused committees, programs and community presentations throughout the year.

The Service recognizes that many incidents of I.P.V. go unreported. In November 2024, a social media based I.P.V. Awareness Campaign was developed in collaboration with the Service's I.P.V. Coordinator, C.P.E.U., Corporate Communications and Victim

Services Toronto. The campaign was designed to provide awareness of the support services available to victims of I.P.V.

In support of the Board's motion, the Service continues to be a contributing member of SafeTO, the City of Toronto's Community Safety and Well-being Plan. The Service's SafeTO Lead, an Inspector from the C.P.E.U., participates in monthly meetings to ensure a collaborative I.P.V. response between the Service's I.P.V. Working Group and the City of Toronto funded Community I.P.V./Gender Based Violence Working Group. The Service's I.P.V. Working Group includes the Service's SafeTO Lead, members from Sex Crimes, Analytics and Innovation – S.C.A.L.E. (SafeTO Collaborative Analytics and Learning Environment) and the T.P.C.

Conclusion:

This report provides the Board with an overview of the Service's whole of service approach to I.P.V.

Chief Superintendent Joe Matthews will be in attendance to answer any questions that the Board may have regarding this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Myron Demkiw, M.O.M.
Chief of Police



Toronto Police Service

2024 Annual Intimate Partner Violence Report



Table of Contents

I. Introduction	3
II. Analytics & Insights	6
III. Partnerships & Referrals	13
Partnerships	13
Referrals	17
IV. Community Engagement	18
V. I.P.V.-focused Case Management and Service Training	22
VI. Concluding Comments	26



I. Introduction

The Toronto Police Service (Service) recognizes that Intimate Partner Violence (I.P.V.) is a serious social problem that has a direct and continued impact on victims/survivors, and families, as well as overall community safety and well-being in Toronto. The City of Toronto also recognizes the seriousness of this social problem and in 2023, Toronto city council declared Gender-Based Violence (G.B.V.) and I.P.V. to be an epidemic. In responding to I.P.V., the Service is one part of a multi-sectoral approach and is committed to continuing this important work with all partners.

The Service is committed to community safety and well-being through the intervention, prevention and investigation of I.P.V. occurrences as well as supporting victims of these crimes.

In addressing I.P.V., the goals of the Service are:

- to reduce the incidents of I.P.V. in the community through multi-sectoral collaboration and education and enforcement.
- to thoroughly investigate all I.P.V. occurrences and incidents and bring offenders to justice wherever possible.
- to enhance the safety of victims through prompt action, including referrals to other community partners.
- to build effective and impactful partnerships with community support agencies to ensure a victim-focused response that is Trauma-Informed.

This report describes the work the Service undertakes to address I.P.V. in Toronto.

Service Procedure 05-04: Intimate Partner Violence gives direction to front line officers and investigators to assist them in properly identifying, recording and investigating I.P.V. occurrences. Consistent with this procedure, officers are required to notify a Supervisory Officer of all I.P.V. occurrences or if unavailable, notify an Intimate Partner Violence Investigator (I.P.V.I.) at the Division. Moreover, I.P.V. occurrences are investigated at the divisional level with support from the I.P.V. Coordinator under the direction of the Sex Crimes Unit.

With the Service's ongoing commitment to building trust and confidence through transparency, and in compliance with the Board's 81 recommendations (now known as directions), on police reform, direction #36 directs the Service to post on the Service's public website, up-to-date copies of those procedures of public interest that govern the interaction of police with the public. In compliance with this direction, Procedure 05-04 is posted on the Service's external website for members of the public to view. It can be found at the following link:

<https://www.tps.ca/service-procedures/>.

The Service's I.P.V. procedure, 05-04 defines I.P.V. and several I.P.V. related terms as follows:

Intimate Partner Violence means any physical, sexual or psychological harm caused, or attempted, between persons involved in an intimate relationship including:

- assault;
- murder;
- sexual assault;
- threatening;
- harassment;



- intimidation;
- unlawful interference with personal liberty;
- any other criminal offence;
- offences under other statutes, such as the Family Law Act, Children's Law Reform Act, etc.;

but **does not** include child abuse investigations.

There is no specific offence of I.P.V. in the *Criminal Code*, but rather, it spans a range of conduct and offences which can be committed against intimate partners. Some amendments to the Criminal Code were made in 2019 when former Bill C-75 received Royal Assent on June 21, 2019. Among other changes, these amendments strengthened bail provisions and allowed for higher maximum penalties for I.P.V. offenders that have a prior conviction for violence against an intimate partner.

Intimate Partner Incident means any incident between persons involved in an intimate relationship where, although no criminal offence has occurred, police have been called to the scene.

Intimate Partner Violence Occurrence means an occurrence report created to detail criminal behaviour and/or a breach of any statute related to an intimate partner violence situation and includes an arrest report. (excludes an Intimate Partner Incident).

Intimate Relationship - Dating means marriage, domestic partnership, engagement, casual or serious romantic involvement, and dating, whether in a current or former relationship. Intimate Partner Violence can occur between persons of any sex, sexual orientation, gender, gender identity, or gender expression, and it can occur in any type of intimate relationship including monogamous, non-committed, and relationships involving more than two partners.

Intimate Partner Violence Investigator means an investigator qualified in the investigations of intimate partner violence as prescribed in the Community Safety and Policing Act.

Dominant Aggressor means the individual who has been the principal abuser, and not necessarily the person who initiated the violence that resulted in the attendance of police.

Intimate Partner Violence Coordinator is a position that is mandated by the Province of Ontario. This Service member is in the role of Detective and is responsible for monitoring compliance with and managing amendments to the Service procedures related to I.P.V., assist with delivering training to officers via the Toronto Police College (T.P.C.) and liaise with the T.P.C., Divisional I.P.V. Coordinators, I.P.V. Crown Attorneys, Probation and Parole Services, Partner Assault Response (P.A.R.) service providers, Victim Witness Assistance Program (V.W.A.P.), local Children's Aid, Violence Against Women Shelters, Toronto area Hospital's Domestic Violence Care Centres, court related I.P.V. committees including the High-Risk I.P.V. committee and other local services and community representatives responsible for responding to issues related to I.P.V. occurrences. The Service's I.P.V. Coordinator is also responsible for managing and administering the Ontario Domestic Assault Risk Assessment

(O.D.A.R.A.) licenses to Service members.



There are a number of I.P.V. related terms that the community uses and the Service is aware of, but does not currently use and are not included in Service governance. The following are some examples:

Gender-based Violence (G.B.V.) – this term is commonly interchanged with I.P.V., however it is specifically related to violence against a person because of their gender and is often but not always related to I.P.V.

Femicide – this term is commonly used in the community referencing the murder of females and is often used when a female is murdered by their intimate partner. Femicide is commonly used to describe the killing of women and girls because of their sex/gender.

Coercive Control – this term is often used to describe patterns of control and mental abuse that cause fear or terror, including coercion and control (regulating or dominating a partner's behaviour and choices, isolating a person from family and friends, and restricting access to employment, education or medical care).

Coercive control is not identified as a criminal charge in the Criminal Code of Canada and therefore, in most cases there are no criminal charges that can be associated with the offender's behaviour. The Service's I.P.V. investigators appreciate that Coercive Control is often present in a criminal I.P.V. investigation and this behaviour is evaluated and considered during the risk assessment process in the pursuit of victim safety.



II. Analytics & Insights

I.P.V. data is collected and analyzed throughout the year. It is not uncommon for victims and/or complainants to file a police report after the occurrence date. This report includes I.P.V. occurrences that took place in 2024, though many may have been reported in early 2025. Likewise, I.P.V. occurrences that took place in 2023 but were reported or identified after the investigation in 2024 will be found in 2023 data.

The data provided in this report was provided by the Service's Analytics and Innovation Unit (A.&I.). The full dataset for this report can be found at the [Public Safety Data Portal - Open Data – Intimate Partner Violence](https://opendata-torontops.opendata.arcgis.com/pages/intimate-partner-and-family-violence). (<https://opendata-torontops.opendata.arcgis.com/pages/intimate-partner-and-family-violence>)

Analytics & Insights Data Glossary

Crime Rate: the number of crimes per 100,000 members of the population. This is used to provide a standardized measure for comparison.

Family: Familial relationships such as parents, siblings, or any other family members.

Family Violence: Family violence refers to any occurrence where the “Family Violence Flag” was selected to be a parent, child, or sibling relationship.

Unclassified: The relationship between the victim and the accused in the occurrence is not identified or indicated but the investigating officers have identified this as an intimate partner related incident.

Historical Occurrence: Refers to occurrences where there is a difference between the reported date and the occurrence date by 365 days or more.

I.P.V. Occurrence: For A.&I. statistical purposes, an I.P.V. Occurrence includes both Intimate Partner incidents and I.P.V. occurrences.

2024 - Reported Intimate Partner & Family Violence Occurrences

In 2024 there was a grand total of 20,389 I.P.V. / Family Violence occurrences reported to the Service. This was nearly a 3% increase over the 19,832 occurrences reported in 2023. Historically, the volume of I.P.V. occurrences has only slightly fluctuated over an 11-year span (2014 - 2024). The average percentage change of total occurrences from 2014 to 2024 is **less than 1 %**.

Figure 1a below compares the number of reported occurrences over the last eleven years.




Figure 1a: Total Reported I.P.V. Occurrences (2014-2024). This includes I.P.V., Family Violence and Unclassified occurrences.

In 2024, 89% (18,122) of total reported occurrences were specific to I.P.V., representing less than a 1% increase from the 17,966 (90%) occurrences reported in 2023. Table 1 below shows the reported occurrence breakdown between I.P.V., Family Violence (F.V.) and Unclassified.

	Intimate	Family	I.P.V. / F.V. Ratio	Unclassified	Total	Total %Chg
2014	18,584	1,531	12	536	20,651	N/A
2015	18,630	1,371	14	972	20,973	1.6%
2016	19,127	1,501	13	1,042	21,670	3.3%
2017	17,196	1,332	13	2,178	20,706	-4.4%
2018	17,893	1,135	16	1,791	20,819	0.5%
2019	18,943	1,065	18	1,121	21,129	1.5%
2020	19,283	907	21	827	21,017	-0.5%
2021	18,749	852	22	959	20,560	-2.2%
2022	17,544	616	28	1,194	19,354	-5.9%
2023	17,966	581	31	1,285	19,832	2.5%
2024	18,122	730	25	1,537	20,389	2.8%

Table 1: Reported Occurrences Total Counts and Percentage Change




Figure 1b: Reported Intimate Partner, Family, and Unclassified Occurrences (2014-2024).

2024 - Total Reported I.P.V. Occurrences by Division

In 2024, the top 5 divisions with the highest I.P.V. rate per 100,000 members of the population were:

- D12 (**978.4**)
- D31 (**811.4**)
- D51 (**708.8**)
- D41 (**645.2**)
- D22 (**614.2**)

Compared to D53 which had the lowest I.P.V. crime rate (**362.1**), D12's I.P.V. rate was **2.7 times** more than that of D53.




Figure 2: I.P.V. Crime Rate by Division in 2024



Division	Occurrences	Population	Rate per 100k Population
D12	1,328	135,735	978.4
D31	1,361	167,730	811.4
D51	1,106	156,042	708.8
D41	1,244	192,808	645.2
D22	1,579	257,075	614.2
D14	1,129	186,457	605.5
D43	1,356	227,807	595.2
D23	996	168,642	590.6
D11	813	138,749	586.0
D52	629	108,188	581.4
D55	1,477	264,864	557.6
D13	714	142,599	500.7
D33	1,095	229,704	476.7
D32	1,177	290,229	405.5
D42	1,037	282,831	366.7
D53	832	229,765	362.1

Table 2: I.P.V. Divisional I.P.V. Occurrences and Crime Rate in 2024

Citywide, the rate of I.P.V. reported occurrences per 100,000 members of the population was 637.2 in 2024, no change from the previous year despite population growth.



2024 - Total Reported I.P.V. Occurrences by Neighbourhood

Although *West Hill* had the highest number of I.P.V. occurrences in 2024 (**316** occurrences), it only ranked 8th in terms of I.P.V. Crime Rate per 100,000 populations. *Weston* ranked 1st for highest crime rate (**1,315.7**) in 2024, followed by *Beechborough-Greenbrook* (**1,295.8**) and *Weston-Pelham Park* (**1,187.8**). All top 3 neighbourhoods fall within or intersect with D12 boundary.




Figure 3: I.P.V. Crime Rate by Neighbourhood in 2024

Neighbourhood	Occurrences	Rate per 100k Population
Weston	284	1,315.7
Beechborough-Greenbrook	100	1,295.8
Weston-Pelham Park	146	1,187.8
New Toronto	141	1,115.1
Black Creek	255	1,106.9
North St.James Town	217	1,019.3
Oakdale-Beverley Heights	252	1,016.8
West Hill	316	987.5
Rockcliffe-Smythe	235	979.8
Mount Dennis	142	976.0

Table 3: Top 10 Neighbourhoods' I.P.V. Occurrences and Crime Rate in 2024



2014 – 2024 Total Reported I.P.V. / Family Violence Occurrences by Division

Between 2014 to 2024, the following divisions experienced the highest total number of occurrences:

- 43 Division (**20,316** Occurrences)
- 55 Division (**20,105** Occurrences)
- 31 Division (**18,744** Occurrences)
- 41 Division (**17,950** Occurrences)




Figure 4: Total number of reported occurrences between 2014 and 2024 by Division.
This includes I.P.V., Family Violence and Unclassified occurrences.

2025 - Reported Intimate Partner Violence Occurrences Year-to-date Trend

There have been 14,308 I.P.V. / Family Violence occurrences reported to the Service between January 1, 2025, to September 30, 2025. This represents a 7% decrease compared to the same period in 2024.



III. Partnerships and Referrals

1. Partnerships

A victim-focused response that is Trauma-Informed requires building effective community partnerships to ensure that victims are supported and have access to important services. Through the Community Partnerships and Engagement Unit (C.P.E.U.) and the I.P.V. Coordinator, the Service liaises and partners with numerous organizations, participating in I.P.V.-focused committees, programs, and community presentations throughout the year. These organizations include:

- **The Toronto Network of Gender-Based Violence Shelter**
 - A Service Protocol was signed and put into action in 2024. This Protocol is guided by many objectives, including to establish a collaborative approach, and a mutual understanding of procedures, policies, roles, and responsibilities between the 13 Violence Against Women (V.A.W.) shelters and the Service, benefitting victims and their families in their time of need.
- **Interval House - Intimate Partner Violence & Family Shelter**
 - Supporting a strong collaborative partnership, all new Service recruits receive a training presentation from the Interval House Shelter to increase their awareness and understanding of the shelter and available supports for victims/survivors who may need emergency family shelter resulting from an I.P.V. incident. Additionally, the Interval House Shelter hosts many pre-arranged visits for Service recruits to see the Shelter in person for an enhanced understanding of their facility.
- **The Toronto Region Intimate Partner Violence High Risk Committee**
 - Formally established in 2024, this committee has a mandate to facilitate a timely, coordinated and effective **criminal justice response** to high-risk cases involving I.P.V. This is achieved through the identification, monitoring, and management of high-risk I.P.V. cases.
 - The committee's goal is to enable the sharing of information, and collaboration to enhance the safety of victims / survivors / complainants, their families and the general community in a manner that is Trauma-Informed and considers the intersectional identities of survivors.
- **The Intimate Partner Violence Advisory Committee**
 - This committee **provides a forum for information sharing** between members of the judicial system, local children's aid societies, women's shelters and other community-based agencies with a specific emphasis on improving follow-up support for victims.
- **The Victim Witness Assistance Program (V.W.A.P.)**
 - The program **provides assistance and support to victims and witnesses of crime** to increase their understanding of, and participation in, the criminal court process.



- **The Domestic Violence Court Advisory Committees (D.V.C.A.C.)**
 - Facilitated by the Ministry of the Attorney General - Court Services Division, Toronto. This committee **enables effective communication** when issues arise or when changes in process are required. There are four individual Court Advisory Committees, one for each court team (West, Central, South and East courts).
- **The Partner Assault Response (P.A.R.) Program**
 - A component of Ontario's Domestic Violence Court program, which **provides educational / counselling services** by community-based agencies to people who have assaulted their intimate partners.
- **Victim Services Toronto (V.S.T.)**
 - Victim Services Toronto provides immediate, personalized support and advocacy for any person in Toronto impacted by crime or sudden tragedy.
 - V.S.T. and the Service work together across multiple points of the victim/survivor journey - from crisis response and justice system navigation to prevention and training. The following initiatives illustrate how these partnerships ensure that victims/survivors of I.P.V. are supported while working together to build safer communities for the future.

I. Crisis Response

24/7 Crisis Line

V.S.T.'s 24/7 Crisis Response Program responds immediately to support individuals and families in the aftermath of crime and/or sudden tragedy. The crisis counselors ensure victims/survivors receive immediate, Trauma-Informed care at the moment of crisis — reducing isolation, supporting safety, and complementing police response.

- Two 24/7 dedicated crisis phone lines: one public, one for the Service.
- V.S.T. crisis counselors provide support on-site or over-the-phone, from immediate emergency care, safety planning, to ongoing support whether or not an individual files a report to police.
- Service officers connect I.P.V. victims to V.S.T. crisis counselors who provide immediate support on the scene.
- Supported 17,551 victims in 2024



Exit Route

The Exit Route Program embeds professional social workers in Service divisions and specialized units creating a bridge between the Service and the community. The model increases community trust, reduces repeat victimization, and helps to ensure that victims/survivors' complex needs are met.

- V.S.T. Neighbourhood Victim Advocates (N.V.A.) are embedded in 9 divisions & units:
 - 5 police divisions (14, 23, 31, 43, 51)
 - 4 specialized units: Human Trafficking, Internet Child Exploitation, Homicide/Missing Persons and the Emergency Task Force
- N.V.A. work directly alongside officers to meet victims/survivors' needs — addressing housing, counseling, and system navigation outside law enforcement's scope.

II. Court & Justice Support

These initiatives provide enhanced emotional support to victims during police statements and court testimonies. They create conditions that reduce trauma for victims/survivors of I.P.V. and G.B.V. ultimately helping to increase access to justice.

Court Accompaniment & Advocacy

- V.S.T. social workers prepare young victims and witnesses to testify and accompany them to court, including for I.P.V. cases.
- Trauma Dog Program: V.S.T.'s certified trauma dog is available to provide comfort to victims/survivors during police statements and court proceedings.

Remote Testimony Program (anticipated to launch by end of 2025)

- In partnership with Women's College Hospital (W.C.H.), and with Service input, this dedicated room at W.C.H. will allow victims/survivors to testify in a safe, trauma-informed space outside courtrooms.

RISE Program (In Development)

- First of its kind, post-court therapy program for child abuse victims who testified in court addressing a critical gap in survivor recovery recognizing that the experience of testifying can compound trauma.

III. Prevention & Awareness

Educational Programs

V.S.T. education initiatives equip tens of thousands of students annually with tools to prevent abuse, recognize danger, and seek support early. They establish early intervention for young people already at risk of I.P.V., building resilience and safety in high need communities.



Annual Youth Safety Symposium

- Partnership between the Toronto District School Board (T.D.S.B.) and the Service
- 24,951 students reached in 2024 (Grades 5–12).
- In-class programming designed to prevent G.B.V. including I.P.V. covering topics like consent, healthy relationships, trafficking risks, and online safety.
- Impact Highlights: 95% of students found content relevant; 100% of educators reported increased safety skills.

T.E.A.R. Program (Teens Ending Abusive Relationships)

- The T.E.A.R.™ Program helps prevent in-person and online gender-based violence by equipping youth with tools and resources to make healthy relationship choices, identify the warning signs of abusive relationships and reach out for help.
- Mobile T.E.A.R. embeds counselors in six high-priority T.D.S.B. schools, reaching the most vulnerable youth.
- 4,484 youth participants annually.

Ask for Angela – Community Safety Campaign

Ask for Angela offers a community-based pathway to safety, complementing Service efforts by reaching victims/survivors in everyday settings and expanding citywide safety nets. This program, introduced by V.S.T. in October 2023, uses a video to promote the program. The video involves a person discreetly approaching staff members at participating venues and asking for "Angela" as a code phrase for help. The staff members are trained to understand this code and assist the person in need, which can be particularly useful in situations of potential I.P.V.

- Launched at 238 Loblaws/Shoppers locations across Toronto.
- Trained staff respond discreetly when someone asks, "Is Angela here?"
- 500+ victims/survivors of G.B.V. directly connected to supports via QR codes
- Several referrals to V.S.T. Crisis Response Program helped victims of I.P.V. access safety and support.
- Expansion planned for 2026 in response to anticipated increased G.B.V., including I.P.V., during FIFA World Cup.

Officer Training & Capacity Building

V.S.T. delivers specialized training for incoming officers at the T.P.C. which covers Trauma-Informed care and survivor-centered practices, including when responding to I.P.V. cases. This helps to build capacity within the Service to respond with compassion, skill, and effectiveness, from day one of service.

Together, V.S.T. and the Service provide a continuum of care — from the scene of a crime, across communities, and through the courts — ensuring victims/survivors of I.P.V. are never left to face trauma alone. At the same time, this collaboration increases



capacity and awareness, equipping youth, families, and community members with tools to recognize warning signs and act early. Guided by their promise of “No Victim Alone”, their partnership builds safety, dignity, and resilience across Toronto.

2. Referrals

Service members regularly make referrals to community-support partner agencies. Such referrals are fundamental to removing barriers that victims face in navigating their journeys, including the reporting of I.P.V. The Service procedure directs officers to offer victims/survivors of Intimate Partner Incidents and I.P.V. the assistance of V.S.T. and make the referral if accepted.

Additionally, front-line officers have immediate and direct access to many agencies for referrals. Currently, there are approximately 16 community-support partner agencies collaborating with the Service to assist victims/survivors and their families some of which are:

- Victim Services Toronto;
- Domestic Violence Care Centers (Women’s College Hospital, Scarborough Health Network – Birchmount);
- Toronto area Intimate Partner Violence / Gender Based Violence shelters;
- Children’s Aid Societies;
- BOOST - Child Youth Advocacy Centre;
- M.C.I.S. Language Solutions.



IV. Community Engagement

Community Engagement for the Service is led by the C.P.E.U. The C.P.E.U. supports officers in all Divisions in the practical application of community mobilization principles and crime prevention. The C.P.E.U. administers large organizational programs and crime prevention initiatives. Recognizing that community safety and well-being is a shared responsibility between the community and the police, the C.P.E.U. develops, maintains, and is committed to building collaborative relationships with all partners and stakeholders utilizing a multi-sectoral approach. The C.P.E.U. is comprised of three subsections: Community Engagement, Community Services and Neighbourhood Policing. The Service is committed to building collaborative relationships with all our communities while fostering mutual respect and understanding.

I.P.V. Community Engagement Strategy – Data-Driven “Hot Spot” Approach

A key component of the I.P.V. community engagement strategy is the strategic use of data to identify geographic “hot spots” — areas experiencing elevated levels of I.P.V.-related activity. In partnership with local divisional Neighbourhood Community Officers (N.C.O.s), Crime Prevention Officers (C.P.O.s), and SafeTO community safety partners, the Service delivers targeted community presentations tailored to address the specific needs of these high-priority areas.

These presentations typically include:

- Analysis of relevant data and emerging trends
- An overview of intimate partner violence
- Prevention strategies and safety planning
- Reporting mechanisms and procedures
- Information on available community services and support agencies

“Hot spot” data is compiled and analyzed on a quarterly basis using the following criteria:

- Number of reported occurrences
- Number of arrests
- Volume of calls for service

While the top five divisions with the highest indicators are prioritized for proactive engagement, all divisions across the Service remain actively involved in the ongoing prevention and response to I.P.V.

SafeTO Engagement on I.P.V. and G.B.V.

SafeTO is the City of Toronto’s comprehensive ten-year plan designed to advance community safety and well-being. The Service is a contributing member of SafeTO via the Service’s SafeTO Lead who plays a key role in facilitating a coordinated response to I.P.V. and G.B.V. This includes fostering collaboration between the Service’s I.P.V. Working Group and the City of Toronto-funded Community I.P.V. / G.B.V. Working Group. The Service’s I.P.V. Working Group comprises representatives from SafeTO, C.P.E.U., Sex Crimes, T.P.C. and A.&I. and SCALE. The Service’s SafeTO Lead actively engages with the community through consultations and the presentation of Service data to community groups to inform strategic responses. The Service’s



SafeTO Lead also represents the Service on the City of Toronto funded Community I.P.V. / G.B.V. Working Group. Through this collaboration, the Service has identified community needs to further enhance a collaborative community response.

Key Areas of Focus for I.P.V. / G.B.V. Community Engagement

In alignment with SafeTO's goals of awareness, intervention, and prevention, the following initiatives were undertaken:

- Quarterly Hot Spot Analysis
 - Joint data review with the Service and the City of Toronto
 - Shared data analysis via SCALE to identify relevant trends and insights, including:
 - Overview of I.P.V. occurrences (e.g. frequency, location, timing/trends)
 - Prevention strategies
 - Reporting mechanisms to support prevention (e.g. personal safety, internal referral services at the time of the incident)
 - Information on support services and community resources
 - Community feedback on Service presence and engagement
- Continued participation in the City of Toronto-funded I.P.V. / G.B.V. Community Working Group Work Plan
- Community-Informed Training Development
 - In July 2025, the Service hosted members of the City of Toronto-funded I.P.V. / G.B.V. Community Working Group at the Toronto Police College. The Service presented a training précis on I.P.V. / G.B.V. and solicited community input on officer training approaches. Participating organizations included:
 - WomanACT (Trustee)
 - Y.W.C.A.
 - White Ribbon
 - Women's Habitat
 - Aura Freedom International
 - Barbra Schlifer Commemorative Clinic

These efforts reflect the Service's ongoing commitment to evidence-based, community-informed approaches in addressing I.P.V. and G.B.V. across Toronto.

Social Media Engagement

In 2024, the C.P.E.U. spearheaded a comprehensive and multifaceted social media campaign during the I.P.V. Awareness Month of November. This campaign highlighted the community partners crucial role in the ongoing commitment to support victims of I.P.V. The collaboration and engagement with the community is vital in these efforts. This campaign involved cooperation between community agencies, Consultative Committees, established community



safety networks, C.P.O.s, N.C.O.s, Corporate Communications, and front-line officers. All played an essential role in this collective effort. Throughout the year, the C.P.E.U. continued to support V.S.T. by using social media to repost V.S.T.'s information on I.P.V. and G.B.V.

The C.P.E.U., in consultation with Sex Crimes, A.&I., Corporate Communications, V.S.T. and the Service's SafeTO Lead, developed materials focused on I.P.V. awareness and community resources to support victims of I.P.V. and their families. The objectives for this initiative were:

- **I.P.V. Awareness:** To provide a better understanding of I.P.V. through information and education while promoting community resources to support victims and their families.
- **Promote community support and resources:** To increase awareness of available resources and support services utilizing social media and mainstream media.
- **Deliver training to members:** Provide internal training to all Divisional Crime Managers to better inform front-line members on I.P.V. awareness, focusing on the importance of referrals and timely community engagement to support crime prevention efforts.
- **Increase referrals:** Reduce incidents of I.P.V. by increasing Service referrals to V.S.T. and other community support networks.

This Social Media campaign ran from November 1, 2024, to November 30, 2024, and saw strong engagement across multiple social media platforms. This campaign also included two voting polls on "X" (Twitter) to encourage community engagement.

2024 I.P.V. Awareness Social Media Campaign

Platform	Impression	Likes	Shares	Poll Votes
X (Twitter)	105,858	201	105	940
Facebook	8,177	194	38	
Instagram	38,893	2,356	366	
	152,928	2,751	509	940

Figure 5: I.P.V. Social Media Awareness Campaign results



C.P.E.U. created an educational pamphlet and poster for public dissemination to help achieve these goals. These materials included QR codes that provide quick access to information on I.P.V. and community resources for support. The materials were distributed to community partners, including the Toronto Community Housing Corporation, the Toronto Transit Commission (T.T.C.), Toronto Public Health and all Toronto school boards. Posters were provided to all Divisional C.P.O.'s. The materials were shared through other established public safety and health networks including universities, colleges, downtown security networks, public libraries and hospitals. The Service's SafeTO Lead continues to collaborate with the City of Toronto to share analytics and information to support program alignment in this area.

Community Presentations

The Services' Chief's Consultative Committees (C.C.C.) and Divisional Community Police Liaison Committees (C.P.L.C.) have also been essential in sharing information and materials with community members. The Seniors Liaison Officer conducted 6 community presentations to Seniors groups on Elder Abuse and I.P.V.

Community Liaison Officers participated in podcasts, community radio interviews and talk shows providing information and education on I.P.V. These sessions were developed with input from the Service's I.P.V. Coordinator, V.S.T. and the respective C.C.C. to identify and address potential differences and issues within our communities. Liaison Officers continue to engage and distribute the material to the various ethnic media outlets, including radio and television.

An integral element of this initiative includes the active engagement of Service members within our communities and neighbourhoods to enhance community safety and well-being while building relationships with community members through meaningful conversations. C.P.E.U. and Divisional C.P.O. hosted I.P.V. information sessions at identified events and locations within the divisions. These events included a Crime Prevention Pop-Up at the Queen Street. T.T.C. Subway Station, Newcomer Day at Nathan Philips Square, a Crime Prevention table at Mel Lastman Square, Trinbago Festival at Nathan Philips Square and a community presentation delivered by the Service's 2SLGBTQI+ Liaison officer.

With the assistance of the Service's Divisional N.C.O., the C.P.E.U. promoted the 'Ask for Angela' (V.S.T. program) campaign through community engagement and social media.

On November 7, 2024, the C.P.E.U., along with V.S.T. and the T.D.S.B., co-hosted the School Safety Symposium. T.D.S.B. students, community partners and stakeholders were in attendance. The symposium, aimed at youth in grades 5-12, focused on preventing youth involvement in violence, including healthy versus unhealthy relationships.

The C.P.E.U. identified I.P.V. as a priority during the Provincial Crime Prevention Week campaign, providing information on I.P.V. and community support services available.

Crime Prevention Internal Educational Support

The Service recognizes the importance of ongoing learning and information sharing amongst members to support crime prevention initiatives. The C.P.E.U. conducts weekly briefings on crime trends, including I.P.V., with all Divisional C.P.O.



V. I.P.V.-focused Case Management and Training

In addition to training Service members on I.P.V. response, all I.P.V. investigations are case-managed by investigators who are accredited in I.P.V. investigations and who use a Trauma-Informed Approach that enhances victim safety and ensures a victim-centered focus. Furthermore, accredited investigators are trained to conduct a risk-assessment when an index incident involves either a physical assault or credible threat of death against a current or former intimate or dating partner. In these cases, the O.D.A.R.A. tool is used to evaluate the likelihood of the offender committing future assaults. The use and application of O.D.A.R.A. enhances victim safety, helps identify high-risk cases before the courts, and facilitates better informed decisions regarding the release of offenders.

O.D.A.R.A. – is a Province-wide, 13-item I.P.V. actuarial risk assessment tool that is used by accredited Service I.P.V. trained investigators to assess the risk to the victims/survivors by predicting the future violence against an Intimate Partner, as well as the frequency and severity of the violence at the hands of the offender. O.D.A.R.A. considers many factors including the number of children in the family, substance abuse issues, the offender's criminal history and the barriers that victim's/survivor's face in terms of accessing support.

In June 2025, the I.P.V.I. Course at the T.P.C. was accredited by the Ontario Police College (O.P.C.) under the C.S.P.A. The course has been extended from five to eight days (56 hours), with the additional time covering topics such as:

- Trauma-Informed Approach/Response
- Domestic Violence Death Review Committee (D.V.D.R.C.)
- Non-Consensual Distribution of Intimate Images
- Human Trafficking
- Human Trafficking Survivor Perspective
- Wellness
- Ending Violence Against Indigenous Women & Girls
- Safe Pets (Helping I.P.V. Survivors with their pets) program training
- I.P.V. Homicide Case Study

Service members are trained in I.P.V. throughout their career, beginning with recruitment. Officers performing dedicated investigative functions have their I.P.V. training enhanced with specialized courses. Service members may also attend specialized conferences and seminars offered externally on I.P.V. investigations and on supporting victims/survivors of I.P.V.

The T.P.C. also engages with the community when the need for training subject matter experts is required. On July 9, 2025, the T.P.C. had the opportunity to provide an overview of the I.P.V.I. Course, discuss its alignment with the C.S.P.A., and engage with Toronto Police Service Board members and the City of Toronto's I.P.V. Working Group in collaborative dialogue regarding course content, trauma-informed practices, and victim support.



T.P.C. Courses – I.P.V. Training – 5316 Officers Trained

The following courses delivered by the T.P.C. to Service members are either specific I.P.V. training courses or include components of I.P.V. investigations, including Trauma-Informed victim/survivor support principles that support officers during investigations that include an I.P.V. component. The included training information represents the current minimum standard of training across the Service. These courses and statistics are representative from September 1, 2024, to August 31, 2025.




Figure 6: Total officers trained - September 1, 2024, to August 31, 2025

Cadet-In-Training Onboarding (Recruits) – 351 Officers Trained

Recruits attend the O.P.C. for the Basic Constable Training Course. Recruits return to the T.P.C. for post-O.P.C. training in advance of deployment. I.P.V. training is included in O.P.C.'s curriculum.

Upon returning to the T.P.C., recruits receive localized Toronto centric I.P.V. training including:

- In-class module related to the investigative principles of I.P.V., Service Procedures, and the principles/resources related to victim support.
- Participation in live scenario training involving actors where recruits respond to various incidents they would encounter in the field. Three of these scenarios are related to I.P.V. investigations.
- The 2SLGBTQI+ portion of training which discusses the topic in relation to I.P.V. and discusses local examples.



Coach Officer Course – 258 Officers Trained

The Coach Officer course is a mandatory course delivered to officers taking on the role of Coach Officer in which they are responsible for mentoring and training new officers. This course includes training related to I.P.V. Three courses ran between September 1, 2024 and December 31, 2024 (87 officers trained). Three of six sessions have been completed for 2025 (171 officers trained).

Special Constable Recruit Program – 144 Officers Trained

The Special Constable Recruit program delivers a Criminal Justice Terminology Lesson. The lesson covers Victim Notifications as relates to Procedure 01-15: Bail Hearings and Detention Orders. To enhance I.P.V. victim safety, an accused's bail conditions are communicated personally to the victim as close as possible to the time bail is granted in the court room and not delayed until the actual physical release. Court Services Special Constables play a vital role in this safety measure, by notifying and delivering the release documents to the division, for victim notification before the release of the accused.

Annual In-Service Training – 3885 Officers Trained

In-Service Training (I.S.T.) is mandatory in-class and scenario training delivered to officers from the rank of Constable to Staff Sergeant.

The 2024 I.S.T. curriculum included a module dedicated to I.P.V. The curriculum was designed to accomplish several learning objectives, including:

- Using a Trauma-Informed Approach
- Identifying the dominant aggressor
- Highlighting aspects of the Service's I.P.V. Procedure
- Identifying the need for I.P.V. accredited investigators to complete the online module of the O.D.A.R.A. Tool
- Resources and supports that are available for victims and others impacted by I.P.V.

The 2025, I.S.T. curriculum included discussions around violence against women as it relates to Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women. Additionally, statistical information was presented raising the awareness that women in the Indigenous community are at a higher risk of experiencing violence.

Intimate Partner Violence Investigator's Course – 120 Officers Trained

Service Investigators are required to complete the mandatory I.P.V.I. Course before being assigned as a case manager of an I.P.V. investigation. This I.P.V.I. training has been recently modernized and updated. In June 2025, the I.P.V.I. Course at the T.P.C. was accredited by the O.P.C. under the C.S.P.A. Two course sessions were delivered in 2024 (September and November). To date for 2025, two sessions have been delivered.



Specialized Investigative Training

The T.P.C. has incorporated I.P.V. response and awareness training on various courses designed to train Service members who are assigned to investigative roles across the Service. The additional training added to these courses addresses the intersectionality of I.P.V. and other criminal investigations. These investigative courses include:

1. Criminal Investigators Training – 249 Officers Trained

This course replaced the General Investigators Training in July 2024, after receiving certification through the O.P.C. Three sessions were delivered by the T.P.C. in September, November and December 2024. To date for 2025, six sessions have been delivered at the T.P.C. Sixteen Service members received this training externally by certified instructors from other services.

2. Death Investigator's Course – 47 Officers Trained

This course has been recently updated by the T.P.C. and is pending accreditation from the O.P.C. Two sessions were delivered in 2024 (October and November).

3. Human Trafficking Investigator's Course – 21 Officers Trained

This course has been recently updated by the T.P.C. and is pending accreditation from the O.P.C. One session was delivered in November 2024.

4. Sexual Assault Investigator's Course – 100 Officers Trained

This course has been recently updated by the T.P.C. and received accreditation from the O.P.C. in April 2025. Two sessions were delivered in 2024 (November and December) and two sessions have been delivered to date in 2025 (March and July).

5. Sergeant Promotional Onboarding 2025 – 191 Officers Trained

The T.P.C. delivered two-week long mandatory training courses for members on the eligibility list to be promoted to the rank of Sergeant. This course included a module dedicated to I.P.V. 78 Officers were trained between September 1 and December 31, 2024. 113 Officers were trained between January and March 2025.

6. Re-Integration Course – 28 Officers Trained

This course is designed to prepare a Police Officer to return to frontline duties after returning from a long-duration absence/leave. This course includes training dedicated to I.P.V. investigations.

The T.P.C. will continue its commitment to developing and delivering training to prepare members to effectively investigate I.P.V. and support victims and others using a Trauma-Informed Approach.



Concluding Comments

The Service's response to I.P.V. is multi-faceted and comprehensive. Training on I.P.V. is embedded in the Service throughout all members' careers, including specialized training courses for those directly involved in investigating I.P.V. cases. Furthermore, all I.P.V. incidents are case managed by specially trained officers.

The Service has been focused for years on exploring, developing, maintaining, and enhancing community partnerships in the pursuit of community safety and well-being. To strengthen these relationships, the Service continues to build trust within the community through transparency and open dialog. With the release of Open Data I.P.V. Dashboard statistics through the Public Safety Data Portal on the Service website, the Service has increased this transparency to the community. Looking forward, collaborative analysis of these shared I.P.V. analytics within the SafeTO Working Groups will continue to improve the Service response to I.P.V. incidents with the goal of a safer Toronto.

Acknowledging the analysis of I.P.V. data is essential to respond to I.P.V. incidents appropriately, the Service continues to improve data quality by reducing the number of "unclassified" I.P.V. incidents with improved officer training around data input. With enhanced data, more accuracy is achieved and a better localized community response can be implemented at the divisional level.

Recognizing the complexity of addressing I.P.V. and supporting victims, the Service builds effective partnerships with a wide range of community organizations. Through the relationships with community organizations, the Service assists victims/survivors to navigate significant barriers to obtaining services and to reporting incidents by referring them to appropriate organizations. Using a Trauma-Informed lens, the Service recognizes the importance of victim support at the start of the investigation and strives to improve on the number of referrals made to our community partners and V.S.T. Ongoing collaboration with community partners and continued training and education of front-line officers and I.P.V. investigators will achieve this goal.

The Service's continued commitment to addressing I.P.V. is also reflected in the numerous programs that are planned each November to bring awareness to this significant issue in our communities during the I.P.V. Awareness month. In November 2025, the Service will again be collaborating with I.P.V. community partners and through Corporate Communications, to promote I.P.V. education through a social media campaign. Through our ongoing community engagement strategies, the Service continues to interact with the community and community organizations exchanging valuable information regarding I.P.V.



4. Update on the Implementation of Auditor General Recommendations



PUBLIC REPORT

September 30, 2025

To: Chair and Members
Toronto Police Service Board

From: Myron Demkiw
Chief of Police

Subject: Update on the Implementation of Auditor General
Recommendations

Purpose: ☒ Information Purposes Only ☐ Seeking Decision

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive the following report and forward a copy to the City of Toronto (City) Council for information.

Financial Implications:

To date, all costs incurred to implement the recommendations made by the Auditor General (A.G.) have been aligned and incorporated into existing Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) projects, programs and initiatives that have approved funding allocations. Various funding sources have been used to support the costs, including the Modernization Reserve and the City's Tax Stabilization Reserve.

At this time, all remaining costs will be contained within the approved 2025 Operating Budget.

Summary:


This update to the Board highlights the T.P.S.'s ongoing implementation of recommendations from the A.G.'s reports:

- “Review of Toronto Police Service – Opportunities to Support More Effective Responses to Calls for Service; A Journey of Change: Improving Community Safety and Well-Being Outcomes.”
- “Audit of 9-1-1 Public Safety Answering Point Operations; Better Support for Staff, Improved Information Management and Outcomes.”

It is anticipated that 24 out of the 51 recommendations from both audits will be implemented by the end of the first quarter of 2026. The remaining recommendations will continue to be addressed collaboratively through internal efforts and external partnerships with City agencies.

All implemented recommendations have been submitted for verification by the A.G. The chart below displays the number of recommendations by implementation status as of September 2025.

Please refer to Appendix A and B for further information on the implementation status of each recommendation



Status Markers	
In Progress	Work is underway, not yet complete.
In Progress – Near Completion	Targeted for completion by the end first quarter of 2026.
Implemented	Recommendation operationalized, pending Auditor General verification.
Supporting Role Only	The T.P.S. supports recommendations led by the City Manager or Board.

Discussion:

Engagement Strategies:

The ongoing collaboration and engagement with internal and external partners, including City agencies, ensures the practical and sustainable implementation of these recommendations. At the core of this approach is the co-creation and co-development of mutually beneficial solutions that address both the needs of the T.P.S. and those of our broader community partners.

Internally, recommendations are managed through a structured process: each is assigned to a designated lead unit, with subject matter experts from across the organization providing targeted support for effective implementation. T.P.S. Communications Services is a significant stakeholder in this process, leading the work on most of the recommendations.

Externally, T.P.S. continues to collaborate closely with the City's Social Development Division (S.D.) to coordinate progress on the 16 shared recommendations. Prior to September 2025, T.P.S. coordinated progress with the Deputy City Manager's Office (D.C.M.O.), which included co-developing City Council updates, and major reports delivered in the fall of 2023 and May 2025.

For recommendations requiring a cross-agency approach, T.P.S. partners with key City divisions:

- Paramedic Services (P.S.)
- Toronto Fire Services (T.F.S.)
- Customer Experience Division (C.X.D.)
- Municipal Licensing and Standards (M.L.S.)
- Strategic Public & Employee Communications (S.P.E.C.)
- Social Development (formally known as Social Development, Finance & Administration)
- Community and Social Services (C.S.S.)

City and Police sub-groups advancing this work include:

- 9-1-1 Committee (T.P.S., T.F.S., P.S.)
- "See Ambulance" Protocol Review Working Group (T.P.S., P.S.)

- "Make the Right Call" Working Group (S.P.E.C., T.P.S.)
- Update Call on Policing Reforms (Board, T.P.S., S.D., D.C.M.O.)
- Operational Leads Review Table (C.X.D., T.P.S.)
- Non-Emergency Call/Response Steering Committee (N.E.C.R.S.C) (C.X.D., D.C.M.-C.S.S., M.L.S., S.D., S.P.E.C.)
- Tri-Services Committee (T.P.S., T.F.S., P.S.)

Key Auditor General Recommendation Highlights

Since the July 2023 update to the Board, we have initiated several projects to further these recommendations, some of which are highlighted below.

Repeat Calls for Service Diversion Project: The Divert Repetitive Occurrence Program (D.R.O.P.) was piloted in 42 Division and showed strong results by reducing repeat calls for service and improving outcomes for high-needs individuals, specifically in cases involving missing persons and mental health apprehensions. Building on this success, the T.P.S. is developing a Service-wide project in collaboration with Strategic Projects, Community Safety Command Pillars, and City partners.

As a foundational step, the project will adopt a data-driven approach that expands current tools to capture a broader range of repeat call information. By improving data sharing and analysis, the initiative will identify new diversion opportunities and strengthen partnerships for appropriate city or community-based alternatives. This supports a proportional response model, ensuring that non-emergent issues are addressed without unnecessary police involvement. Enhanced insights will guide more effective resource allocation, align with precision policing practices, and deliver services that better reflect community needs.

Make the Right Call Campaign: Jointly launched by T.P.S. and the City in October 2024, this public education initiative helps residents understand when to call 9-1-1, 3-1-1, 2-1-1, or the police non-emergency line. The campaign addresses the high volume of non-emergency calls to 9-1-1, by providing clear guidance through advertisements, social media, and multilingual resources. This allows emergency operators to prioritize urgent situations and supports the Calls for Service Recommendations # 1, 22, 25 and 9-1-1 Recommendations #9,12, 14, 24 and 26. Corporate Communications continues to support public awareness through ongoing social media posts. Early results show increased public awareness, supporting faster emergency response and more efficient use of City services. In September 2025, the Make the Right Call campaign received the City Manager's Award of Excellence in the Customer Experience category for achieving a high and measurable standard of excellence.

Environics Analytics: The Environics project, jointly funded by the T.P.S. and the Toronto Police Association (T.P.A.), commenced in 2023 to support Calls for Service Recommendations #6, 7, 8 and 10. The goal of this project is to improve workforce management through detailed staffing analysis. Environics Analytics has developed two models: a *Work Performance Model* to determine optimal officer staffing based on

demand and population growth, and a *Queuing Model* to link response times with required staffing to meet T.P.S. targets. T.P.S. has incorporated elements of the Environics model—specifically the shift relief factor—to translate daily on-duty officer counts into total staffing requirements within the operational model used in the most recent deployment. As reported at the November 2024 Board budget meeting, both models are in the final stages of review and acceptance. This project work is anticipated to be complete by the end of Q4 2025.

Gerstein Crisis Centre Pilot: T.P.S. and the City collaborated to develop and evaluate mental health call diversion pilots, focusing on two key initiatives: the Toronto Community Crisis Service (T.C.C.S.) and the Gerstein 9-1-1 Call Diversion Pilot Program to support Calls for Service Recommendations #1, 18, 21, 25 and 9-1-1 Recommendation #21. The Gerstein 9-1-1 Call Diversion Pilot Program operated from October 2021 to September 2024. This program redirected crisis calls from 9-1-1 operators to non-police resources. The pilot started in Divisions 14, 51, and 52, before expanding citywide. During this time, Gerstein Crisis Centre (G.C.C.) operators were embedded within Communications Services, working alongside T.P.S. operators to divert non-emergency mental health calls away from police responses.

In 2024, T.P.S. independently contracted the Provincial System Support Program (P.S.S.P.) to evaluate the G.C.C. Call Diversion Pilot Project and updated the City on the outcome. A final report was provided to the Board on September 12, 2024 (Min. P2024-0912-6.0. refers), underscoring the program benefits, challenges, and recommendation to refocus resources to support the T.C.C.S. The pilot was concluded thereafter, and G.C.C. operators were transitioned out of Communications Services and continue their partnership under T.C.C.S.

9-1-1 Committee Collaboration and NG9-1-1 Migration: The 9-1-1 Committee has remained focused on the coordinated transition to Next Generation 9-1-1 (N.G.9-1-1), aimed at improving the efficiencies amongst the Tri-Services (T.P.S., T.F.S. and P.S.) as well as aligning with 9-1-1 Recommendations # 9, 10, 21 and 22. New trends and issues are reviewed bi-weekly by the Tri-Services Committee to ensure a timely response and ongoing improvement. Phase one of the migration was completed in July 2024. On May 22, 2025, T.P.S. launched the second phase of N.G.9-1-1 with the deployment of the Emergency Services I.P. Network (E.S.I.Net). This completed the full implementation of N.G.9-1-1, well ahead of the Canadian Radio Television and Telecommunications Commission (C.R.T.C.) timeline. The 9-1-1 Committee will continue to meet quarterly, ensuring ongoing collaboration between T.P.S., T.F.S, and P.S with the goal of live time interconnectivity.

Communications Services Shift Schedules: T.P.S. and the T.P.A. have continued to work together to identify the best shift model to improve efficiency and better align resources within Communications Services, in support of Calls for Service Recommendation #6 and 9-1-1 Recommendations #1 and 2. Members had the opportunity to vote on alternative shift patterns developed by Circadian in 2023. While the vote on November 6, 2023, did not result in a move to a new schedule, it provided

valuable insights to guide the next phase of discussions. Following continued collaboration through the Joint Shift Schedule Committee, a second vote was held on September 18, 2025. Communications Services members voted in favour of adopting an eight-hour, five platoon compressed work week schedule, which will be piloted beginning January 5, 2026. Staffing levels and operational impacts will be evaluated throughout the pilot to help determine whether the new schedule improves efficiency and service delivery.

***TPS (*877):** On August 7, 2025, the T.P.S. launched *TPS (*877), a new three-digit number available on cellular networks that provides direct access to the non-emergency line. The initiative was developed in response to 9-1-1 Recommendation #25 and offers the public a simplified option for reporting non-emergency matters, helping to ensure emergency services are used appropriately and that callers are directed to the most suitable response channels. Implementation required coordination with major wireless carriers—Rogers, Bell, TELUS, and Freedom Mobile—over a three-month period, involving network configuration, gateway adjustments, and testing. Calls placed to *TPS (*877) are routed through the existing non-emergency line, and because of this integration, usage of the short code cannot be tracked separately. The launch was supported by a communications campaign designed to inform the public and promote adoption.

Conclusion:

The examples above highlight only a portion of the important work undertaken through this project. The attached appendices provide additional details on the progress made to support the implementation of all recommendations in both reports.

T.P.S. is committed to advancing reforms and enhancing community safety throughout the City. Since the last coordinated reports in July 2023 and May 2025, T.P.S. and City divisions have continued to keep City Council, the A.G. and the public updated on the progress of the A.G.'s recommendations. The next joint update will be provided in 2027, in alignment with the City's SafeTO implementation report.

Chief Superintendent Jacqueline Baus will be in attendance to answer any questions that the Board may have regarding this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Myron Demkiw, M.O.M.
Chief of Police

Attachments:

Appendix A - Appendix A - Toronto Police Service Response to Toronto Auditor General Recommendations Review of Toronto Police Service - Opportunities to Support More Effective Responses to Calls for Service. A Journey of Change: Improving Community Safety and Well-Being Outcomes (2022) Appendix B - Toronto Police Service Response to Toronto Auditor General Recommendations Toronto Police Service-Audit of 9-1-1 Public Safety Answering Point Operations, Better Support for Staff, Improved Information Management and Outcomes (2022)

Appendix A - Toronto Police Service Response to Toronto Auditor General Recommendations

Review of Toronto Police Service - Opportunities to Support More Effective Responses to Calls for Service.

A Journey of Change: Improving Community Safety and Well-Being Outcomes (2022)

Response Legend

In Progress - Work is underway, not yet complete.

In Progress – Near Completion - Targeted for completion by the end of the first quarter of 2026.

Implemented - Recommendation operationalized, pending AG verification.

Supporting Role Only – The Service supports recommendations led by the City Manager or Board

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
<p>#1</p> <p>City Council request the City Manager, and the Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) to work in collaboration along with other agencies, to determine the feasibility of setting up adequately resourced, non-time restrictive, alternative responses for events where police are currently attending and where such attendance is likely not essential. In doing so, the City and T.P.S. should:</p> <p>a) identify call for service event types, including but not limited to, the six event types discussed in our report that may be suitable for an alternative response;</p> <p>b) develop reasonable criteria for each event type to assess the calls for service within those event types that may be suitable for an alternative response, including defining the level of acceptable risk and liability and how these factors will be managed;</p> <p>c) consider alternative response pilot programs (e.g. community dispute mediation), with adequate evaluation mechanisms, to provide information and insights on the effectiveness of any established responses. This should include an assessment of the feasibility and cost effectiveness of providing these alternative</p>	<p>Status: In Progress</p> <p>T.P.S. continues to work with City divisions through the Non-Emergency Call/Response Steering Committee (N.E.C.R.S.C.) and various working groups to develop alternative response options for non-urgent police events.</p> <p>Key Initiatives</p> <p>T.C.C.S.: T.P.S. continues to support T.C.C.S., which expanded city-wide in July 2024. On May 6th, 2025, T.P.S. enabled direct cold-transfers from 9-1-1 to 2-1-1, removing the need for a communications operator to stay on the line. Since that date to September 2025, there have been 1,735 calls diverted to T.C.C.S. through the Cold Push process. This is an estimated 50% increase compared to the same period the previous year. T.P.S. and T.C.C.S. maintain regular collaboration, especially on data analysis. In September 2025, it was announced that T.C.C.S. plans to embed crisis workers in three downtown T.T.C. stations to further reduce police involvement in non-violent mental health crises and increase resolutions by community-based teams.</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
<p>responses;</p> <p>d) consider existing City or other community programs that could provide an alternative response and where needed, the feasibility and cost-effectiveness of changing the approach and resourcing to provide a timely and effective non-police response (e.g. Municipal Licensing and Standards Division for noisy small gatherings, Shelter, Support & Housing Administration Division street outreach teams);</p> <p>e) consider a gradual and informed approach to establishing responses and assess the factors that would be needed for an effective and efficient full transition, including consultation with the public; and</p> <p>f) develop and regularly update a plan that includes key milestones and targets so that progress can be tracked.</p> <p>Related City Council Motion: 22-AU13.6 #1</p>	<p>C.O.R.E.: In partnership with Toronto Public Health, this pilot program provides outreach support to vulnerable populations in the downtown core.</p> <p>Repeat Calls for Service Diversion: This initiative aims to reduce repeat calls by linking individuals with appropriate services, building technology that supports divisional insights, and deploying resources more efficiently. The project launch is planned for Q1 2026.</p> <p>Public Education -“Make the Right Call” Campaign: Launched in fall 2023 by the T.P.S. and relaunched in collaboration with the City in October 2024 with updated messaging, these campaigns helped to clarify when to use 9-1-1 versus non-emergency services such as 2-1-1, 3-1-1, *TPS or the police non-emergency line. Outreach included social media, transit posters, and other materials to reduce misuse of emergency lines.</p>
<p>#2</p> <p>City Council request the City Manager, in consultation with the Toronto Police Services Board, to reiterate the City’s requests for funding commitments from the Government of Canada and the Ontario Government to support permanent housing options and to provide supports to address Toronto’s mental health and addictions crises.</p> <p>In doing so, the City should communicate to the other governments that a “whole-of-government” funding approach in these areas will be critical to building the infrastructure needed to support effective alternative response delivery and ensure the best possible outcomes for the people of Toronto.</p>	<p>Status: Supporting Role Only</p> <p>The City has continued to make requests to federal and provincial governments to provide permanent housing and mental health supports.</p> <p>See City update for links and added info.</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
<p>Related City Council Motion: 22-AU13.6 #2</p>	
<p>#3</p> <p>Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.), in consultation with the Toronto Police Association, to:</p> <p>a) assess the impact of expanding the Primary Report Intake, Management and Entry (P.R.I.M.E.) Unit, Community Investigative Support Unit (C.I.S.U.) and District Special Constable programs, and, where appropriate, if it would assist with supporting and/or further reducing the time spent on events currently attended by Priority Response Unit (P.R.U.) officers. For the P.R.I.M.E. and C.I.S.U. units, consider both sworn members (including retired officers) and potentially civilian members, where appropriate, for potential expanded capacity.</p> <p>b) consider if all T.P.S. Special Constables, including Court Officers and District Special Constables, can be cross-trained to increase the pool of Special Constables available to assist the P.R.U. in call for service diversion.</p> <p>Related to City Council Motion: 22-AU13.6 #5</p>	<p>Status: Implemented</p> <p>In alignment with this recommendation, Communications Services, working in collaboration with Strategic Projects, Primary Report Intake Management Entry (P.R.I.M.E.), Computer-Aided Dispatch (C.A.D.), Information Technology Services (I.T.S.), and the Communications Training Unit, expanded call types handled by P.R.I.M.E. A comprehensive review of P.R.I.M.E., Community Investigative Support Unit (C.I.S.U.) and District Special Constable programs was conducted to assess capacity and identify opportunities for expansion.</p> <p>C.I.S.U. members, including retired sworn officers, are now fully integrated into the C.A.D. system, enabling real-time assignment of non-urgent calls by P.R.I.M.E. supervisors. C.I.S.U. now handles hundreds of reports monthly, significantly reducing the burden on Primary Response Unit (P.R.U.) officers. As well, T.P.S. has explored the feasibility of incorporating civilian personnel into C.I.S.U. and P.R.I.M.E. roles where appropriate, with pilot evaluations underway.</p> <p>To further support implementation of this recommendation, the Special Constable Generalist program was introduced and approved in 2022. Since then, all newly hired Special Constables are trained as generalists, capable of performing in three roles: Court Officer, Booking Officer and District Special Constable. Pre-2022 Special Constables were offered a Patch</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
	<p>Course at the Toronto Police College to transition into the generalist model, expanding the pool of deployable personnel. Cross-trained Special Constables are now available to assist with non-emergency calls, supporting P.R.U. deployment efficiency. The T.P.S. will continue to offer training opportunities for Special Constables hired before 2022 to become generalists. Starting September 2025, the Special Constable Patch Course will be replaced by the Special Constable Bridge Program which will serve as the new training pathway.</p> <p>Evaluation is ongoing with monthly monitoring of diverted call volumes and response time improvements. Divisional supervisors provide continued feedback to ensure readiness and stakeholder alignment.</p> <p>The implementation of this recommendation has led to measurable improvements in P.R.U. response efficiency and expanded capacity for call diversion. The T.P.S. remains committed to continuous evaluation and adaptation of staffing models to meet evolving operational demands.</p>
<p>#4</p> <p>Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service to examine if:</p> <p>a) aspects of the Primary Report Intake Management and Entry Unit and Community Investigative Support Unit (C.I.S.U.) can be centralized together, so that the workload can be shared and calls for service can be handled more efficiently.</p> <p>b) for aspects that cannot be centralized, (e.g. mobile C.I.S.U. units) consider more clearly defining the responsibilities and expectations, including workload allocations, to both units.</p>	<p>Status: Implemented</p> <p>A pilot project was launched on March 21, 2022, in Divisions 33, 41, and 55, which enabled P.R.I.M.E. to collaborate with divisional C.I.S.U. officers and retired officers to process non-emergency calls for service. Following positive results, the C.I.S.U. centralized dispatch program was implemented city-wide on May 2, 2022. As a result, the P.R.I.M.E. unit's handling of non-emergency calls increased by approximately 900 calls per month. Additionally, C.I.S.U. was restructured to include station and mobile roles. The station roles are typically assigned to members with accommodations or retirees and focus on non-enforcement duties. The mobile units are equipped with use-of-force tools and handle field service calls. Responsibilities and expectations for both station and mobile</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
	<p>members have been clearly defined to enhance operational clarity. The C.I.S.U. Project has enabled the PRIME Unit to process approximately 900 additional non-emergency calls for service each month.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2022 (8-month average) 1,045 calls/month • 2023 average 937 calls/month • 2024 average 905 calls/month <p>C.I.S.U. officers are now fully integrated into the T.P.S.'s C.A.D. system, allowing P.R.I.M.E. supervisors to assign low priority calls in real time. Although P.R.I.M.E. and C.I.S.U. operate as separate entities, they collaborate closely to manage non-emergency calls. This cohesive system streamlines low-priority service response. It has increased efficiency, report volume and led to a more balanced workload distribution across divisions.</p> <p>This demonstrates the T.P.S.'s effective implementation of this recommendation to achieve a sustainable model for managing non-urgent calls for service.</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
<p>#5</p> <p>City Council request the Chief, Toronto Paramedic Services, and the Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) to work in collaboration to review current protocols for when Priority Response Unit (P.R.U.) officers are requested for See Ambulance calls for service. This should include:</p> <p>a) determining if there are any opportunities to further refine the See Ambulance protocol so that the attendance of P.R.U. officers is based on an articulable risk to paramedic safety, specific to the unique circumstances of each call for service;</p> <p>b) re-evaluating the criteria for when police are requested. This evaluation should specifically consider, but not be limited to, if the presence of alcohol, in absence of other risk factors, requires an automatic P.R.U. response;</p> <p>c) ensure that the rationale for requesting P.R.U. attendance and other important information is clearly documented in the Toronto Paramedic Services call for service details. Both entities should also consider documenting which entity initiated the request for attendance from the other entity;</p> <p>d) in situations where T.P.S. would have sent P.R.U. officers to calls for service irrespective of a request from Toronto Paramedic Services, T.P.S. should consider documenting this in its call for service system;</p> <p>e) regular, joint evaluation of calls for service where P.R.U. attendance is requested, to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the revised protocol and consider any changes as necessary; and</p> <p>f) consider if additional training is needed for T.P.S. and Toronto Paramedic Services call takers to ensure requests for police attendance are well documented and comply with policies and</p>	<p>Status: In Progress- Near Completion</p> <p>T.P.S., P.S., and T.F.S. have strengthened emergency response coordination through the 9-1-1 Committee and a dedicated working group focused on “See Ambulance” (SEE.AM.) calls, particularly when paramedics require police attendance.</p> <p>In partnership with P.S., Communications Services has improved workflow and safety protocols. Paramedics now receive specialized training to better assess on-scene risk factors, such as the presence of alcohol, which has led to fewer SEE.AM. calls triggered solely by these concerns.</p> <p>These joint efforts have delivered measurable results: SEE.AM. notifications decreased by 17% from 2022 to 2023, by a further 3% in 2024, and by an average of 16% per month in 2024–2025. This initiative remains ongoing and is closely monitored.</p> <p>To sustain progress, Calltaker training is updated regularly to reflect new developments and maintain best practices across all services. Emerging trends and issues are reviewed bi-weekly by the Tri-Services Committee, supporting timely adjustments and continuous improvement.</p> <p>Updated procedures now ensure clear documentation and transparency. When a P.R.U. is required, communication operators record the rationale, initiating agency, and detailed call information, including potential criminal activity. This ensures accurate event classification and effective inter-agency coordination.</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
<p>procedures.</p> <p>Related City Council Motion: 22-AU13.6 #3</p>	
<p>#6</p> <p>Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) to evaluate the root causes for increasing response times and determine a strategy for meeting priority one to priority three response time targets. This should specifically include:</p> <p>a) considering strategies for how to improve staff deployability rates, both across the organization and for individual T.P.S. divisions; this could include reallocating officers across divisions when needed, and more active management of T.P.S. members who are on accommodation, or long or short-term disability.</p> <p>b) assessing how implementing the recommendations in Section A of this report would assist with improving response times.</p>	<p>Status: In Progress - Near Completion</p> <p>Through comprehensive analysis, the organization identified that increased response times were linked to resource allocation and reporting inefficiencies. In response, targeted initiatives were introduced to optimize staffing levels and deployment strategies, resulting in improved response and wait times.</p> <p>To further enhance workforce management, T.P.S. launched the Environics project in 2023, jointly funded by the T.P.S. and the T.P.A. Environics Analytics was engaged to develop two staffing models: the Workload Performance-Based Model, which determines the optimal number of officers based on service demand, population growth, and proactive policing time; and the Queuing Model, which links staffing levels to</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
	<p>response times to help meet service targets. The Analytics & Innovation (A.&I.) team have finalized both models and are collaborating with Strategic Projects and the T.P.A. on next steps.</p>
<p>#7</p> <p>Toronto Police Services Board (T.P.S.B.) direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) to:</p> <p>a) evaluate the root causes for increasing clearance times, particularly for non-emergency, low priority (priority four to six) calls for service, and consider the impact on response times; and,</p> <p>b) in collaboration with T.P.S.B., consider setting reasonableness thresholds for call for service clearance times by event type and evaluating/analyzing clearance times across divisions and event types to enhance performance measurement and operational monitoring at a high-level (e.g. divisional and/or T.P.S.-wide).</p>	<p>Status: In Progress</p> <p>Clearance time and time on call, including both travel and clearance durations, are key operational metrics tracked by the T.P.S. to monitor officer availability and identify trends affecting service delivery. These metrics are accessible through Service-wide dashboards. Regular reports on officer hours per call, broken down by division and event type, are available to support recruit deployment and resource demands. The T.P.S. acknowledges that factors such as officer experience and call complexity can impact clearance time and officer availability.</p> <p>Data analysis capabilities have improved through the T.P.S.'s budget process. The Analytics Framework provides a suite of metrics for 9-1-1- response and patrol that guides operational improvements. It is designed to enhance data driven decision making by identifying operational needs and gaps. It involves collaborative efforts among subject matter experts, operational units, and leadership to co-develop reporting standards. Further analysis on clearance times by event type is on-going. The final stage aims to standardize reporting practices, ensuring consistent, efficient and transparent data management across the service.</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
<p>#8</p> <p>Toronto Police Services Board, work in collaboration with the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) to:</p> <p>a) review response time standards adopted as part of the Metropolitan Toronto Police Restructuring Task Force’s “Beyond 2000: Final Report” and determine if any updates are needed;</p> <p>b) once a reasonable set of response time standards have been agreed upon and formally adopted, communicate them across the organization and routinely measure progress;</p> <p>c) consider publicly reporting out on its response time performance to increase transparency and accountability; and</p> <p>d) consider its current response time calculation methodology and consider including the impact of call taker time and any other relevant factors, including items which may not be currently included.</p>	<p>Status: In Progress</p> <p>The T.P.S. has significantly improved its service quality, achieving a Year to Date (Y.T.D.) response time of 13 minutes for priority 1 calls, a 25% improvement year-over-year.</p> <p>Response time-P1 2023 - 23.1 minutes 2024 - 17.1 minutes 2025 - 13.3 minutes</p> <p>The progress is partly due to the T.P.S.’s focused efforts to increase P.R.U. staffing levels within existing budget constraints. Additionally, since the beginning of 2024, the T.P.S. has adopted a data-driven approach to quarterly new recruit deployment, aimed to optimize the resource allocation across divisions. A dashboard has been developed to monitor the relationship between response time and workload. The insights from this dashboard, combined with other operational factors, inform the final deployment strategy.</p> <p>The T.P.S. has also partnered with Environics to develop advanced models that estimate optimal staffing levels needed to achieve targeted response times, given the change in demand and operational constraints, to support long term strategic workforce planning. This strategic initiative supports evidence-based workforce planning and will be leveraged in coming budget planning.</p> <p>Response time metrics are reported publicly through regular analytics updates at Board meetings and as part of the T.P.S.’s budget process. A.&I. is actively working with internal stakeholders to review and enhance the methodology for calculating and reporting response times. This includes evaluating the inclusion of Calltaker time and other relevant factors to ensure accuracy and completeness.</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
<p>#9</p> <p>Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) to determine if an automated technology solution can be implemented to improve completeness of information for officer arrival times (or increase compliance with officers pressing the “at-scene” button), so that arrival time is recorded for all responses and that all responses are included in the response time calculation.</p>	<p>Status: In Progress</p> <p>To improve the at-scene compliance, the T.P.S. launched an internal campaign to emphasize the importance of timely scene status updates for improving response times and enhancing officer safety. Strategic Projects collaborated with Corporate Communications to produce a video demonstrating three different ways to update unit status. This video was shared through an e-Update, an intranet post and screensaver, and a written parade note.</p> <p>With the support of A.&I., data was extracted to evaluate the campaign’s effectiveness. The analysis revealed that compliance improved following the campaign and was sustained.</p> <p>With the implementation of the new Niche Records Management System (NicheR.M.S.), a technical solution will be revisited.</p> <p>The new Mobile for Public Safety (M.P.S.), scheduled to replace the current Mobile Data Terminal (M.D.T.) on November 4th, 2025, will feature a one-push button to enhance the recording of officer arrival times. Officers will press this button when they receive a call for service and are enroute, upon arriving at the scene, and once the call is cleared.</p> <p>The Global Positioning System (G.P.S.)-based location data transmitted from T.P.S. vehicles and electronic devices currently lacks the precision necessary to support fully automated on-scene response capabilities. This limitation is primarily due to the dense urban environment that characterizes much of Toronto.</p> <p>Geolocation data services have evolved beyond traditional G.P.S. accuracy ranges of five to 15 meters. In response, I.T.S. is actively reviewing the Geolocation Data Infrastructure</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
	<p>with the objective of modernizing and enhancing the accuracy and consistency of location data.</p> <p>Planned infrastructure upgrades aim to deliver improved vehicle tracking and advanced location capabilities for officers. All location data will be consolidated within a unified platform and made accessible to all T.P.S. applications—such as NicheR.M.S. -that rely on this information.</p> <p>This consolidated data source will play a pivotal role in supporting digital program development and advancing service modernization.</p>
<p>#10</p> <p>Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) to ensure its 70/30 reactive/proactive officer time goal is effectively communicated across the organization, understood by the front line, and regularly measured. In measuring achievement of this goal, T.P.S. should identify divisions where the goal has not been met, identify the root causes, and develop strategies to enhance achievement.</p>	<p>Status: In Progress</p> <p>The Calltaker time metric has been added to the 9-1-1 Response & Patrol service line within the Analytics Framework. Regular reports are now available, and T.P.S. has increased awareness of this metric.</p> <p>In accordance with the 2024 Inspector General of Policing Report, the Inspectorate of Policing (I.o.P.) will use insights from recent research to guide future thematic inspection on police response times, aiming to improve performance across Ontario police services.</p> <p>Currently, comprehensive data capturing all reactive and proactive activities is not yet available. In the interim, we are monitoring the percentage of time officers spent attending 9-1-1 calls (from dispatch to clearing the scene) relative to their total working hours. This metric reflects the primary portion of the reactive work; however, as it does not account for the administrative and other related working hours associated with reactive work, the actual proportion of reactive work is higher.</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
	<p>By maintaining this metric at a healthy level, the T.P.S. can help ensure that enough time remains available for proactive work, supporting progress towards the 30% proactive work goal.</p>
<p>#11 Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) to improve T.P.S. data quality and reliability by:</p> <p>a) establishing more detailed time categories in the Intergraph Computer Aided Dispatch system, so that T.P.S. can have more detailed information on how time is being spent on a per call for service basis. For example, this could include time spent on activities such as reporting, time spent during calls for service on investigative activities, and time spent on customer service/dispute resolution/mediation.</p> <p>In improving the usefulness of data for time tracking purposes, T.P.S. should consider both the need to collect more enhanced, detailed information, and the operational demands on T.P.S. members.</p> <p>b) Improve the reliability of the data of the Time Resource Management System, including ensuring accurate reflection of leave hours, and members' work assignments.</p> <p>c) Improve data reliability and quality related to members on disability and/or accommodation.</p> <p>d) Consider opportunities for integration between staffing and accommodation/disability management systems, where appropriate, so that there is one clear, reliable source of information for making staffing, resourcing and wellness decisions.</p>	<p>Status: In Progress - Near Completion</p> <p>To enable reliable and accurate reporting on time spent on reactive/proactive activities, the T.P.S. is working to consolidate all relevant data sources that track officer activities - including timesheets, Human Resource records and the dispatch database, On Call Analytics. This effort will support quantifying the actual hours spent on each activity and assist in determining whether additional time codes, event types are needed to fully capture all proactive work.</p> <p>The Wellness Unit has implemented a number of measures focused on enhancing data reliability and quality. A member of the unit has been assigned quality assurance responsibilities to review data associated with case management on a regular basis and identify trends and opportunities for improvement. In addition, they will conduct training for unit members whose role involves the input of data into the existing case management software.</p> <p>A new analyst role in the Wellness Unit will develop tools and reports for real-time data metrics.</p> <p>The Wellness Unit is considering available options for better software integration; however, this poses challenges due to the duty to adhere to strict confidentiality and privacy requirements. As a result, it is necessary to limit access to the personal health information of members strictly to those members of the Wellness Unit whose roles involve responsibilities associated with accommodation and disability management.</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
<p>#12</p> <p>Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) to improve the collection and analysis of its call for service data so that it includes more detailed sub-categories or data fields for responding officers to indicate the nature of the calls for service. This will allow for more robust data analysis and provide data for calls for service that may be suitable for alternative responses. Specifically, this should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) sub-categories/data fields to better understand event types that are broad in nature. For example, Check Address, Unknown Trouble, Advised and 3-1-1 Referral; b) system flags/data fields to identify any calls for service that involved interaction with persons experiencing homelessness and/or mental health challenges, or any other factors that may be helpful in analyzing calls for service; and c) text analysis on call for service notes in the call for service system to allow for more effective event analysis. 	<p>Status: In Progress</p> <p>The T.P.S. is enhancing its information management and data reporting capabilities to address this recommendation. Information Management is consulting with stakeholders to assess the feasibility of adding sub-categories for calls for service, either through system updates or improved integration between C.A.D. and the new NicheR.M.S. This includes evaluating the impact on Calltaker workload and historical reporting.</p> <p>Mental health-related 9-1-1 call volumes are publicly reported on the Public Safety Data Portal, and the T.P.S. is collaborating with 2-1-1, social services, and hospitals to help reduce these calls. Efforts are underway to improve data fields for unhoused and mental health, with full implementation dependent on future infrastructure upgrades. In partnership with the City's S.D., the T.P.S. is aligning data flags for the unhoused and mental health with SafeTO priorities to support more effective response analysis. Information Management will continue to evaluate and recommend further improvements to enhance service data.</p> <p>The NicheR.M.S. project focuses on configuring and delivering essential capabilities to support the T.P.S.'s strategic objectives. The project is exploring the functionality and capability to address the recommendation by implementing features that enhance data analysis and support alternative responses for calls for service. This includes adding sub-categories and data fields to better understand broad event types like Check Address, Unknown Trouble, Advised, and 3-1-1 referrals; incorporating system flags to identify calls involving interactions with persons experiencing homelessness or mental health challenges, and utilizing text analysis on call notes to enable more effective event analysis.</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
<p>#13</p> <p>City Council request the City Manager, and the Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) to work in collaboration along with other agencies to:</p> <p>a) analyze low priority, non-emergency calls for service (e.g. Unwanted Guests, Check Address etc.) to identify instances where officers are repeatedly attending the same locations; to determine if an alternative resolution can be implemented. In developing solutions, T.P.S. should consider if call for service volume can be reduced through implementing Recommendation 1 of this report; and</p> <p>b) for calls for service at hospitals related to missing persons inquiries, consider if a technological solution, such as an automated portal with authentication, may help reduce hospital visits and free-up officer time for more priority calls for service. This evaluation should consider legislative requirements and consultation with the Ministry of the Solicitor General and other stakeholders, as required.</p> <p>Related City Council Motion: 22-AU13.6 #4</p>	<p>Status: In Progress</p> <p>a) The T.P.S. is advancing efforts to address repeat low-priority, non-emergency calls by leveraging data analytics and collaborative partnerships. The Repeat Calls for Service Diversion Project seeks to reduce repeat calls by connecting people with services, improving divisional technology, and deploying resources more efficiently. The project launch is targeted for Q1 2026.</p> <p>The T.P.S. will continue working with City partners through the N.E.C.R.S.C. to identify repeat callers and locations and develop strategies that address root causes and reduce unnecessary police responses.</p> <p>b) When addressing calls for service at hospitals related to missing persons, the T.P.S. has initiated a review and update both in governance and operations. Although full technological solutions are not yet in place, the T.P.S. is utilizing Special Constables to take on certain tasks normally done by sworn officers. These include canvassing hospitals and shelters for missing persons, obtaining video evidence and securing items for D.N.A. analysis as outlined in the Missing and Missed Report (M.M.R.), Recommendation #42 (M.M.R. 42). The use of civilians alleviates the heavy workload experienced by sworn officers. The implementation of M.M.R. 42 has led to the increased use of civilian members, particularly Auxiliary members and Special Constables.</p> <p>The NicheR.M.S. project is exploring options to integrate the T.P.S. 710 form, known as the Person in Crisis Information Form, into the NicheR.M.S. system. The T.P.S. 710 is used to collect personal information for mental health assessments, including details such as patient number, name, gender, date of birth, address, and location of occurrence. Officers complete Canadian Triage and Acuity Scale (C.T.A.S.) scores to assess</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
	<p>risk levels and indicate if an Integrated Hospital Officer (I.H.O) is available for transfer of care. (refer to recommendation #21)</p>
<p>#14</p> <p>Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) and City Council request the City Manager to work in collaboration with the President & C.E.O., Toronto Community Housing Corporation (T.C.H.C.) to determine if strategies can be implemented to reduce instances of Priority Response Unit officers repeatedly dispatched to the same locations within T.C.H.C. properties.</p> <p>Related City Council Motion: 22-AU13.6 #5</p>	<p>Status: In Progress</p> <p>Reducing repeat calls for service to T.C.H.C. properties has been identified as a 2025 priority for the N.E.C.R.S.C. This work will be advanced through the Repeat Calls for Service Diversion Project, with plans to expand the scope to include repeat calls for T.C.H.C. locations. The T.P.S. will collaborate with T.C.H.C. to share information, provide support, and develop strategies to improve responses on their properties. In addition, the repeat client resource dashboard is being enhanced to help track calls and address underlying issues more effectively.</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
<p>#15</p> <p>Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) to:</p> <p>a) accelerate the Digital Officer program and electronic memo book initiative, including any interfaces with other records management and reporting systems, to create efficiencies in how front-line officer time is spent.</p> <p>b) consider any best practices that can be leveraged from other jurisdictions, and if any aspects of a digital memo book can be implemented on a more short-term basis, even if full integration is not achieved.</p>	<p>Status: In Progress</p> <p>Planning for this initiative is underway this year and will be integrated into the new NicheR.M.S. which is expected to launch in Q1 of 2027.</p> <p>The NicheR.M.S. project is accelerating the Digital Officer program and electronic memo book initiative to create efficiencies in front-line officer time. This includes integrating NicheR.M.S. with other records management and reporting systems, automating notifications and tasks, and introducing mobile capabilities for real-time data capture.</p>
<p>#16</p> <p>Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) to:</p> <p>a) continue to pursue digital strategies, such as video calling, as an alternative to front-line Priority Response Unit officer response and consider if there are any event types that can be addressed remotely without an on-scene police response. In doing so, T.P.S. should assess if there are any legislative or Privacy requirements that would need to be examined in relation to increased use of technology such as video capability.</p> <p>b) review event types and consider if there are any additional event types that the public can report through the online reporting system or if current reporting criteria (e.g. dollar value limits) can be expanded.</p>	<p>Status: In Progress</p> <p>The Video Response (V.R.) Project has evolved from divisional pilots into a centralized model designed to enhance operational coordination with existing diversion units, including P.R.I.M.E. and C.I.S.U., in managing low-priority calls.</p> <p>The current pilot aims to ensure timely responses, reduce call backlogs, and improve frontline officer availability while strengthening overall call for service performance.</p> <p>Eligibility of event types for diversion is being assessed through a comprehensive analysis of call for service metrics, alignment with A.G. recommendations, procedural requirements, and supervisory oversight.</p> <p>Review and refinement of event types the public can report through the online reporting system is in progress. A list of online community complaint options is being developed and tested for user experience. Development and addition of these event types will take place following the modernization of the</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
	current online reporting options and added value of removing financial limits to reporting.
<p>#17</p> <p>Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) to consider as part of its Digital Platform and Transformation Program, an interface for callers to communicate with Toronto Police Service call takers and provide additional information, and provide confirmation, for certain event types, if a situation no longer exists, such as that an unwanted guest has gone or a noisy party has concluded.</p>	<p>Status: In Progress</p> <p>Work for this recommendation has begun with Parking Complaints - if a call has been reported online, the user is able to cancel or follow up on their complaint using the online interface, thereby diverting those calls from the non-emergency or parking phone lines. This recommendation will be addressed through the user research and development of additional community complaint types that can be reported online following the modernization of the current online reporting system.</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
<p>#18</p> <p>City Council request the City Manager, and the Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) to work in collaboration to:</p> <p>a) conduct joint program assessments of the outcomes from current mental health call for service diversion pilots, including the Gerstein Crisis Centre call for service diversion pilot, and the City's Toronto Community Crisis Service, to assess the effectiveness and outcomes of these programs.</p> <p>b) ensure mechanisms are in place so that both the City and T.P.S. have access to the necessary data, including T.P.S. call for service data (e.g. number of calls for service received, diverted) and relevant call for service details to complete effective evaluations of the current and any future pilots.</p> <p>c) ensure planning for future pilot programs are coordinated, involve both the City and T.P.S., and consider the recommendations from Section A.1 of this report, to ensure they are achieving the desired outcomes in the most efficient and effective way.</p> <p>Related City Council Motion: 22-AU13.6 #6</p>	<p>Status: Implemented</p> <p>The T.P.S. and the City collaborated to develop and evaluate mental health call diversion pilots, focusing on two key initiatives: The T.C.C.S. and the Gerstein 9-1-1 Call Diversion Pilot Program.</p> <p>The Gerstein 9-1-1 Crisis Diversion Pilot Program operated from October 2021 to September 2024. This program redirected crisis calls from 9-1-1 operators to non-police resources, initially serving Divisions 14, 51, and 52, before expanding citywide. During this period, G.C.C. operators were embedded within T.P.S. Communications Services, working alongside communication operators to divert non-emergency mental health calls to appropriate nonpolice resources.</p> <p>To assess the pilot's effectiveness, the T.P.S. independently contracted the P.S.S.P. to evaluate the G.C.C. call diversion pilot project. The findings were shared with the City and presented to the Board on September 12, 2024. The final report highlighted the program's benefits and challenges and recommended refocusing resources on enhancing the T.C.C.S. model. Following this evaluation, the Gerstein pilot was formally concluded, and G.C.C. operators were transitioned out of Communications Services.</p> <p>The T.P.S. continues to support mental health diversion through ongoing enhancements to the T.C.C.S. This includes the integration of a C.A.D. data push, which streamlines call transfers and reduces wait times. In May 2025, the T.C.C.S. transfer process was further improved with the introduction of cold transfers to 2-1-1 services and the removal of the consent requirement, allowing for faster connections to appropriate crisis supports.</p> <p>To support ongoing evaluation and planning, reporting products are being developed to streamline analysis of data</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
	<p>related to call for service diversions to T.C.C.S., including a Call Diversion Dashboard. These tools will enable extensive reporting by connecting data from before and after the implementation of the cold push process, offering a comprehensive view of diversion activity and informing future strategy.</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
<p>#19</p> <p>Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) to:</p> <p>a) consider automating and streamlining the process by which T.P.S. members make and track referrals for community-based services, including the Furthering Our Community by Uniting Services (F.O.C.U.S.) table and other community referrals, with the goals of making the referral process easier for officers, preventing further repeat calls for service requiring Priority Response Unit officer response, increasing diversion to supporting organizations, and improving the outcomes and quality of service to the public.</p> <p>b) with these same goals in mind, T.P.S. to also consider performing analysis of call for service data at a corporate level to identify trends or possibly situations that may also be suitable for referral.</p>	<p>Status: In Progress</p> <p>Specific to Furthering Our Communities Uniting Services (F.O.C.U.S.) Toronto Situation Table referrals, all F.O.C.U.S. members, including the T.P.S., have transitioned to an online submission format supported by the United Way of Greater Toronto (U.W.G.T.). T.P.S. referrals to external agencies can occur in several ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directly from a T.P.S. member or Neighborhood Community Officer to an agency • From Engage 416 to an agency partner • From a T.P.S. Divisional F.O.C.U.S. representative or a Community Partnerships & Engagement Unit (C.P.E.U.) member to the F.O.C.U.S. Toronto Situation Table • Directly from a T.P.S. Divisional F.O.C.U.S. representative or C.P.E.U. member to a single agency within the F.O.C.U.S. Toronto network. <p>In 2024 the T.P.S. brought 67% (699 of 1039) of all referrals to the F.O.C.U.S. Situation tables. Thus far in 2025 (As of Sept 28th) the T.P.S. has referred 60% of all referrals to the F.O.C.U.S. tables (450 of 754).</p> <p>A third of the T.P.S. F.O.C.U.S. referrals meet the appropriate criteria and are brought directly to a F.O.C.U.S. Situation Table. For this process, there is a robust on-line process that the T.P.S. F.O.C.U.S. Divisional Representative/C.P.E.U. member can access for referral submission. The remaining two-thirds are referred directly to a single F.O.C.U.S. partner agency. This F.O.C.U.S. table data can be accessed via Power B.I. dashboards through the U.W.G.T.</p> <p>The Repeat Calls for Service Diversion Project aims to reduce repeat calls by linking individuals with appropriate services, enhancing technology for divisional insights, and ensuring</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
	<p>resources are deployed efficiently to the right situations. The project team will work collaboratively to streamline how referral information is captured and shared. The project launch is targeted for Q1 2026.</p> <p>b) The Calls for Service dashboard is available internally and is continuously enhanced to deliver insights into corporate-level trends. Currently, the dashboard features key performance indicators (K.P.I.s) such as call volume, units dispatched, officers dispatched, pending time, response time, and officer time on call.</p> <p>The NicheR.M.S. project is exploring Application Programming Interface (A.P.I.) integration to support automating and streamlining the process by which T.P.S. members make and track referrals for community-based services. This initiative includes adding specific workflows, such as checklists for Intimate Partner Violence, Sexual Assault, Robbery/Hold-up, Break & Enter, digital notes and service mandates, and managing arrests and traffic tickets. Additionally, workflows involving forms and internal dropdown code tables, as well as user access control roles, are being configured.</p> <p>These enhancements aim to make the referral process easier for officers, prevent repeat calls for service, increase diversion to supporting organizations, and improve service outcomes. Phase 2 of the project (2027) will see the Digital Program merge with new development opportunities in NicheR.M.S.</p>
<p>#20</p> <p>Toronto Police Services Board direct the Executive Director and Chief of Staff, Toronto Police Services Board Office, in consultation with the Chief, Toronto Police Service, and other stakeholders as necessary, to request changes to the legislation for mental health apprehensions regarding police custody while waiting at hospitals.</p>	<p>Status: Supporting Role Only</p> <p>The T.P.S. has strong partnerships with the City's largest hospital networks and are working with these partners to advocate for legislative changes, including updates to the <i>Mental Health Act</i> that support a more efficient transfer of care process. These improvements will help reduce emergency</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
	department wait times and ease the burden on hospital staff and emergency responders.
<p>#21</p> <p>Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.), in consultation with the Chief, Toronto Paramedic Services and the Chief Executive Officers (or other appropriate executive liaisons) of Toronto hospitals to:</p> <p>a) leverage technology and/or the use of data to identify the most appropriate hospital for an officer to transport an individual in custody, with the view of minimizing wait times and travelling the least possible distance; and</p> <p>b) develop police-hospital liaison committees and transfer of care protocols with all hospitals where T.P.S. transports apprehended persons, to minimize wait times and develop protocols to create a workflow which will benefit both T.P.S. and the hospitals.</p> <p>Related City Council Motion: 22-AU13.6 #7</p>	<p>Status: In Progress</p> <p>In September 2024, the T.P.S. launched a one-year I.H.O. pilot at three hospitals: Humber River Health, Toronto Western Hospital, and St. Michael's Hospital. The pilot was designed to support faster patient handovers to emergency room staff and reduce wait time for front line officers. In their role as I.H.O.s, specially trained District Special Constables supported the transfer of mental health apprehensions allowing P.R.U. officers to return to core policing duties more quickly.</p> <p>A working group, including representatives from both the T.P.S. and participating hospitals, met regularly to oversee the I.H.O. program. A memorandum of understanding (M.O.U.) was signed by two of the hospitals, while the third removed itself from the pilot, but implemented a process change to mirror the objectives. The M.O.U. did not cover data sharing however data was presented at the regular check-in meetings.</p> <p>Following a successful year long collaboration with our healthcare partners, the I.H.O. pilot project ended September 16, 2025. The three hospitals involved have established new internal protocols that will replace those previously set by the I.H.O. These updated protocols ensure that apprehended individuals in hospital care are transferred at the earliest appropriate opportunity.</p> <p>Alongside the I.H.O. initiative, the T.P.S. has continued to strengthen its broader efforts in crisis response through advisory panels, internal monitoring, and system integrations to improve coordination and data capture.</p> <p>The Mental Health and Addiction Advisory Panel (M.H.A.A.P.)</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
	<p>meets quarterly to review protocols and training for T.P.S. officers responding to persons in crisis.</p> <p>The T.P.S. maintains internal dashboards for Mobile Crisis Intervention Team (M.C.I.T.) activity and T.C.C.S. diversions, providing exclusive access to these units for self-evaluation and K.P.I. reporting.</p> <p>Regular reporting on the diversion of persons in crisis calls to the T.C.C.S. has been ongoing since 2022. To improve data capture, a C.A.D. dispatch system integration with T.C.C.S. was launched in May 2025.</p> <p>As of May 6th, 2025, a total of 1,735 calls have been diverted to T.C.C.S. using the newly implemented Cold Push process, which eliminates the need for a communications operator to stay on the line during the transfer. This is an estimated 50% increase compared to the same period the previous year.</p> <p>To date in 2025, there has been a 50% decrease in the number of calls diverted to T.C.C.S. where police also attended.</p> <p>The T.P.S. continues to work closely with T.C.C.S. through strong daily and weekly collaboration. An analyst from Communications Services sends basic information regarding the events reviewed on a daily basis. These are events where police attended that T.C.C.S. either attended as well or sent back to the T.P.S. because they were not suitable. In addition to the daily email communication, representatives from T.P.S., T.C.C.S., and 2-1-1 meet weekly to investigate the reviewed events to compare data. Together, they investigate reasons why events were sent back to the T.P.S. or why police were required to attend with them. Any potential data inconsistencies are discussed and areas for increased training for any/all parties are identified.</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
<p>#22</p> <p>City Council request the City Manager, and the Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) to work in collaboration to:</p> <p>a) assess if current call for service diversion strategies to the City, through 3-1-1 Toronto, are working as intended, and if T.P.S. and City staff clearly understand the roles and responsibilities.</p> <p>This should include evaluation of call volumes and outcomes at both T.P.S.'s Communications Centre and 3-1-1 Toronto for relevant call for service types.</p> <p>b) assess if there are opportunities to increase call for service diversion from T.P.S. to the City.</p> <p>Related City Council Motion: 22-AU13.6 #8</p>	<p>Status: In Progress - Near Completion</p> <p>The T.P.S. has worked with the City to assess and strengthen call diversion strategies through N.E.C.R.S.C. This includes reviewing common non-emergency call types, such as noise complaints, traffic concerns, and police-initiated requests like road debris, while ensuring roles and responsibilities between the T.P.S. and 3-1-1 Toronto are clearly understood.</p> <p>As part of this effort, the T.P.S. contributed to the <i>Make the Right Call</i> public education campaign, in fall 2023 and relaunched in October 2024 in collaboration with the City, with updated messaging. The campaign helped residents understand when to use 9-1-1, the T.P.S. non-emergency line (416-808-2222),*TPS, 3-1-1, and 2-1-1. Outreach through social media, transit posters, and other materials has reduced inappropriate use of emergency lines and improved triage outcomes.</p> <p>The T.P.S. and the City have also worked together to identify opportunities to increase service diversion. Enhancements to the 3-1-1 knowledge base and the introduction of a warm transfer process in May 2024 now allow 3-1-1 staff to screen calls and transfer them directly to the T.P.S. non-emergency line in real time. This reduces client redirection, improves ease of reporting, and ensures timely service. Transfer numbers continue to be an ongoing discussion for the N.E.C.R.S.C., and in the three months following the process change, approximately 941 calls were successfully warm transferred.</p> <p>Looking ahead, the Repeat Calls for Service Diversion Project will further support this work by strengthening processes for non-emergency call diversion, improving data and insights on repeat calls, and helping to design sustainable solutions in collaboration with city partners.</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
<p>#23</p> <p>City Council request the City Manager, and the Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) to work in collaboration to consider through an interface or other means, increasing the information shared between City divisions (e.g. Municipal Licensing and Standards Division, 3-1-1 Toronto, etc.) and T.P.S. on a per call for service basis (e.g. addresses where police respond to noisy parties) so that trends can be identified and the City can help address the root cause of issues that are not police matters.</p> <p>Before undertaking any data sharing, T.P.S. and the City should perform a legal review, which includes consideration of any relevant privacy considerations, specifically the requirement outlined in the <i>Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act</i>.</p> <p>Related City Council Motion: 22-AU13.6 #9</p>	<p>Status: In Progress - Near Completion</p> <p>The T.P.S. has actively contributed to enhancing data sharing and collaboration with city divisions.</p> <p>As part of the N.E.C.R.S.C., which includes C.X.D., M.L.S., S.D., and T.P.S., data collection processes are being enhanced and expanded to share data across divisions and within the T.P.S. This committee has facilitated significant improvements in streamlining processes to support customer experience, including partnership with C.X.D. – 3-1-1 Toronto to implement a live call transfer process for inquiries that begin with 3-1-1 but fall within the scope of T.P.S. non-emergency services.</p> <p>Additionally, a joint C.X.D.-T.P.S. working group was established under the N.E.C.R.S.C. to explore integrating parking infraction reporting processes. This group met several times in 2024 to consider whether 3-1-1 Toronto could intake service requests directly from residents for parking-related matters; however, due to the independent nature of the City's</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
	<p>3-1-1 Toronto and T.P.S. systems, further integration would require substantial resources and a dedicated project footing.</p> <p>The Repeat Calls for Service Diversion Project will further support this work by strengthening processes for non-emergency call diversion, improving data and insights on repeat calls, and helping to design sustainable solutions in collaboration with City partners.</p>
<p>#24</p> <p>City Council request the City Manager, and the Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) to work in collaboration to leverage 2-1-1 Central data in conjunction with call for service data, at an aggregate level, to identify neighborhoods where there are a high number of low priority calls for service, and where community resources may exist to help divert front-line police resources. Before undertaking any data sharing, T.P.S. and the City should perform a legal review, which includes consideration of any relevant privacy considerations, specifically the requirements outlined in the <i>Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act</i>.</p> <p>Related City Council Motion: 22-AU13.6 #10</p>	<p>Status: In Progress - Near Completion</p> <p>In 2025, the N.E.C.R.S.C. will prioritize this work through the Repeat Calls for Service Diversion Project. The project will redefine existing technological tools to expand on the data collected to help support the identification of neighborhoods with high volumes of low priority calls as well as repeat calls for service. Once the data is collected, T.P.S., and N.E.C.R.S.C. City partners will collaborate to develop strategies for addressing repeat callers and high-call areas.</p> <p>The goal will be to collaboratively connect these calls with appropriate community resources, reducing reliance on front-line police where alternative supports are better suited.</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
<p>#25</p> <p>City Council request the City Manager, and the Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) to work in collaboration to consider implementing public awareness campaigns addressing the public's perceptions on people experiencing mental health challenges and/or homelessness and what type of response (e.g. police or non-police response) would be most appropriate. This process should include mechanisms for campaign evaluation (e.g. key metrics that will be measured), a process for including community engagement in the planning process and determining the most appropriate target audience.</p> <p>Related City Council Motion: 22-AU13.6 #11</p>	<p>Status: In Progress - Near Completion</p> <p>Corporate Communications and S.P.E.C. collaboratively launched the "Make the Right Call" campaign to educate residents on when to use various city and police services, which included a dedicated mental health webpage to provide information and resources. In addition, the T.P.S. will support the City's Q4 2025 mental health anti-stigma campaign, to promote the use of the T.C.C.S., direct mental health calls to 2-1-1, and reduce stigma.</p>

Appendix B - Toronto Police Service Response to Toronto Auditor General Recommendations

Toronto Police Service-Audit of 9-1-1 Public Safety Answering Point Operations, Better Support for Staff, Improved Information Management and Outcomes (2022)

Response Legend

In Progress - Work is underway, not yet complete.

In Progress – Near Completion - Targeted for completion by the end of the first quarter of 2026.

Implemented - Recommendation operationalized, pending AG verification.

Supporting Role Only – The Service supports recommendations led by the City Manager or Board

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
<p>#1</p> <p>Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) to reevaluate and establish new minimum staffing requirements for Communications Services, ensuring staffing levels are sufficient to achieve T.P.S.'s 9-1-1 service level standard, and using improved data and information to include:</p> <p>a) consideration of staff absenteeism rates and other detractors/ factors, the underlying causes of not adhering to the current minimum staffing requirements, and aiming to minimize overtime where possible, for the different timeslots. (considering peak and non-peak periods).</p> <p>b) Re-balancing the workload amongst staff and staffing resources as needed throughout the day to meet operational needs while also enhancing staff's mental health and well-being.</p>	<p>Status: In Progress - Near Completion</p> <p>a) Communications Services collaborated with the T.P.A, and Strategic Projects to conduct a comprehensive staffing analysis through Circadian. The insights from this analysis were shared with Command and Communications Services to inform the development of updated staffing standards.</p> <p>To support these efforts, the T.P.S secured increased staffing through a multi-year hiring strategy. As part of this plan, 90 Communications Operators have been hired in 2025 to help sustain service levels and improve operational efficiency.</p> <p>This approach incorporates key operational factors such as absenteeism, overtime, and the root causes of staffing shortfalls. These considerations are guiding the creation of staffing models that better align with demand fluctuations throughout the day, aiming to reduce overtime and enhance coverage during both peak and non-peak periods.</p> <p>To further support staffing decisions, Communications Services has a daily staffing report, which provides improved data to help balance staffing on the floor in real time.</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
	<p>b) To support workload rebalancing and enhance staff well-being, several initiatives have been implemented. Five platoon clerks were hired in February 2025 to reduce administrative duties for Operational Supervisors, allowing them to focus on core responsibilities. Members with permanent restrictions from call taking and dispatch have been reassigned to administrative roles, such as scheduling, to reduce strain on operators. A talk time study on double divisional desks has provided data to guide future staffing decisions.</p> <p>Training improvements have also been prioritized. On-desk training (O.D.T) hours were reduced from 320 to 240 to alleviate trainer burnout, and evaluation forms are being revamped to better identify trainee needs, currently pending approval from Labour Relations and the T.P.A. The implementation of an Interactive Voice Response (I.V.R.) system has successfully reduced non-emergency call volume by approximately 900 calls per day, easing workload and improving member well-being. Communications Services is also exploring the use of an artificial intelligence (A.I.) virtual agent to further support triaging of non-emergency calls.</p> <p>In terms of scheduling, the Joint Shift Schedule Committee reviewed alternative shift models, and following member consultations and voting, the 8-hour shift schedule was selected. A pilot of this model will begin on January 5, 2026. Communications Services is also launching the Internal Calltaker Cadre in September 2025 and the Casual Calltaker initiative in January 2026, reflecting a proactive and collaborative approach to balancing operational needs with staff wellness.</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
<p>#2</p> <p>Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) to review the current staffing levels, shift deployment and start hours, and scheduling system for communications operators to ensure the assignment of the actual number of operators at work aligns with its planned minimum staffing requirements (that T.P.S. reevaluates as part of Recommendation 1) as required to achieve its service levels and handle its call volume. Depending on the results of T.P.S.'s evaluation of minimum staffing requirements, T.P.S. should consider:</p> <p>a) requesting an overall staffing increase of communications operators for T.P.S. Communication Services.</p> <p>b) hiring part-time call takers, particularly to help address peak periods and spike incidents.</p>	<p>Status: In Progress - Near Completion</p> <p>a) Communications Services, in collaboration with the T.P.A, and Strategic Projects engaged a third-party consulting firm to conduct a comprehensive review of staffing levels, shift deployment, and scheduling practices. Following the completion of this analysis, potential shift schedules were identified and presented to Communications Services members. A vote was held in October 2023, and the majority of members opted to retain their existing schedule. However, in early 2025, the T.P.S. revisited the shift schedules with support from Strategic Projects, and a second member vote was conducted in September 2025. The 8-hour, five-platoon model received majority support and will be piloted beginning January 5, 2026.</p> <p>b) To further enhance staffing flexibility and address peak periods and incident spikes, Communications Services continues to explore practical staffing solutions in collaboration with Labour Relations, and the T.P.A. These discussions are focused on ensuring compliance with legal frameworks while identifying viable candidate pools. As part of this effort, Communications Services is advancing the internal call taker cadre and casual Calltaker initiatives. The internal cadre is scheduled to launch by the end of September 2025, with the casual Calltaker position following in January 2026. These initiatives are designed to strengthen operational capacity and responsiveness while supporting sustainable staffing practices.</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
<p>#3</p> <p>Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) to improve T.P.S.'s data to understand the time required for communications operators to meet operational needs, by establishing separate time codes to track the time a communications operator:</p> <p>a) spends on processing a previously answered call.</p> <p>b) needs after handling a traumatic call (either at their desk or away from their desk).</p> <p>c) needs to recuperate before being available for the next call. This will allow T.P.S. to have more information on how certain calls affect the mental health and well-being of its communications operators, and the actual occupancy time needed to handle and complete a call, as well as the processing time.</p>	<p>Status: In Progress</p> <p>a) N.G.9-1-1 was fully implemented on May 21, 2025; however, this recommendation remains in progress. Communications Services and Data Management are actively exploring technology solutions and leveraging the new data made available through N.G.9-1-1 to meet these requirements.</p> <p>Data from the N.G.9-1-1 system have been enabled in a reporting database since July 2024. Key metrics such as call volume and wait time have been developed using this new data source and are currently under review. The next phase of this work will focus on analysing the time spent on each call. This analysis will help the T.P.S. determine whether a separate time code is needed to track the time spent on processing a previously answered call.</p> <p>Communications Operators are trained to select the appropriate “Make Busy” code after completing a call, indicating the reason they are unavailable to take the next call. These codes vary depending on the nature of the task or break required (Time-Out, Consult Trainer, Consult Supervisor, Aid Calltaker, Make Busy to Hold, Hang ups (H.U.P.S.) from Phones, Post Call Processing). Due to limitations of the current technology, Communications Operators are unable to change their make busy code once it has been selected. In July 2024, Communications Services submitted a Research and Development request to Solacom to address this system limitation; however, Solacom has prioritized its efforts on the nationwide implementation of N.G.9-1-1 to meet the C.R.T.C.’s March 2027 deadline. As a result, user-based requests like this one will be considered only after that milestone is reached.</p> <p>The Communications Services Dashboard is updated daily to show a breakdown of “Make Busy” code usage, including the percentage and specific reasons. These codes are reviewed daily to monitor operator availability and identify trends.</p> <p>b) Communications Services actively encourages members to take</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
	<p>breaks when needed and to inform their supervisor so that appropriate support can be provided in the event of a traumatic incident. Supervisors remain attentive to traumatic calls, checking in with affected members to ensure their well-being following such incidents. Communications Services has also taken a proactive approach to wellness by establishing a Wellbeing Team dedicated to addressing all aspects of staff well-being across the Unit, including peer support initiatives.</p> <p>The "We Care" initiative is a peer-led program designed to provide support and resources for members on an extended leave (maternity, paternity, injured on duty, long-term sick etc.). Through this initiative, members are connected with a Peer Support Ambassador. The Peer Support Ambassador will conduct regular check-ins with the member and provide guidance, assistance, and any necessary information throughout their leave.</p> <p>c) Due to technological limitations, Communications Services has been unable to generate data relevant to this. Since the effects of calls vary from person to person, engagement with the Supervisor team is essential to assess individual needs and provide appropriate support. Communications Services continues to manually process Injured on Duty (I.O.D) documentation, either at the request of the individual or when deemed necessary. Members also participate in debriefs both within the unit and at the divisional level and engage in peer support networks to promote wellness and recovery.</p> <p>Communications Services continues to communicate available resources and support options to members while engaging them individually in response to critical incidents.</p>
<p>#4</p> <p>Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) to analyze T.P.S.'s data (using new time tracking codes from Recommendation 3) on the time needed by communications operators to handle traumatic calls, in combination with additional feedback received from staff, and</p>	<p>Status: In Progress</p> <p>Communications Services continues to prioritize the mental health and well-being of its members through a combination of proactive wellness initiatives. Members are encouraged to take breaks when needed and to notify their supervisor so that appropriate support can be provided following traumatic incidents. Supervisors remain</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
<p>use these insights in developing additional strategies to assist the communications operators in their mental health and well-being. In doing so, T.P.S. should leverage strategies used by other agencies.</p>	<p>attentive to such calls and routinely check in with affected members to ensure their well-being. Communications Operators are often included in divisional debriefing sessions and are mandated to have yearly sessions with the T.P.S. psychologist.</p> <p>To further support staff, Communications Services has established a dedicated Wellbeing Team focused on all aspects of employee wellness across the Unit. This includes peer support initiatives such as the "We Care" program.</p> <p>Communications Services is currently developing a Safe and Healthy Staffing Strategy, led by unit leadership, aimed at embedding operational practices that reduce stress and foster resilience among Communications Operators. One key component includes mandatory on-desk breathers, such as three to five-minute breaks following every 55 minutes of high-intensity 9-1-1 call processing. Implementation of this strategy will require integration into the existing shift accords.</p> <p>Communications Services engages in the Ontario supervisor network that meets in person and online at least once a year to discuss various topics including strategies to assist the Communications Operators in their mental health and well-being.</p>
<p>#5</p> <p>Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.), in consultation with T.P.S.'s Corporate Services Command, to determine the feasibility of filling vacancies sooner than the required two-year time lapse for communications operators who are on Injured on Duty assignment (but not replacing the position), to address its operational requirements.</p>	<p>Status: In Progress</p> <p>Initial discussions have begun to scope a Wellness Project, designed to support the implementation of this recommendation. The project will address operational requirements tied to the two-year vacancy replacement timeline outlined in Human Resources Unassigned Group procedures specific to Communications Services. While these procedures typically require a two-year absence before initiating a replacement, exceptions are made in cases involving permanent restrictions. The project will explore alternative approaches to streamline timelines and enable earlier action where appropriate.</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
	Scoping will take place in 2025, with formal support and implementation planning scheduled for 2026.
<p>#6</p> <p>Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.), in consultation with T.P.S.'s Corporate Services Command – Legal Services, and the Toronto Police Association, to evaluate the 'return to work' criteria for those communications operators Injured on Duty, so that either they are only fit to return if that means fit to return to their previous job site, working at the 9-1-1 Communications Centre, or if T.P.S. needs to employ them elsewhere, that T.P.S. is able to hire additional surge positions in the 9-1-1 Communications Centre to address its operational requirements.</p>	<p>Status: In Progress</p> <p>Wellness remains at the forefront of evaluating return-to-work criteria for Communications Operators I.O.D. Wellness is working on identifying and developing meaningful work opportunities that align with each member's unique skills and recovery needs, while still meeting the operational requirements of the 9-1-1 Communications Centre. This involves assessing whether an injured operator is fully fit to resume their previous role or an alternative position.</p>
<p>#7</p> <p>Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service, in consultation with the Toronto Police Association, to explore and develop recruitment strategies to address the shortage in communications operators and challenges in retaining trainees and full-time permanent staff, including:</p> <p>a) the feasibility of hiring dedicated call taker/ dispatcher positions, and potential to retain qualified individuals who did not pass dispatcher training as call taker only beyond one year permanently, depending on the results of the pilot program.</p> <p>b) increasing the probation period for communications operators beyond one year permanently, depending on the results of the pilot program that recently began.</p>	<p>Status: In Progress - Near Completion</p> <p>Communications Services remains committed to strategically addressing the current shortage of Communications Operators and the challenges associated with retaining trainees and full-time permanent staff. The T.P.S. continues to closely monitor the effectiveness of the 18-month probationary period pilot program, while the one-year Calltaker contract remains in place - a measure that supports retaining qualified individuals who, for various reasons, did not pass dispatcher training. Communications Services is also working toward having the Internal Calltaker cadre ready by the end of September 2025, with a planned launch of the casual Calltaker position in January 2026.</p> <p>To support our recruitment efforts, Communications Services employs a variety of strategies to attract and engage potential candidates. Participation in job fairs and career expos, including events in Oshawa, the Canadian National Exhibition, and the National Women's Show, helps raise awareness about career opportunities within the organization.</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
	<p>Communications Services also collaborates closely with three key colleges: Durham College, Cambrian College, and Humber College, all of which offer programs related to emergency communications. Through campus tours, observation opportunities, and mock disaster exercises, students and faculty are engaged to build a strong pool of qualified candidates. Additionally, our social media campaigns help spread our message and reach a wider, more diverse group of applicants.</p> <p>The review of retention strategies remains ongoing, with Communications Services focused on supporting the success of all new members. Regardless of the duration of the probationary period, Communications Services is committed to maintaining high retention rates and ensuring that new operators are well-equipped for long-term success.</p>
<p>#8</p> <p>Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.), in consultation with T.P.S.'s Corporate Services Command, to identify and provide the necessary human resources and hiring supports to Communications Services, so the communications operators can maximize their time in performing call answering and dispatching services.</p>	<p>Status: Implemented</p> <p>Through the 2025 Budget process, Communications Services successfully secured the hiring of 90 Communications Operators, significantly strengthening operational capacity and addressing ongoing workforce demands. This expansion is part of a broader strategic effort to ensure adequate staffing levels that allow Communications Operators to focus on their core responsibilities of call answering and dispatching. In support of this initiative, Human Resources has engaged external psychologists to conduct psychological assessments on candidates, ensuring a thorough and timely evaluation process. Talent Acquisition is prioritizing background checks for Communications Operator applicants to expedite hiring and ensure candidates are ready in time for scheduled training classes.</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
<p>#9</p> <p>Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service, to review and determine the management information needs of Communications Services and improve the data available, ensuring the data is accurate, collected efficiently, and the results of data analysis should be used to inform strategies and action plans to address operational improvements, including but not limited to:</p> <p>a) enabling accurate and robust data analysis of its calls for service, workload, deployment of staffing resources, and communications operators' activities.</p> <p>b) developing strategies for how to improve timeliness of answering 9-1-1 dialed calls.</p> <p>c) identifying further areas of training opportunities for communications operators.</p> <p>d) identifying areas where further call diversion can be made.</p>	<p>Status: In Progress</p> <p>a) Communications Services has secured a C.A.D. Geographic Information System Analyst position, with a successful candidate identified. This role will strengthen data analysis and interpretation to support operational and strategic decision-making.</p> <p>b) To improve 9-1-1 call response, Communications Services has launched several initiatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In June 2025, a dedicated 9-1-1 queue model was introduced to ensure operators remain available for emergency calls only. • Abandoned calls were redirected to a separate daily role, preventing delays for those in the 9-1-1 queue. • Automatic text-backs now confirm if a disconnected call is an emergency, reducing unnecessary callbacks and freeing operators for live emergencies. • A shift schedule pilot (January 2026), the Internal Calltaker cadre (September 2025), and a casual Calltaker role (early 2026) will increase staffing flexibility and improve response times. <p>c) Communications Services continues working with City partners to refine responses to mental health-related calls and adapt to community needs. Training remains ongoing through In-Service and classroom sessions. In Spring 2025, the updated T.C.C.S transfer process introduced faster cold transfers to 2-1-1 services, improving efficiency.</p> <p>d) Updates were made in August 2025 to the Non-Emergency phone tree, easing pressure on Communications Operators and supporting 9-1-1 prioritization. Online reporting has also been enhanced with translation capabilities, usability improvements, and the removal of limits on reportable theft amounts. By October 2025, mischief, damage, and graffiti reporting will also be modernized.</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
	<p>Public awareness efforts were reinforced in June 2025 through the ongoing “Make the Right Call” campaign.</p>
<p>#10</p> <p>Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) to ensure the data and information management needs of Communication Services are included and addressed in T.P.S.’s data strategy, Next Generation 9-1-1 implementation related to data analysis, and any future upgrade of T.P.S.’s Intergraph Computer Aided Dispatch system, including the need for interconnection between the information systems.</p>	<p>Status: In Progress - Near Completion</p> <p>Communications Services continues to work with internal and external partners to address data and information management needs as part of the broader T.P.S. data strategy. As N.G.9-1-1 evolves, the team is exploring integration opportunities with E.S.I.Net and developing new features like auto text-back to improve communication efficiency.</p> <p>A key achievement is the creation of an automated reporting dashboard, developed in collaboration with A.&I. and the N.G.9-1-1 vendor. This dashboard provides improved access to operational K.P.I.s, such as call volume, staffing levels, service levels, and compliance with National Emergency Number Association (N.E.N.A.) Standards. The new system reduces manual processes and offers a more comprehensive overview of performance.</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
	<p>The Data Management Unit will continue to support these initiatives to ensure ongoing access to accurate data for business and operational needs.</p>
<p>#11</p> <p>Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) to regularly provide the information on timeliness of transferred 9-1-1 calls to Toronto Paramedic Services, Toronto Fire Services, and other agencies where appropriate, with the view to working together to meet the 9-1-1 emergency call service level standards T.P.S. and the other agency(ies) should meet, when needed, to determine if any changes are needed to established protocols to ensure the safety of citizens.</p> <p>City Council Motion 22-AU13.5 #1</p>	<p>Status: In Progress</p> <p>The Tri-Services 9-1-1 Committee, comprised of leadership from the T.P.S., P.S., and T.F.S., has been re-established and meets regularly to address shared challenges and develop strategies that support the timely transfer of 9-1-1 calls. P.S. has implemented process changes and related training to improve call handling, including a requirement for Calltakers to clearly articulate the reason for police attendance when requested. This information is now documented in the event text, helping to reduce unnecessary police dispatches, particularly for “See Ambulance” calls.</p> <p>Communications Services is developing a Safe and Healthy Staffing Strategy, led by unit leadership, to embed operational practices that reduce stress and promote resilience among Calltakers. One component of this strategy will allow T.P.S Calltakers to transfer medical calls without needing to remain on the line, streamlining the process and improving overall efficiency while maintaining service level standards.</p> <p>The committee will continue to convene regularly to review calls that may benefit from further collaboration, with the goal of identifying opportunities for improvement and enhancing service delivery.</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
<p>#12</p> <p>Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) to analyze T.P.S.'s call-for-service data to identify callers and locations that repeatedly call 9-1-1 for non-emergency matters (priority 4 to 8), or those who repeatedly call the police non-emergency line for non-police matters. The results of this analysis should be used to inform a targeted education/awareness program to raise awareness of the proper use of 9-1-1, the police non-emergency line, and the availability of other non-police City resources.</p>	<p>Status: In Progress - Near Completion</p> <p>The Repeat Calls for Service Diversion Project will directly support this recommendation by focusing on non-emergent and low priority calls for service. Strategic Projects will work with A.&I. to develop an expanded dashboard that identifies repeat calls for service. This dashboard will be used by divisional resources to connect individuals with appropriate services, ensuring that support is deployed efficiently and in the right situations.</p> <p>Strategic Projects and the N.E.C.R.S.C. will review the project's progress through use cases and other evaluation methods to ensure its success and support the identification of other resources and supports that may be available. The project launch is planned for Q1 2026.</p> <p>Although considerable awareness work has already been done through the "Make the Right Call" campaigns, this project will support future iterations of the ongoing campaign. Once the project is live, we will work with partners to continue educating the public and stakeholders about appropriate service pathways.</p>
<p>#13</p> <p>Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) to accelerate the Digital Workflows project and use data analytics to identify other opportunities and technological tools to create efficiency in the call handling process for communications operators, and to further explore other areas for call diversion. In implementing this recommendation, T.P.S. should consider any best practices and leverage any existing tools already used by other agencies.</p>	<p>Status: In Progress</p> <p>Communications Services is actively working with I.T.S. to prioritize the Digital Workflows Project within the T.P.S.'s broader digital workplan. As part of this initiative, the T.P.S. is exploring the adoption of an artificial intelligence virtual agent application to support the triaging of non-emergency calls, with the goal of improving efficiency in the call handling process for Communications Operators. The project is currently in the discovery phase to assess requirements, process re-engineering and design, user needs, and technical feasibility.</p> <p>In Q4 2025, Communications Services will integrate RapidSOS into the Communications Centre to enhance emergency response capabilities. RapidSOS is an emergency data platform that enhances</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
	<p>caller location accuracy and provides real-time supplemental information directly to 9-1-1 centres. The RapidSOS Portal can be accessed through a secure browser, giving Calltakers improved G.P.S. location and real-time data from smartphones, apps, vehicles, and connected devices. For centres using Solacom, such as the T.P.S, RapidSOS is fully integrated into the Guardian call-handling suite, meaning data appears directly within the call-taking interface. Many C.A.D. systems also integrate RapidSOS through Application Programming Interfaces (A.P.I.s) allowing enhanced location and other emergency data to display seamlessly in dispatch workflows. At a high level, RapidSOS provides Canadian 9-1-1 centres with a significant upgrade in caller location accuracy and situational awareness, whether through direct integration with Solacom or C.A.D, or via the standalone portal.</p> <p>These advancements are being explored alongside best practices from other agencies, with the aim of identifying further opportunities for call diversion and workflow optimization.</p>
<p>#14</p> <p>Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) to use T.P.S.'s data to identify callers who are repeatedly making pocket dials, abandoned, and hang-up calls on the 9-1-1 line. T.P.S. should consider a strategy to reduce these types of calls, in consultation with its Corporate Services Command -- Legal Services, and the Toronto Police Services Board, including the feasibility of introducing a fee for this unwanted behavior that impacts T.P.S.'s resources.</p>	<p>Status: In Progress</p> <p>To support the identification of repeat callers Communications Services is currently exploring the use of Smart Analytics, a new phone reporting software, through a demo/sandbox environment. One of the key features under review is the "Emergency Top Calling Number" report, which enables the service to track the frequency of 9-1-1 calls by individual numbers on a daily, weekly, and monthly basis. This tool will help flag repeat callers and provide actionable insights. Full integration of live data into the platform is expected in 2026, offering an additional method to monitor and address this type of call activity.</p> <p>Pocket Dial Messaging: The confirmed pocket dial messaging can be found on our N.G.9-1-1 webpage, which was updated on May 22 when the system launched:</p> <p><i>If you accidentally dial 9-1-1 from a wireless device, please</i></p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
	<p><i>disconnect immediately. You will automatically receive a text message prompting you to text back 1 if you have an emergency, or text back 9 if you do not. If you text back 1, a 9-1-1 call-taker will call you back. There is no need to dial 9-1-1 again as your call is already in the queue.</i></p> <p>Public education messaging on pocket dials related to the Make the Right Call campaign have been periodically released since 2023. The information focused on general tips to avoid accidental calls and staying on the line to save communications operators' time, so they didn't have to call each one back manually freeing up the line for emergency calls.</p> <p>This pocket dial messaging changed after the launch of N.G.9-1-1 on May 22, 2025, when an automatic text back feature was implemented. The new technology recognizes when a call is dropped, removes it from the 9-1-1 queue, and places a text to confirm if someone is having an emergency.</p>
<p>#15</p> <p>Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) to explore technological tools that can assist T.P.S.'s communications operators in assigning event types and in prioritizing the urgency of the call for service, to ensure the assessment is consistent with T.P.S. policies and to help reduce stress levels for T.P.S.'s communications operators.</p>	<p>Status: In Progress - Near Completion</p> <p>Communications Services actively monitors new trends and regularly updates training programs to ensure operators use the latest best practices, tools, and technologies when assigning event types and prioritizing call urgency. As N.G.9-1-1 is now implemented, ongoing data analytics will further strengthen this approach by providing enhanced insights and supporting continuous improvements in service delivery.</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
<p>#16</p> <p>Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service to identify where system upgrades can be made to automate manual processes that must be made by communications operators during the call. Such processes can include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) adjusting the default priority rating for certain factors on calls. b) selection of call source for 9-1-1 dialed call. c) adjusting the event type and priority rating for certain types of calls based on the amount of time elapsed from when the event started. 	<p>Status: In Progress - Near Completion</p> <p>Communications Services continues to review event types and priority classifications for accuracy, making manual adjustments as needed. Work is underway with I.T.S. to explore technologies that could automate and standardize call handling. In most cases, the call source in C.A.D. is set automatically to show where an event started. Operators can update this field if the event comes from a different source than first shown. Call source types include Alarm, Automatic Number Indicator and Automatic Location Indicator (A.N.I./A.L.I.), Officer, Phone, and Walk-in. This system ensures events are accurately tracked and lets operators adjust the source as needed.</p> <p>Communications Services remains actively engaged in assessing calls and incorporating new information that may influence event type classification and priority ratings. Each event type is assigned a default priority level that reflects the nature of the event. The priority of an event is determined by two factors: the type of event and the circumstances surrounding it. A Calltaker or dispatcher can manually upgrade or downgrade an event type based on new information or the duration of the call, to assign the event the appropriate priority. A P.R.U. supervisor can modify the priority based on the updated information. Should a Sergeant determine that a priority 1 or 2 call be downgraded, they must provide their badge number along with the reason for the change. This information will be recorded in the call text, allowing the dispatcher to adjust the priority to 3 accordingly.</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
<p>#17</p> <p>Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) to review and update T.P.S.'s Call Taker Manual to ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. clarity of all event types and the related procedures. b. that the event type's default priority rating is consistent with police response expectation and urgency of the type of event. <p>When reviewing and updating the manual, also consider the following potential changes to specific event types and priority ratings outlined in the report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Whether danger to life versus damage to property (in situations where it may be lower priority) could be better distinguished in priority ratings. b) Default priority ratings for events relating to civil matters. c) Further defining 'catch-all' event types (e.g. check address). 	<p>Status: Implemented</p> <p>Since the Auditor General's audit in June 2022, Communications Services has adopted a rigorous and ongoing process to review and update its operational manuals. This initiative ensures alignment with evolving service standards and supports high-quality training and operational excellence.</p> <p>Manual Revisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The Calltaker Manual has been updated nine times •The Dispatcher Manual has undergone eight revisions <p>Updates are conducted prior to each training class to ensure the material reflects the most current event types, policies, terminology, and procedures.</p> <p>To adhere to high compliance standards and operational efficiency, all updates to the operational manuals are aligned with N.G.9-1-1 requirements. These updates are informed by new insights and evolving service needs, ensuring that content remains current and relevant. Strategic revisions improve training effectiveness, reduce operator fatigue, and improve clarity and accuracy in workflows.</p> <p>A key component of this process is the regular review of event types and priority ratings. These reviews ensure that manuals are accurate, responsive and reflective of operational needs. This structured and proactive approach reinforces the T.P.S.'s commitment to continuous improvement, adaptability, and excellence in emergency communications.</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
<p>#18</p> <p>Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service to explore training opportunities for communications operators to further improve their skills, particularly regarding assignment of event type, adjustment of the default priority rating, updating an event based on information on related subsequent call(s), and inclusion of key notes in the event chronology.</p>	<p>Status: In Progress - Near Completion</p> <p>The training syllabus for Communications Services is continually reviewed and updated to reflect changes in event types, policies, and procedures. Recommendations from the A.G. are carefully considered and integrated to ensure the curriculum aligns with best practices and regulatory standards. This ongoing process ensures that Communications Operators receive relevant and effective instruction tailored to their evolving operational responsibilities, including the assignment of event types, adjustment of default priority ratings, updating events based on related subsequent calls, and the inclusion of key information in the event text.</p> <p>The Training Unit is currently revamping the classroom portions of dispatcher and Calltaker training. The goal is to reduce the amount of time spent in class, increase the focus on applied knowledge through hands-on learning experiences, and improve observation periods. These changes aim to better prepare trainees for real-world operational demands by emphasizing practical skill development over theoretical instruction.</p> <p>These changes are designed to help new members become more comfortable with the technology and systems used in Communications Services, ultimately aiming to improve the success rate of trainees and better prepare them for the demands of the role. In-Service training sessions also undergo continuous evaluation to ensure they incorporate the latest developments within Communications Services and the broader T.P.S., maintaining their relevance and effectiveness over time.</p>
<p>#19</p> <p>Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) to analyze T.P.S.'s call answering data to identify the call taker time that impacts the police response time and evaluate the feasibility to further reduce this time interval in the view to understand and improve the overall</p>	<p>Status: In Progress</p> <p>The Calltaker time metric is now included in the 9-1-1 Response & Patrol service area of the Analytics Framework. A Command-level dashboard is used to support trend analysis and support informed decisions using this data.</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
<p>response times for citizens, especially for high priority emergency (priority 1 to 3) calls.</p>	<p>While official Response Time metrics begin only after the event is created (excluding Calltaker Time), this time still impacts the total experience for a 911 caller.</p> <p>Operationally, Calltaker Time is monitored separately in the command-level dashboard, alongside other key time metrics related to Response Time.</p> <p>On average, Calltaker Time for P1 remains steady at approximately 1.6 minutes, with only minor year-to-year fluctuations (~5 seconds). Although an operator's experience can influence how quickly information is gathered, the primary factors affecting Calltaker Time are usually the complexity of the incident and the caller's condition or ability to communicate.</p>
<p>#20</p> <p>Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service to ensure the clearance of a call-for-service event is communicated in a timely manner by officers, so that the dispatcher is aware of the availability of the officer units to be assigned for other calls for service.</p>	<p>Status: In Progress - Near Completion</p> <p>To support this recommendation, Corporate Communications and Strategic Projects will be developing an internal "clear from scene" video campaign and messaging. Additionally, Communications Services participates in onboarding sessions for new Sergeants to explain event clearance procedures and the requirements for broadcasting calls. Senior leadership also attends these sessions to emphasize the importance of units clearing calls in a timely manner.</p> <p>The NicheR.M.S. project will assist with the configuration of the M.P.S. system, which includes a "cleared" button feature to ensure that dispatchers are promptly informed when a call-for-service event is cleared by officers. When an officer uses the M.P.S. cleared button, the system will automatically update the status of the call in real-time within the NicheR.M.S. This immediate update notifies the dispatcher of the officer's availability for reassignment to other calls for service, thereby enhancing the efficiency of the call handling process and ensuring timely communication.</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
<p>#21</p> <p>Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service, in collaboration with Toronto Paramedic Services and Toronto Fire Services, to achieve live-time interconnectivity in communication on 9-1-1 calls and events amongst these entities, both currently, and in the implementation of the Next Generation 9-1-1 solution moving forward. This should include consideration of an interface of the Intergraph Computer Aided Dispatch system to allow for improved communication during 9-1-1 call transfers and events, and to specifically assist with communication where Toronto Police Service are no longer required by Toronto Paramedic Services and/or Toronto Fire Services as applicable, so as to avoid unnecessarily committing police resources.</p> <p>City Council Motion 22-AU13.5 #2</p>	<p>Status: In Progress</p> <p>Communications Services is actively collaborating with I.T.S to prioritize this work within the Service's broader digital workplan.</p> <p>As part of this effort, P.S. and T.F.S. are currently working to establish a new C.A.D. interface between their agencies. Their existing interface supports only one-way communication, from P.S. to T.F.S., where T.F.S. can acknowledge and close events but cannot send information back. The next phase involves developing a two-way interface that enables T.F.S. to transmit data back to P.S..</p> <p>Monthly Tri-Service meetings between the T.P.S, T.F.S., P.S. have been established to support this initiative.</p> <p>Communications Services, through its operations, training, and C.A.D teams is now working to define the business rules for what information should be shared with and received from T.F.S and P.S. This will guide engagement with internal I.T. teams and external vendors to develop a unified solution.</p> <p>Real-time interconnectivity across all emergency services is now a high priority focus for both C.A.D. Support and I.T.S., it has been flagged for immediate attention due to operational impact and A.G. recommendations.</p> <p>The T.C.C.S. Call Diversion Dashboard has been developed and is in the review stage by internal stakeholders to ensure accuracy and clarity. This dashboard provides a summary of trends since the implementation of the diversion pilot, through to the changes to the internal T.P.S. diversion process in 2025. Data summarized in the dashboard includes the number of total calls diverted, the number of calls attended by police, and the number of calls returned to the T.P.S.</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
<p>#22</p> <p>Toronto Police Services Board, in consultation with the Chief, Toronto Police Service and its Corporate Services Command -- Legal Services, to engage with the City and City Council for the collection of the 9-1-1 levy or request a change in legislation with the provincial government, so that a 9-1-1 levy can be collected by the telecommunication service providers and remitted to the Public Safety Answering Point, particularly given the fiscal sustainability issues with the implementation of mandated Next Generation 9-1-1 requirements, and given this is the current practice in most other provinces in Canada.</p>	<p>Status: Supporting Role Only</p> <p>The T.P.S. and City partners have sought authorization for a 9-1-1 levy to address Next Generation 9-1-1 funding gaps. At this time there have been no legislative or operational changes enacted by the Ontario government or Toronto City Council.</p>
<p>#23</p> <p>The City Manager, in consultation with Toronto Police Services Board, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.), and City's Legal Services, to include the following to inform its feasibility review of whether to move the 9-1-1 operations to a non-police City Service:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) fulsome cost/benefit analysis that includes the potential impact to call answer and call response time of police, fire, and ambulance, and the other related functions of the call center such as audio and data requests including for court proceedings, and maintenance of radio communications. b) cost impact and feasibility with regards to staffing, given the current collective agreement of communications operators. c) legislative feasibility given the current draft and forthcoming legislative requirements related to the delivery of policing and related services, in particular, the involvement of the police service in the Public Safety Answering Point (P.S.A.P.) dispatching function. 	<p>Status: Supporting Role Only</p> <p>City update from May 2025 - further discussions to inform the feasibility review of a non-police, City-operated 9-1-1 service will take place following implementation of other A.G. recommendations set out in AU13.5/AU13.6.</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
<p>d) legal risk and who would be responsible for those 9-1-1 calls and/or alternate non-police response where police are not dispatched, and it results in a negative outcome.</p> <p>e) governance model for P.S.A.P. with the view to enhance interoperability and coordination of emergency response services delivered.</p> <p>f) the goals and outcomes that are intended through a potential move of the 9-1-1 operations, and whether other strategies may be more effective, efficient, and economical to achieve those, such as offering another phone number for non-police response such as 2-1-1, and/or working together with T.P.S. on other strategies, including but not limited to, updating the 9-1-1 communications operators manual, additional training, data and technological supports for communications operators and police officers, and increased public education and awareness.</p>	
<p>#24</p> <p>Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service, in collaboration with the City, to undertake public education campaigns (including targeted awareness programs) and ongoing public education initiatives to improve public awareness and understanding on distinguishing between the various lines and the proper use of 9-1-1, the non-emergency line (416-808-2222), online police reporting, and other non-police alternative resources, including promotion of 2-1-1 (assistance in connecting people with community and social service resources) and 3-1-1.</p> <p>Assessment should be made to evaluate the effectiveness of these campaigns and initiatives on call behaviors. The campaign and/or initiatives should:</p> <p>a) include strategies to increase public awareness on what to do when the caller dials 9-1-1, including the specific</p>	<p>Status: In Progress - Near Completion</p> <p>In 2023, T.P.S. ran two successful social media campaigns: one from late October to December promoting key contact numbers and services, and another focused on preventing accidental 9-1-1 calls. Both campaigns received strong engagement.</p> <p>Building on this momentum, T.P.S. secured dedicated funding for public education in the 2024 Operating Budget. The “Make the Right Call” campaign ran from October 28 to December 28, 2024, using multilingual illustrations to educate the public on appropriate contact numbers.</p> <p>Social Media Engagement 2024 & 2025:</p> <p>X (formally known as Twitter):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Views: 123, 066 • Shares: 292 • Likes: 426

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
<p>information that needs to be provided to the call taker in order to shorten police response time, how to prevent pocket dials, and what to do when an individual dials 9-1-1 by mistake.</p> <p>b) be multi-lingual.</p> <p>c) be refreshed and refocused periodically to address the 9-1-1 call analysis results to reduce unnecessary or avoidable non-emergency-related calls to 9-1-1.</p> <p>City Council Motion 22-AU13.5 #4</p>	<p>Facebook & Instagram:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Views: 324,594 • Shares:872 • Likes: 4,648 <p>The T.P.S. also participated in the first province wide “Every Second Counts” campaign to reduce non-emergency 9-1-1 calls, amplified through social media.</p> <p>Additional T.P.S. efforts to improve public awareness and reduce non-emergency 9-1-1 calls include:</p> <p>Pocket Dial Messaging: Updated in May 2025 with the launch of N.G.9-1-1, this messaging educates the public on what to do if they accidentally dial 9-1-1. The new system sends an automatic text to confirm whether the call is an emergency, helping to reduce unnecessary callbacks and free up emergency lines. Ongoing messaging since 2023 has also focused on preventing accidental calls and encouraging callers to stay on the line.</p> <p>Phone Tree Enhancements: In August 2025, updates to the Non-Emergency phone tree were implemented to streamline call routing, reduce pressure on Communications Operators, and prioritize true emergency calls.</p> <p>Online Reporting Improvements: Enhancements include multilingual support, improved usability, and expanded reporting options. By October 2025, the system will support modernized reporting for mischief, damage, and graffiti, making it easier for the public to use online tools instead of calling 9-1-1.</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
<p>#25</p> <p>Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.), in collaboration with the city, to consider a shorter and easier to remember number (if possible three digits) for T.P.S.'s dedicated non-emergency line.</p> <p>City Council Motion 22-AU13.5 #5</p>	<p>Status: Implemented</p> <p>On August 7, 2025, the T.P.S. launched a new three-digit number, *TPS (*877), giving wireless users direct access to the non-emergency line. Implementation required individual carrier requests, network configuration, gateway adjustments, and testing, and was completed over three months. Major mobile carriers, including Rogers, Bell, TELUS, and Freedom Mobile, now support the service.</p> <p>At this time, *TPS is not available through landlines. Although the T.P.S. explored using an N11 designation, (three-digit N11 codes within the North American Numbering Plan – e.g. 9-1-1, 4-1-1 etc. that are governed by the C.R.T.C.), the request did not qualify under C.R.T.C. criteria. Instead, carriers programmed *TPS as a wireless short code.</p> <p>A communications campaign accompanied the launch, including a news release, social media outreach, explainer video, website updates, and internal eUpdates. Media outlets also covered the announcement.</p>
<p>#26</p> <p>Toronto Police Services Board direct the Chief, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) to further improve T.P.S.'s website so that it is easy for the public to navigate and to find information on the 9-1-1, non-emergency line (8-2222), and online reporting.</p>	<p>Status: Implemented</p> <p>To improve public accessibility and awareness regarding emergency and non-emergency communication channels and the services provided, the T.P.S. redesigned its official website to make key services more accessible and mobile-friendly.</p> <p>On May 3, 2022, the Service redesigned its homepage into a horizontal structure for easier navigation and quicker access to information about 9-1-1 services, the non-emergency line and online reporting tools.</p> <p>The top of the tps.ca homepage features a rotating banner with links to informational pages on 9-1-1, 2-1-1, 3-1-1, the non-emergency line, online reporting, reporting hate crimes, and police record checks.</p> <p>In October 2024, the T.P.S. and the City launched a “Make the Right Call,” a collaborative public education campaign as part of AG #24.</p>

Toronto Auditor General's Recommendation	Toronto Police Service Update
	<p>This multilingual, public awareness campaign was designed to educate the public on when to call 9-1-1, the non-emergency line (416-808-2222), 2-1-1 and 3-1-1.</p> <p>Changes to emergency and non-emergency information on tps.ca were made to align with the “Make the Right Call” branding on the day of the launch. The revisions reflected the T.P.S.’s collaboration with the City, while also enhancing visibility, coordinated messaging, and improved overall user-friendliness. Continuous maintenance and updates are conducted to ensure the information presented remains accurate, clear and accessible to users.</p> <p>The Online Reporting Portal page allows members of the public to file reports for specific non-emergency incidents such as parking complaints, theft, hate-motivated graffiti, and financial and property-crime under \$5,000. It includes clear instructions, eligibility criteria and follow-up procedures, making it easier for users to navigate the reporting process. In July 2025, the T.P.S. removed the financial limit for reporting theft online and made reporting available in 98 languages. The multi-language reporting feature was also applied to parking complaints. The improved user entry and language supports are expected to be applied to all online reporting types by the end of 2025. Additional changes and designs to the Online Reporting pages will be made based on user feedback.</p>



5. Annual Report on Training & Development – 2024



PUBLIC REPORT

August 14, 2025

To: Chair and Members
Toronto Police Service Board

From: Myron Demkiw
Chief of Police

Subject: Annual Report on Training & Development - 2024

Purpose: ☒ Information Purposes Only ☐ Seeking Decision

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive the following report.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications arising from the recommendation contained in this report.

Summary:

The Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) is committed to continuing to work towards national and global recognition as a leader in police training, education, and the professional development of its members. Central to this commitment is a focus on training that promotes meaningful community engagement, effective de-escalation, and compassionate interactions with individuals in crisis, while upholding the principles of equity, inclusion and human rights. Through the Toronto Police College (T.P.C.), the T.P.S. provides high-quality, responsive learning opportunities that meet the evolving needs of both sworn officers and civilian members. The approach to training is not only about building skill, but also a strategic investment in public trust, institutional integrity and professional excellence. By advancing meaningful reform and accelerating the professionalization of policing through innovative training, guided by the T.P.S.'s core values, the T.P.S. is laying the groundwork for a safer, more inclusive and thriving Toronto.

Discussion:

The T.P.C. is committed to training its sworn and civilian members using a variety of methods tailored to meet the diverse learning needs of a large urban police service and community. This report is divided into two parts, followed by three appendices which provide a comprehensive overview of T.P.C.'s training and evaluation efforts:

Part 1: Training Section Highlights: Provides insight into the various sections within the Toronto Police College.

Part 2: *2024 Level 3 - Post-Course Effectiveness Study* Overview produced by the Toronto Police College.

Appendix A: Detailed Findings of the 2024 Level 3 - Post-Course Effectiveness Study produced by the Toronto Police College.

Appendix B: Provides a summary list of all courses and training completed by all Toronto Police Service members in 2024.

Appendix C: *Phase One Preliminary Report: A Multimethod Examination of Toronto Police Service's Annual In-Service Training Program* by Humber College Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning

Background:

At its meetings of August 24, 1995, and January 20, 1999, the Board requested that the Chief of Police provide an annual report that assesses the effectiveness of training programs (Min. Nos. P333/95 and P66/99 refer). This report outlines the 2024 training delivered by the T.P.C.

Advancing Training Excellence in 2024

In 2024, the T.P.S. continued to demonstrate its commitment to modern, inclusive, and high-quality training for all members. Over the course of the year, a total of 68,175 internal course completions were recorded across a wide range of programs. These courses were delivered not only by the T.P.C., the T.P.S.'s central hub for training, but also by specialized units such as Traffic Services, Court Services, Intelligence Services, and the Emergency Management and Public Order Unit, among others. This decentralized and collaborative approach ensured that training remained responsive to evolving operational needs and accessible to members across the organization.

The T.P.C. played a leading role in this effort, delivering 1,432 in-house courses and accounting for 45,024 completions by T.P.S. members. Training was offered through a variety of formats, including classroom instruction, unit-specific and specialized courses, online learning, and leadership development initiatives. This multi-platform strategy supported the professional growth of both uniform and civilian members, while reinforcing the T.P.S.'s values of equity, inclusion, and community engagement by ensuring training

is accessible and inclusive, delivered with integrity, designed with empathy and respect, and continuously improved through feedback and reflection.

A cornerstone of the T.P.C.'s programming was the annual In-Service Training (I.S.T.) course, mandatory training completed by 4,216 frontline officers within a 12-month period. In 2024, the I.S.T. curriculum was significantly enhanced to reflect emerging priorities in community safety and operational readiness. Officers received updated instruction on crisis intervention, intimate partner violence, and adverse childhood experiences. The training also addressed officer-induced jeopardy, the duty to intervene, and strategies for recognizing and interrupting bias, ensuring that members are equipped to serve Toronto's diverse communities with professionalism and compassion.

In response to the *Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019 (C.S.P.A.)*, which came into effect on April 1, 2024, the T.P.S. implemented key training reforms to align with new provincial standards. A major milestone was the launch of the Criminal Investigative Training (C.I.T.) course, which replaced the longstanding General Investigators course. Developed in consultation with provincial and policing stakeholders, the C.I.T. is now the foundational course for members pursuing specialized investigative roles. The T.P.S. also contributed to the creation of the *C.S.P.A. Community of Practice*, a provincial working group focused on sharing investigative best practices and certifying trainers across Ontario.

Tactical and emergency preparedness training was also enhanced. New training programs were introduced or expanded for uniform and high-risk plainclothes officers, equipping them with life-saving skills for field deployment, including tourniquet training and high-risk vehicle takedown training. The Defensive Tactics curriculum was updated to include safer, more effective takedown techniques; changes that received positive feedback from T.P.S. members and drew interest from other Canadian police services.

The T.P.S. also continued to lead in digital learning through the development and delivery of innovative e-learning modules hosted on the Canadian Police Knowledge Network (C.P.K.N.). These modules were designed to enhance cultural competency, promote trauma-informed service delivery, and support the ongoing professional development of T.P.S. members. Among key offerings were courses on body-worn camera use, gender diversity and trans-inclusion, and an introduction to the Indigenous experience.

Two modules in particular, *Foundations of Islam and Addressing Islamophobia* and *Foundations of Judaism and Understanding Anti-Semitism*, received national recognition through the Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police. These modules were widely requested, not only by other police services, but also by publicly funded agencies and ministries outside of policing, reflecting their broader relevance and impact. The T.P.S. also introduced a Military Veterans Wellness Program, further demonstrating its commitment to inclusive, member-focused learning. Collectively, these digital resources have become valuable tools across the public safety and public service sectors, reinforcing T.P.S.'s role as a national leader in modern, accessible, and equity-informed training.

Fostering Collaboration

Collaboration remains a cornerstone of training and professional development at the T.P.S., internally, and across local, provincial, national, and international levels.

Academic partnerships continue to play a vital role in shaping the T.P.S.'s training strategy. In 2024, the T.P.C. maintained strong collaborations with institutions such as the University of Toronto, Toronto Metropolitan University, York University, and the Humber Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning (Humber College). These partnerships supported leadership development, transfer-of-learning evaluations, and enhancements to instructional design and adult learning methodologies.

Internally, the People Strategy and Performance Unit launched two key initiatives to support member development and promote a high-performing, inclusive workforce. The Interview Skills Course, originally designed to support promotional readiness, was expanded to include both sworn and civilian members. Among 95 participants, the course led to a 45 percent increase in interview confidence and a 25 percent improvement in interview knowledge. The T.P.S. Mentorship Program Pilot paired civilian members with mentors for an 8 to 10 month period, supporting career development, knowledge sharing, and internal networking. A formal evaluation in late 2025 will determine the program's long-term future.

The T.P.C. also facilitated cross-sector collaboration through events such as the Vulnerable Seniors Symposium, which brought together over 120 participants from 25 partner organizations, including public safety, healthcare, academia, and the Ministry of the Attorney General. The T.P.S. hosted several high-profile conferences throughout the year, including , the International Women's Day Seminar, the Fentanyl Awareness Conference, and the Artificial Intelligence (A.I.) and Policing Symposium. These events promoted knowledge exchange and showcased the T.P.S.'s leadership in modern, community-informed policing.

At the national level, the T.P.S. collaborated with other police services to co-develop training focused on equity, inclusion, human rights, and specialized investigations. In response to the C.S.P.A., the T.P.S. also led the development of a 16-week Special Constable Recruit Training Program, aligned with new Ontario Police College standards. The program has attracted significant interest from special constable employers across Ontario, resulting in multiple site visits to the T.P.C.

Internationally, the T.P.S. strengthened its engagement through participation in the International Association of Chiefs of Police and the United Arab Emirates (U.A.E.) Ministry of Interior Police Exchange Program. In August 2024, four officers from the U.A.E. joined T.P.S. Recruit Class 24-04, graduating in February 2025. Additionally, T.P.S. members participated in the exchange by completing the four-month basic academy program at the Abu Dhabi Police College.

Evaluation Approach

Evaluation remains a cornerstone of the T.P.S.' approach to professional development and accountability. In 2024, the T.P.S. advanced its evaluation efforts through both internal studies and a landmark academic partnership with Humber College. These initiatives reflect the T.P.S.'s commitment to evidence-informed training, continuous improvement, and public trust.

Community consultation continues to guide this work, supporting a co-design, co-develop model that ensures training is responsive to the needs of both members and the communities. By integrating diverse learning methods with rigorous evaluation practices, the T.P.S. aims to equip its members with the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary to serve effectively, ethically, and respectfully.

To support this goal, the T.P.C. applies the Kirkpatrick Model, a globally recognized framework that evaluates training across four levels: reaction, learning, behaviour, and results. This model enables the T.P.S. to assess not only participant satisfaction and knowledge acquisition, but also behavioural change and the broader impact of training on service delivery.

Independent Academic Review: Humber College Partnership

In 2023, the T.P.S. entered a Memorandum of Understanding with Humber College to conduct an independent, multi-phase academic evaluation of the annual I.S.T. program. Phase 1, completed in 2024, assessed the program's alignment with adult learning principles, instructional design, and knowledge transfer.

Using a multi-method approach, including literature review, curriculum mapping, instructor interviews, and ethnographic observations, the Humber College researchers found that I.S.T. is delivered by a knowledgeable and committed team of instructors and addresses many of the most pressing challenges faced by frontline officers. The training content was found to be timely and relevant, with clear efforts to reflect current operational and societal priorities. The review also identified opportunities for improvement, including the need for more consistent application of adult learning strategies, better pacing of in-class content, and stronger alignment between learning objectives, instructional methods, and evaluation tools. Many of the recommendations have already been integrated into the development of the 2025 curriculum, reflecting the T.P.C.'s proactive approach to continuous improvement. These findings underscore the T.P.S.'s commitment to transparency, academic rigor, and continuous improvement in police education. A summary of the Phase 1 findings is available in Appendix C, with the final report expected by the end of 2025.

Summary of New Programming and Initiatives for 2024

Training Section	2024 Program/Initiative
Training Standards Section	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chief's Wellbeing Program • The Before Operational Stress (B.O.S.) program • Foundations of Islam & Addressing Islamophobia e-learning (expanded in 2024) • Foundations of Judaism & Understanding Antisemitism e-learning • Ontario Public-Police Interactions Training Aid e-learning. • Body-Worn Camera Statement Taking Training Video • Missing Persons Risk Assessment training • Ministry of Transportation- Inquiry Service System (M.T.O.-I.S.S.) training • Special Constable Recruit Training
Incident Response Training Section	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Military Veterans Wellness Program (in collaboration with the Wellness Unit) • Dynamic Simulation Training (Updated Active Bystander Training)
Technology Integration Section	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technology Ambassador Program • Frontline Supervisor Course (updated to include technology integration modules) • Coach Officer (updated to include technology modules)
Investigative Training Section	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criminal Investigator Training (replaced T.P.C.'s General Investigator Course - aligned with C.S.P.A.) • Search Warrant Course (updated to align with C.S.P.A.) • Train-the-Trainer Program (required for delivery of C.S.P.A.-aligned certified courses)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vulnerable Seniors Symposium
Leadership and Member Development Section	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adverse Childhood Experiences module added to I.S.T. • Updated Police Resiliency training module added to I.S.T. • Intimate Partner Violence module added to I.S.T. • First Aid Training (updated to include Tourniquet Training Program)

Conclusion:

The attached report provides the Board with an overview of the training delivered by the T.P.C. during 2024.

The Interim Chief Administrative Officer, or designate, and Superintendent Maher Abdel-Malik will be in attendance to answer any questions the Board may have regarding this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Myron Demkiw, M.O.M.
Chief of Police

Attachments:

Toronto Police College Annual Report on Training and Development - 2024

Appendix A: Detailed Findings of the 2024 Level 3 - Post-Course Effectiveness Study produced by the Toronto Police College.

Appendix B: Provides a summary list of all courses and training completed by all Toronto Police Service members in 2024.

Appendix C: *Phase One Preliminary Report: A Multimethod Examination of Toronto Police Service's Annual In-Service Training Program* by Humber College Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning



Effective Police Training: Toronto Police College
Annual Report on Training and Development – 2024

Table of Contents

Part 1 - 2024 Training Section Highlights – Toronto Police College	10
Armament Section	10
Police Vehicle Operations Section	11
Training Standards Section	12
Technology Integration Section	13
Community Policing Section	14
Incident Response Training Section	15
Investigative Training Section	17
Leadership & Member Development Section	18
Part 2 – 2024 Post Course Effectiveness Study Overview	20
Scope	21
Methodology	21
Interpreting Neutral Responses	22
Summary of Finding	22
Mental Health Crisis Intervention	23
Indigenous Experience	23
Centering Black Experiences	23
4 R's of Trauma-Informed Practice	23
Police Resiliency	24
Dynamic Simulation Training	24
Conclusion	24
Appendix A: Detailed Findings 2024 Post Course Effectiveness Study	25
Mental Health Crisis Intervention	25
Indigenous Experience	27
Centering Black Experiences (C.B.E.)	31
Trauma-Informed Practice - 4 R's	36
Police Resiliency	38
Dynamic Simulation Training	42
Appendix B: Summary list of all courses and training completed by all Toronto Police Service members in 2024	47
Appendix B.1: 2024 Courses Delivered by the Toronto Police College.	48
Appendix B.2: 2023 Courses Delivered by Toronto Police Service Units (T.P.S.), or to T.P.S. members by OPC/CPC/CISO.	58
Appendix C: Phase One Preliminary Report: A Multimethod Examination of Toronto Police Service's Annual In-Service Training Program by Humber Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning	71

Part 1 - 2024 Training Section Highlights – Toronto Police College

Training at the Toronto Police College (T.P.C.) is divided into the following sections:

- Armament
- Police Vehicle Operations
- Training Standards
- Technology Integration
- Community Policing
- Incident Response Training
- Investigative
- Leadership and Member Development
- Special Constable Training Unit (formerly Courts Training Unit)

Armament Section

In 2024, the Armament Section continued to play a critical role in supporting the operational readiness of the Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) through its oversight of firearms, Conducted Energy Weapons (C.E.W.), and Police Vehicle Operations (P.V.O.). The Armament Section remained focused on maintaining high standards in tactical training and firearms proficiency, while also advancing modernization efforts to align with evolving provincial requirements.

Throughout the year, the Armament Section delivered a wide range of training programs to meet the growing needs of the T.P.S. These included cadet firearm training prior to, and post attendance at the Ontario Police College (O.P.C.), firearms instruction for lateral officers (officers joining the T.P.S. with experience working at other police services) and reintegration candidates (members returning to duty after long-term absences); and specialized courses on the Glock 27, C8 Carbine, and Remington 870 less-lethal shotgun. Critical incident and exposure scenario sessions were also conducted to support reintegration and operational preparedness.

In total, the Armament Section delivered 13 C8 Carbine new user courses and 65 requalification sessions, along with multiple recruit and lateral officer training programs. Notably, firearm and carbine training was updated to meet the standards outlined in the *Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019* (C.S.P.A.) ensuring compliance and consistency across the Province.

Modernization remained a key focus in 2024. The Armament Section began replacing aging second- and third-generation Glock handguns as part of a scheduled lifecycle upgrade. Approval was also secured for the acquisition of new Generation 5 Glock 9mm handguns for Police Dog Services, with deployment throughout 2025.

The C.E.W. program remained active with 53 Taser-7 training sessions delivered over the year. Additionally, the Armament Quartermaster took on expanded responsibilities, including the management and distribution of Axon Body Cameras and Signal Sidearm equipment. While the Incident Response Team continues to lead training for these tools, the Quartermaster's support was essential in ensuring smooth implementation and operational readiness.

The contributions of the civilian Quartermaster were particularly valuable in 2024, allowing Training Constables to dedicate more time to instruction and program delivery. This collaborative approach has strengthened the Armament Section's ability to meet the dynamic needs of the T.P.S. and maintain a high standard of public safety.

Police Vehicle Operations Section

The P.V.O. Section continued to deliver specialized vehicle training programs to sworn officers, civilian members, and new recruits across the T.P.S. These programs are designed to enhance operational safety, reduce risk to the public, and ensure compliance with both Service Governance and Provincial Adequacy Standards.

Training covered a wide range of vehicle types and operational contexts, including marked and unmarked police vehicles, wagons, trucks, property vehicles, and bicycles. The P.V.O. Section also delivered advanced driving courses, crowd management vehicle operations, command post deployment, and emergency response driving. Recruit and Divisional Special Constable training remained a core focus, ensuring that all new members were equipped with the skills necessary for safe and effective vehicle operation.

A key responsibility of the P.V.O. Section is the provincially mandated delivery of Vehicle Pursuit training. This training is required for all Police Constables, Special Constables, Parking Enforcement Officers, and select civilian hires, and is tailored to the specific operational needs of each role. Emphasis is placed on collision avoidance, pursuit protocols, and defensive driving techniques to enhance officer safety and minimize public risk.

Training is delivered through a combination of classroom instruction and hands-on, one-on-one sessions. Remedial training is provided as needed to ensure all members meet required standards. The P.V.O. Section also works closely with other police services across the Greater Toronto Area to monitor trends and share best practices related to police pursuits and vehicle collisions.

As part of its commitment to continuous improvement, the P.V.O. Section actively participates in the T.P.S.'s Collision Reduction Committee. This collaboration helps identify leading causes of service vehicle collisions and informs strategies to reduce incidents through targeted training and policy development.

Training Standards Section

Established in late 2023, the Training Standards Section was created in direct alignment with the T.P.S.'s strategic priorities to accelerate police reform and professionalization. Led by a civilian Section Lead, the team includes both sworn members and civilian subject matter experts in areas such as adult education, digital learning, college registrar operations, and Equity, Inclusion, and Human Rights curriculum. This multidisciplinary team continues to enhance the T.P.S.'s capacity to deliver high-quality, relevant, and responsive training to both officers and civilian members.

In 2024, the Training Standards Section advanced several key initiatives focused on modernizing training delivery, strengthening evaluation practices, and enhancing learning outcomes. A major area of growth was the continued expansion of blended learning. Notably, in collaboration with the Wellness Unit, this section launched the Chief's Wellness Program portal for new recruits - an initiative that reinforces the T.P.S.'s commitment to centering wellbeing from the very first day of policing. The portal includes the Chief's Wellbeing Pledge, the Before Operational Stress (B.O.S.) Manual, and a range of wellness resources. Together with the Special Constable Recruit Training portal, these platforms provide a best-in-class blended learning experience for new members.

Reflecting the T.P.S.'s commitment to continuous improvement, this section also led the development and implementation of comprehensive training evaluation strategies designed to measure and enhance training impact. A significant partnership with Humber College supports this work by evaluating the effectiveness of training and the transfer of learning to frontline policing. The outcomes of Phase 1 of this evaluation project are detailed in Appendix C of this report, underscoring the Training Standards Section's commitment to evidence-based practices.

The Training Standards Section plays a critical role in ensuring that all training programs remain compliant with the new C.S.P.A. Legislative updates are reviewed and seamlessly integrated into training content to ensure members are equipped with the knowledge and skills required to meet evolving legal and community expectations.

Throughout 2024, the Training Standards Section released a suite of e-learning courses aligned with the T.P.S.'s operational and strategic priorities. These included modules on the Missing and Missed Recommendations and the use of digital tools in the field. In response to current events, and the need for enhanced cultural competency, two additional courses were launched: *Foundations of Islam & Addressing Islamophobia* (late 2023) and *Foundations of Judaism & Understanding Antisemitism* (early 2024). These courses provided officers and other members with essential knowledge to better support Toronto's Muslim and Jewish communities. Furthermore, in 2025, these training

programs were honoured with the Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police Award for Excellence in the Advancement of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion in Policing.

Specialized training programs were also developed to address other operational needs. The Missing Persons Risk Assessment course introduced updated tools and procedures to improve response effectiveness. The Ontario Public-Police Interactions Training Aid emphasized a relational, de-escalation-focused approach grounded in fairness, respect, empathy, and voluntary cooperation—minimizing the use of force whenever feasible. To support the integration of technology in the field, the Body-Worn Camera and Statement Training course was developed in consultation with the Ministry of the Attorney General's Crown Attorney's Office. This training clarified the distinctions between body-worn camera footage, caution statements, and sworn statements, with a focus on improving the admissibility of evidence in court.

New e-learning courses released in 2024 included:

- *Foundations of Judaism & Understanding Antisemitism*
- *Ontario Public-Police Interactions Training Aid*
- *Body-Worn Camera Statement Taking Training Video*
- *Missing Persons Risk Assessment*
- *Ministry of Transportation - Inquiry Service System (M.T.O.-I.S.S.)*
- *Chief's Wellbeing Program*
- *Special Constable Recruit Training*

The Training Standards Section has quickly become a cornerstone of professional development and accountability within the T.P.C. By leveraging internal expertise, fostering strong external partnerships, and applying data-driven approaches, this section ensures that training remains current, impactful, and aligned with both operational demands and community expectations as the T.P.S. continues to advance its reform and professionalization goals.

Technology Integration Section

The Technology Integration Section (T.I.S.) is dedicated to advancing the T.P.S.'s technological capabilities by integrating current and emerging technologies into training programs. Their mandate is to research new technology, make recommendations for organizational adoption, and implement training that enhances operational effectiveness.

In 2024, the T.I.S. made significant strides in fulfilling this mandate. One of the key initiatives was the launch of the Technology Ambassador Program. This program aims to increase the knowledge and competence of frontline personnel regarding current and future technology tools. Ambassadors, who are frontline members from all 16 divisions across the T.P.S., participate in ongoing training and relay information to their divisional members. They play a crucial role in bridging the gap between the T.P.C. and their divisions by advocating for best practices and identifying practical use cases for new and existing technology tools. The program fosters a culture of innovation, encouraging

members to explore and adopt new technologies, thereby enhancing their ability to complete technology-related tasks efficiently and with high quality.

The T.I.S. also focused on expanding technology inclusion in training by engaging with various internal T.P.C. training sections. This collaboration led to the integration of technology into several courses, including the Frontline Supervisor Course, Coach Officer Course, and full technology days of training for new recruits. These sessions covered the use of cellphones, T.P.S. apps, body-worn cameras, and leveraging approved A.I. tools. Additionally, training sessions included the use of internal dashboards for bail compliance, integrated crime maps, and Pushpin lessons, further enhancing technological competence of personnel.

In 2024, members of the T.I.S. met with several neighbouring and international agencies to discuss and share best practices for technology integration in training. These discussions fostered an exchange of innovative approaches and technologies, contributing to the overall enhancement of the T.P.C.'s training programs. This also resulted in the members of this section being invited to present at an international conference in 2025 to highlight their mandate, initiatives, and process.

Promoting innovation and the seamless integration of technology in training and daily operations was a key focus for the T.I.S. This section encouraged a mindset where technology becomes a natural and essential part of instructional and organizational practices. Additionally, the T.I.S. identified, assessed, and recommended tools and platforms that could meet the T.P.S.'s operational and training needs. New and existing technologies continue to be evaluated to ensure alignment with training goals, with strategic collaboration with Business Relationship Management, ensuring effective implementation.

Community Policing Section

The Community Policing Section is responsible for the design and delivery of foundational training programs for new members of the T.P.S., including police recruits, lateral hires, reintegration candidates, coach officers, and Auxiliary members. This section plays a critical role in shaping the early experiences of new hires, ensuring they are well-prepared for the demands of modern policing.

A core responsibility of the Community Policing Section is overseeing the performance of recruits at both the T.P.C. and the O.P.C. Members provide continuous professional instruction, mentorship, and support, addressing academic, physical, and cognitive needs to help recruits succeed. Several members of this section are seconded to O.P.C. as instructors, where they support the Basic Constable Training Program and monitor the progress of T.P.S. recruits throughout their time at the O.P.C.

In response to the Ontario Government's announcement of a fourth annual recruit intake at the O.P.C., the section worked throughout 2023 to adjust training schedules, equipment allocations, and instructional resources. These efforts ensured the T.P.S. was

well-positioned to meet the increased demand for training in 2024. As a result, four recruit intakes were successfully delivered, with a total of 389 recruits trained as police constables.

A notable highlight in 2024 was the graduation of four police officers from the United Arab Emirates Ministry of Interior, who completed the T.P.S. recruit program as part of the International Association of Chiefs of Police/United Arab Emirates Ministry of Interior Police Academy Exchange Program. These officers participated in both the O.P.C. and the T.P.S. recruit programs over a six-month period, further strengthening international collaboration and knowledge exchange.

The Community Policing Section also leads the development and delivery of the Uniform Coach Officer Training Program, which prepares experienced officers to mentor new recruits in the field. In 2024, six Coach Officer Training courses were delivered, resulting in the certification of 178 new Coach Officers, each playing a vital role in supporting the transition of recruits into operational roles.

In addition to recruit training, the Community Policing Section supports the physical wellness of all T.P.S. members through its team of fitness and wellness coordinators. These coordinators lead initiatives focused on fitness, nutrition, fatigue management, and work-life balance. Physical wellness is embedded into all recruit training programs, ensuring new hires are physically prepared for the demands of frontline policing.

The Community Policing Section also delivered training for experienced officers from other services joining the T.P.S. through lateral entry, as well as for new Auxiliary members. In 2024, 23 lateral hires and 47 Auxiliary members completed their respective training programs under the guidance of this section.

Through its commitment to mentorship, wellness, and high-quality instruction, the Community Policing Section continues to play a foundational role in preparing new members of the T.P.S. and supporting their successful integration into the policing profession.

Incident Response Training Section

In 2024, the Incident Response Training (I.R.T.) Section continued to expand its delivery of both regular and specialized training programs, reflecting the T.P.S.'s commitment to equipping frontline officers and recruits with the skills necessary for safe, effective, and accountable policing. With operational training now fully aligned to support frontline readiness, this section played a central role in maintaining high standards of performance across a wide range of roles and responsibilities.

The I.R.T. Section delivered a comprehensive suite of regular training programs, including Auxiliary Recruit Training, Use of Force Requalification for Auxiliary members, Glock 27 Requalification, the I.S.T. Program, and various recertification sessions such as, Patch and Reset Use of Force. Senior Officer Use of Force and Body-Worn Camera New User

courses were also delivered. While several courses fall under the purview of the Armament Section, including Taser 7 and Less Lethal Shotgun training, I.R.T. instructors continued to lead the delivery of these sessions.

In addition to core programming, the section facilitated a range of specialized training courses throughout the year. These included High-Risk Vehicle Takedown, Plainclothes Tactical, Search Warrant Entry, School Lockdown/Active Attacker Response, Lateral Service Training, Reintegration, Remedial and Supplementary Training, and Frontline Tourniquet Application. Each course was designed to address specific operational needs and enhance officer preparedness in high-stakes environments.

The I.R.T. Section also played a key role in supporting recruit training across all four 2024 constable intakes, as well as training for new Special Constables, Parking Enforcement Officers, Auxiliary members, and lateral officer hires. This section continued to collaborate with the Armament Section to support C8 Carbine instruction and recruit firearms training, ensuring consistency and integration across tactical disciplines.

Collaboration remained a cornerstone of the I.R.T. Section's approach. In 2024, this section worked closely with the Toronto Community Crisis Service, the Canadian Armed Forces, the Community Partnership & Engagement Unit's Military Veterans Wellness Program, and Corporate Communications – Video Services. These partnerships supported the integration of crisis response awareness and veteran support resources into the development of the 2025 I.S.T. Program curriculum, specifically; scenario-based training and lecture content focused on referral pathways and community-based crisis intervention.

The I.R.T. Section also partnered with the Training Standards Section and Humber College to develop standardized metrics for evaluating training effectiveness and knowledge transfer. This work supports a data-informed approach to continuous improvement and ensures alignment with provincial standards.

In 2024, the I.R.T. Section hosted observation and training awareness days for the City of Toronto's Legal Department, its contracted legal counsel, and the Board's Mental Health and Addictions Advisory Panel. These sessions provided these stakeholders with a firsthand view of the T.P.S.'s training practices and created opportunities for feedback that directly informed future curriculum development.

As part of its ongoing commitment to community engagement and accountability, the I.R.T. Section continued to collaborate with other units at the T.P.C. to incorporate community feedback into training design. This included the development of dynamic simulation scenarios that reflect realistic interactions with racialized and vulnerable individuals. Scenario-based Active Bystander Training was also expanded, reinforcing officers' ethical and professional duty to intervene when witnessing conduct that does not align with the T.P.S.'s values or public expectations.

Through its comprehensive, collaborative, and forward-looking approach, the I.R.T. Section remains a vital contributor to the T.P.S.'s operational readiness and commitment to public trust.

Investigative Training Section

The Investigative Training Section continues to support the professional development of members entering or advancing within investigative roles. With a portfolio of over 25 courses, this section is committed to delivering high-quality, relevant training that reflects current legislation, investigative best practices, and adult learning principles. These offerings range from foundational and provincially certified courses to advanced programs tailored for specialized investigative units and Professional Standards.

Throughout 2024, the Investigative Training Section remained actively engaged in the broader policing community, participating in seminars, conferences, and inter-agency training initiatives to support investigative excellence across jurisdictions. This section also delivered a variety of supplementary and refresher courses, ensuring that members could maintain and enhance their investigative competencies in a rapidly evolving legal and operational landscape.

The implementation of the *C.S.P.A.* marked a significant shift in the investigative training landscape. In response, the Investigative Training Section undertook a comprehensive review and adaptation of its curriculum to ensure compliance with new statutory requirements. Several existing courses were retired or replaced with content developed by the O.P.C., as mandated by the *C.S.P.A.* To deliver these certified courses, this section's instructors were required to complete the O.P.C.'s Train-the-Trainer program, which included formal instruction, course observation, and performance evaluation by O.P.C. trainers.

One of the most significant transitions was the replacement of the T.P.C.'s General Investigator course with the O.P.C.'s Criminal Investigator Training (C.I.T.) program. Now a legal requirement under the *C.S.P.A.*, C.I.T. has become the foundational course for all subsequent investigative training and is a prerequisite for the General Constable Development Program. The Investigative Training Section worked closely with the O.P.C. to ensure a smooth and effective transition, resulting in a modernized and high-demand program that better prepares members for investigative roles.

This approach has also been applied to other certified courses, including the Search Warrant Course, ensuring consistency and compliance across the investigative training portfolio.

In September 2024, the Investigative Training Section hosted a *Vulnerable Seniors Symposium* at the T.P.C. The event brought together over 120 participants from 25 agencies, including law enforcement, healthcare, legal, and academic institutions. Speakers included representatives from the T.P.S. Elder Abuse Consultation Team, the Financial Crimes Unit, the Ministry of the Attorney General, Sunnybrook Health Sciences

Centre, and the T.P.S. Vulnerable Persons Coordinator. The symposium was widely regarded as a success and served as a catalyst for the development of a new accredited training program on elder abuse, currently in progress to meet C.S.P.A. standards.

The Investigative Training Section also continues to integrate technology into investigative training. The use of analytical dashboards and digital tools has enhanced the delivery and application of investigative techniques in the field. The section works closely with the Training Standards Section to ensure all course content remains aligned with provincial legislation and T.P.S. wide training standards.

As the T.P.S. continues to adapt to new legislative frameworks and operational demands, the Investigative Training Section remains committed to delivering innovative, compliant, and impactful training that supports the development of skilled, ethical, and effective investigators.

Leadership & Member Development Section

The Leadership and Member Development (L.M.D.) Section plays a vital role in fostering a culture of professionalism, ethics, and accountability across the T.P.S. Through the delivery of training programs focused on equity inclusion & human rights, wellness, and occupational safety, the section supports both sworn and civilian members in developing the knowledge and skills necessary to serve with integrity and build public trust. This section is also responsible for delivering training to officers promoted to higher ranks, including Sergeant, Staff Sergeant, and Inspector.

In 2024, the L.M.D. Section's primary responsibility was the development and delivery of Day 1 of the annual I.S.T. course for all frontline police officers and special constables. This training addressed key topics such as procedural justice, trauma-informed policing, police resiliency, Black experiences, Indigenous experiences, adverse childhood experiences, and intimate partner violence. The curriculum was co-developed through an iterative process informed by both internal and external stakeholders, including community members and consultative committees. This collaborative approach ensured that the training was inclusive, relevant, and responsive to both the learner's needs and community expectations.

Day 1 of I.S.T. was delivered by a team of specialized Equity, Inclusion, and Human Rights (E.I.H.R.) instructors, alongside sworn members with diverse policing backgrounds. These instructors brought a wealth of professional insight and cultural competence to the training environment, shaping content and delivery methods that reflect the lived realities of Toronto's communities. Their contributions were instrumental in creating a learning space where all participants felt seen, heard, and respected.

Several new and enhanced training programs were introduced in 2024. The Adverse Childhood Experiences training helped members understand the long-term impacts of trauma on behaviour, equipping them to respond with empathy and improve interactions with at-risk individuals. The Police Resiliency training, grounded in the "Thrive" model and

the Positive emotion, Engagement, Relationships, Meaning and Accomplishment (P.E.R.M.A.) framework, focused on building personal resilience, managing stress, and promoting wellness through practical tools and strategies. This training emphasized the importance of mental health and post-traumatic growth, drawing on lessons from high-stress environments such as military service.

The Centering Black Experiences training fostered meaningful dialogue around race, mental health, and historical context, enhancing cultural competence and supporting officer wellness. Similarly, the Indigenous Experience training explored Indigenous justice systems, restorative practices, and the role of community leadership in healing and reconciliation. These sessions deepened members' understanding of systemic issues and promoted more culturally respectful approaches to policing.

The Intimate Partner Violence training was designed to support officers' response to complex intimate partner events. It emphasized trauma-informed practices, and victim-centered approaches, with the goal of reducing harm, improving safety, and strengthening partnerships with community support organizations.

In addition to equity-focused training, the section was responsible for delivering comprehensive Occupational Health and Safety (O.H.S.) training. This included instruction on workplace harassment, role-specific hazards, safety equipment, and the rights and responsibilities outlined in the *Occupational Health and Safety Act*. O.H.S. training was delivered to both new recruits and existing members, reinforcing the Service's commitment to a safe and respectful work environment.

The L.M.D. Section also oversaw the delivery of First Aid training in partnership with St. John Ambulance. In 2024, 2,109 members completed or renewed their certification, which included instruction on Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation (C.P.R.), Naloxone administration, automated external defibrillator (A.E.D.) use, and, new this year, tourniquet application. An additional 621 members received specialized training on Naloxone and alcohol withdrawal management, while nine members completed a Marine First Aid certification. To further expand access, a dedicated Tourniquet Training Program was launched, resulting in 1,772 members receiving training and personal-issue tourniquets.

Through its diverse and impactful programming, the L.M.D. Section continues to support the professional growth, wellness, and ethical conduct of T.P.S. members. By highlighting community feedback, promoting inclusive practices, and prioritizing member wellbeing, this section plays a critical role in advancing the T.P.S.'s commitment to excellence and public trust.

Part 2 – 2024 Post Course Effectiveness Study Overview

Evaluating how effectively training translates into real-world policing is a critical component of professional development and public accountability. The T.P.C. recognizes that the application of learning in the field is influenced by a wide range of operational, organizational, and individual factors. While training plays a vital role in enhancing frontline performance, directly linking training to specific outcomes in the field can be complex.

To ensure a rigorous and evidence-based approach to training evaluation, the T.P.C. continues to implement the Kirkpatrick Model¹ of evaluation—a globally recognized framework that assesses training effectiveness across four levels:

Level 1: Reaction

This level of evaluation, conducted during and immediately after the course, assesses participant satisfaction with various aspects of the training. These include course content, instructional methods, facilitator approach, physical facilities, and the use of audio-visual aids.

Level 2: Learning

This level evaluates whether a measurable change in knowledge, skills, or attitudes occurred during the training. Assessments are conducted at the beginning, throughout, and at the conclusion of the course to determine learning outcomes.

Level 3: Behaviour (Transfer of Learning)

This level assesses whether the knowledge, skills, or attitudes gained during training are applied in the workplace. Evaluation methods include post-course surveys distributed approximately six (6) months after course completion and follow-up interviews conducted by course coordinators.

Level 4: Results of Learning

This level focuses on broader organizational outcomes and is typically conducted six months to over a year post-training. It involves long-term, resource-intensive evaluations that measure systemic changes rather than individual performance.

¹ James D. Kirkpatrick and Wendy Kayser Kirkpatrick, *Kirkpatrick's Four Levels of Training Evaluation* (Alexandria, VA: Association for Talent Development, 2016).

Scope

The 2024 Transfer of Learning study, conducted by the T.P.C. examines the extent to which uniform members have applied the knowledge and skills learned during Days 1, 2, and 3 of the 2024 annual I.S.T. course, which is one of the T.P.S.'s most comprehensive and far-reaching training programs. The study focused on five key modules:

1. Mental Health Crisis Intervention
2. Indigenous Experience
3. Centering Black Experiences
4. Police Resiliency
5. Dynamic Simulation Training

To align with the Kirkpatrick Model's framework for Level 3 analysis, this study highlights behavioural change. For each module, specific behaviours were identified as indicators of successful transfer of learning. Participants were asked to assess their ability to apply these behaviours in the field, as well as to identify any barriers that may have impacted their ability to do so.

Methodology

Implemented in 2025, the study was developed to assess the application of key competencies taught during Day 1, 2, and 3 of the previous year's I.S.T. This allowed learners to complete the 2024 training course, return to the field to incorporate the training into their performance/behaviours, and complete the survey when they returned to complete I.S.T. in 2025. The study was circulated digitally via a QR code at the start of each session and was completed in-class using mobile devices.

The analysis reflects responses gathered from March 20, to June 2, 2025, covering 20 I.S.T. sessions. Out of the 1,220 total course attendees during this period, 1098 responses were received, representing a 90% response rate.

Survey questions were rated on a five-point Likert scale, where 1= Strongly Disagree, and 5= Strongly Agree. For clarity and ease of interpretation, "Strongly Agree" and "Agree" responses were grouped as overall agreement. "Strongly Disagree" and "Disagree" responses were grouped as overall disagreement. This approach is commonly used in survey research to simplify interpretation and identify general trends, especially when the focus is on patterns rather than intensity.² The neutral responses were reported separately to reflect uncertainty or limited opportunity to apply the learned content.

² DeVellis, R.F. (2017). *Scale development: Theory and application* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.

Interpreting Neutral Responses

Varying degrees of neutral responses, ranging from as low as 13.3% to as high as 31%, were observed across the modules in the 2024 I.S.T. evaluation. While neutral responses are sometimes interpreted as lack of engagement and decisiveness, research in training evaluation and survey methodology suggest that neutral responses can carry meaningful insight into the transfer of learning process.³

Behaviour change is not solely dependent on the quality of training delivery⁴. Rather, it is significantly influenced by post-training factors such as the opportunity to apply learning, organizational support, and alignment with operational duties. In the context of policing, where application depends on situational factors, it is reasonable that some officers would be uncertain or hesitant to report behavioural change, especially if the opportunity to do so has not yet occurred. This interpretation is supported by research showing that neutral selections on Likert scales are often chosen to reflect conditionality (“it depends”), uncertainty, or lack of opportunity, rather than a passive or disengaged response.⁵ Taken together, these findings indicate that neutral responses in the I.S.T. evaluation likely reflect the real-world complexities of transferring training into practice, especially in environments where officers may not yet have had the opportunity to engage with the content or are hesitant to overstate their behavioural change. However future evaluations should include follow-up questions to provide better insights into the barriers officers face when applying training in the field.

Summary of Finding

Across the five modules, members were asked to indicate their level of agreement with statements assessing their ability to apply key skills and behaviours introduced during the 2024 I.S.T. These included questions related to persons in crisis, demonstrating cultural awareness and humility, engaging respectfully with diverse communities, supporting personal and professional resilience and using structured de-escalation techniques in the field. The average scores ranged from 3.87 to 4.04 out of 5, with overall agreement response scores remaining relatively strong across all content areas.

³ DeVellis, R.F. (2017). *Scale development: Theory and application* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.

⁴ Kirkpatrick, J. D., & Kirkpatrick, W. K. (2012). *Kirkpatrick's four levels of training evaluation*. Association for Talent Development.

⁵ Kulas, J. T., & Stachowski, A. A. (2009). Middle category endorsement in odd-numbered Likert response scales: Associated item characteristics, cognitive demands, and preferred meanings. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 43(3), 489–493. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2008.12.005>

Mental Health Crisis Intervention

The Mental Health Crisis Intervention (M.H.C.I.) module is designed to support officers in responding to Persons in Crisis (P.I.C.), with an emphasis on de-escalation through structured communication skills. The overall module score was **4.04 out of 5**, based on all survey questions combined for this module. Responses included 81.6% agreement, 17.2% neutral, and 1.3% disagreement. Officers reported high agreement on questions related to empathy (84.5%), rapport-building (85.8%), and the application of active listening techniques (79.9%).

Indigenous Experience

The Indigenous Experience (I.E.) module builds officers' understanding of Indigenous histories, intergenerational trauma, and cultural approaches to justice. The overall score for this module was **3.90 out of 5**. Responses were 74.4% in agreement, 23.3% neutral, and 2.3% in disagreement. While strong agreement was reported for recognizing intergenerational trauma (75.6%) and historical injustices (77.7%), questions related to cultural humility and promoting resilience received higher neutral responses (up to 27.5%).

Centering Black Experiences

Centering Black Experiences (C.B.E.) explores anti-Black racism and its systemic impacts, encouraging culturally competent, trauma-informed engagement with Black communities. The average score for this module was **3.92 out of 5**, with 76.2% agreement, 21.5% neutral, and 2.3% disagreement. Highest agreement was reported on questions related to respectful engagement (81.8%) and cultural sensitivity (80.5%), while questions related to de-escalation and historical understanding drew higher neutral responses.

4 R's of Trauma-Informed Practice

The 4 R's, **Realize, Recognize, Respond**, and **Avoid Re-traumatization** is a trauma-informed framework embedded across all I.S.T. modules rather than delivered as a standalone session. This module is designed to support officers to recognize the effects of trauma on behaviour and how to apply trauma-informed principles in their day-to-day interactions. The overall score was **4.03 out of 5**. Officers reported high agreement with statements recognizing how trauma may influence behaviour (85.8%) and identifying when interactions may unintentionally trigger past trauma (85.8%).

Police Resiliency

This module promotes wellness strategies for sustainable personal and professional growth, addressing stress management, mindset, and support systems. The average score was **3.87 out of 5**, with 73.5% agreement, 23.1% neutral, and 3.3% disagreement. Officers reported strong agreement on building supportive relationships (80.2%) and understanding growth mindset (78.3%). Engagement with wellness resources showed the lowest agreement across all modules (58.4%) and the highest neutral (31.0%) and disagreement (10.6%) rates.

Dynamic Simulation Training

Dynamic Simulation Training (D.S.T.) is a judgment-based training scenario designed to reinforce key behaviours such as de-escalation, communication, and trauma-informed responses. Through simulated scenarios officers apply learned strategies in high-pressure situations. The average score for this module was **3.93 out of 5**, with 77.9% agreement, 20.8% neutral, and 1.3% disagreement. Agreement was consistent across all measured behaviours, including use of validation statements (78.3%), “if–then” techniques (77.8% and 78.5%, respectively), and policy-based explanations (78.5%). Disagreement remained below 2% across all questions.

Conclusion

The 2024 Transfer of Learning study includes responses from 1,098 members across 20 I.S.T. sessions held between March 20th and June 2nd, 2025. With a 90% response rate, the results offer an overview of how members are applying content delivered during the 2024 I.S.T. course. The average scores across the five modules ranged from 3.87 to 4.04 out of 5. Mental Health Crisis Intervention had the highest overall score (4.04), while Police Resiliency had the lowest (3.87). Agreement levels stayed high across all modules, and generally ranged between 76% and 82%, with disagreement remaining low across all modules.

Neutral responses were more common in questions where members indicated limited opportunity to apply the content, particularly in the I.E. and C.B.E. modules.

The 2024 I.S.T. course study provides an overview of how participants are currently applying training in the field, while contributing to ongoing efforts to track, evaluate, and support the application and retention of content over time.

Appendix A: Detailed Findings 2024 Post Course Effectiveness Study


Findings by Selected Module

Mental Health Crisis Intervention

The M.H.C.I. module showed the highest overall application across the training program (with an average score of 4.04 out of 5), reflecting high levels of confidence and application in areas related to understanding and responding to Persons in Crisis (P.I.C.s.). Overall, 81.6% of respondents agreed, 17.2% were neutral and only 1.3% disagreed.


When asked whether they understand the connection between substance use and mental health, 82.4% of respondents agreed, 15.9% were neutral, and 1.7% disagreed. This includes recognizing how substance use may be used as a coping mechanism for individuals experiencing trauma or depression, and how this can influence behaviour during crisis calls.

Question 1 (MHCI L2): After completing MHCI training, I understand the connection between substance use and mental health, including how a Person in Crisis (PIC) may use substances to cope with conditions such as trauma or depression, and how this can impact their behaviour and crisis response.



Confidence in applying this knowledge slightly dropped when the question focused on opioid-related crises. 78.6% of respondents indicated feeling more confident identifying symptoms and responding appropriately, while 19.7% were neutral, and 1.7% disagreed.

Question 2 (MHCI L2): After MHCI training, I feel more confident in responding appropriately to a Person in Crisis (PIC) experiencing an opioid-related crisis, including recognizing symptoms.



The **Behavioural Influence Stairway Model** is a communication model that is designed to guide officers through structured engagement with Persons in Crisis (P.I.C.). It emphasizes the progressive development of Active listening, Empathy, Rapport, and Influence, and has been included and reinforced during I.S.T. curriculum for a number of years

In this section officers were asked four follow-up questions focused on the extent to which members are using *Active Listening*, *Empathy*, *Rapport-Building*, and *Influence* techniques when engaging with P.I.C.


Introduction: When asked whether they feel more confident using active listening techniques such as open-ended questions, paraphrasing, and emotional labeling, to support de-escalation, 79.9% agreed, 18.8% were neutral, and 1.3% disagreed.

Empathy: In response to whether they actively apply empathy through tone-matching and non-confrontational communication styles, 84.5% agreed, 14.7% were neutral, and 0.8% disagreed.

Rapport: When asked if they recognize the role of continued active listening and empathy in building rapport, 85.7% agreed or strongly agreed, 13.7% were neutral, and 0.6% disagreed.

Influence: Regarding whether they feel more confident in guiding a person toward cooperation by offering realistic solutions and alternatives, 82.0% agreed, 17.3% were neutral, and 0.8% disagreed.

Agreement across all four components ranged from 79.9% to 85.8%, while disagreement remained below 1.3% throughout.




Indigenous Experience

The I.E. module received an average score of 3.9 out of 5. 78.1% of responses were in the positive range, while 20.1% were neutral, and 1.9 % negative.


When asked about intergenerational trauma, 75.6% of respondents agreed they now recognize the impact of intergenerational trauma and adverse childhood experiences (A.C.E.s.) on Indigenous communities. A further 21.6% were neutral while a small proportion (2.8%) disagreed.

Question 8 (IE L2): After completing the Indigenous Experience training, I recognize that intergenerational trauma and adverse childhood experiences (ACEs) impact Indigenous communities.




Responses to the question around historical injustices resulted in a slightly higher agreement rate, with 77.7% of respondents acknowledging the connection between those injustices and current tensions between Indigenous communities and police. The number of neutral responses dropped to 19.7%, while disagreement remained low at 2.6%. These two questions, focusing on historical context and trauma, received the highest levels of agreement within the module.

Question 9 (IE L2): I recognize how historical injustices have contributed to a strained relationship between Indigenous communities and the police.



When asked whether they actively apply cultural humility by recognizing personal bias and maintaining respectful relationships in their interactions with Indigenous communities, 72.4% agreed. The neutral responses increased to 24.6%, with 3.0% respondents in disagreement.


Question 10 (IE L3): Since the training, I actively apply cultural humility-recognizing my own personal bias, and maintain respectful relationships with my interactions with indigenous communities.



Respondents who disagreed were directed to a follow-up question to explore potential barriers. Respondents most commonly indicated that they had not yet had the opportunity to apply cultural humility during an interaction with a person identified as Indigenous, that other priorities took precedence, or that they were uncertain about how the concept would work in practice. Others indicated they were already applying cultural humility prior to training or that it was not applicable to their current role.


The following question focused on identifying protective factors that support resiliency, such as strong social support systems and healthy coping strategies, 78.3% of respondents indicated agreement. Neutral responses represented 20.9%, while disagreement was minimal at 0.9%.

Question 13 (IE L3): I can identify protective factors that contribute to increased resiliency, such as strong social support, healthy coping strategies and apply them to my role as an officer.



The final question asked whether members had actively promoted resilience in their engagements with Indigenous communities, for example through community involvement or role modeling. In response, 70.3% of participants agreed, while 27.5% were neutral, and 2.3% disagreed.

Question 14 (IE L3): Since the training, I have successfully promoted resilience by identifying protective factors like community engagement, and positive role modeling to my policing engagements with Indigenous Communities.




Centering Black Experiences

The C.B.E. module received an average score of 3.92 out of 5. Overall, 76.3% of responses across the section agreed, 21.5% were neutral, and 2.3% disagreed.


When asked whether they had a clearer understanding of the historical experiences of Black Canadians and how these experiences relate to the challenges faced by communities today, 73.5% of respondents agreed, 23.8% responded neutrally, and 2.8% disagreed. Responses to this question showed one of the highest levels of neutral selection within the module.

Question 15 (CBE L2): I have a clearer understanding of the historical experiences of Black Canadians and how it impacts the challenges faced by communities today.



The following question focused on the application of de-escalation techniques introduced in training, specifically in interactions involving Black individuals or communities. A total of 71.3% of respondents indicated agreement, 25.5% responded neutrally, and 3.1% disagreed. Notably, the neutral response rate was among the highest across all modules.


Question 16 (CBE L3): I have successfully applied de-escalation techniques learned in the training to reduce tensions in challenging situations, especially when interacting with Black individuals or communities.



Respondents were also asked whether the training helped them recognize how the historical treatment of Black Canadians continues to shape current social attitudes and community interactions. Agreement responses totaled 73.4%, while 23.4% were neutral,


and 3.2% indicated disagreement. These results closely mirror **Question 15** (above) which also addresses the historical experience of Black Canadians.

Question 17 (CBE L2): The training has helped me recognize how the historical treatment of Black Canadians continues to shape societal attitudes and approaches to community interactions today




In response to the question regarding cultural and religious sensitivity, 80.5% of members indicated agreement, while 18.0% were neutral. A combined 1.4% selected disagreement responses. This question received one of the highest agreement rates with a lower proportion of neutral and disagreement responses compared to questions addressing historical knowledge.

Question 18 (CBE L2): I approach cultural and religious practices with sensitivity and respect, ensuring that I am mindful of diverse customs and traditions when interacting with Black Canadian communities.




When asked whether they engage respectfully and in a culturally sensitive manner with individuals from diverse backgrounds, including Black Canadians, 81.8% agreed, neutral responses made up 16.9%, and disagreement responses totaled 1.2%. This question had the highest level of agreement in the section.

Question 19 (CBE L3): I actively engage with individuals from diverse backgrounds, including Black Canadians, in a respectful and culturally sensitive manner.



The final question in this module asked respondents whether they were more aware of the stigma and challenges faced by Black Canadians and whether they actively work to challenge those perceptions in their role. In total, 76.8% of members agreed, while 21.1% were neutral, and 2.1% disagreed.

Question 20 (CBE L2): I am more aware of the stigma and challenges Black Canadians face in society and make an effort to challenge these perceptions in my work.




Trauma-Informed Practice - 4 R's

Trauma-Informed Practice is not a standalone module within I.S.T., but rather a key concept introduced and reinforced across the program over the past two years as a guiding framework for police engagement and interactions. The average application score across responses was 4.03 out 5.

When asked whether they had successfully applied the 4 Rs, *Realize*, *Recognize*, *Respond*, and *Avoid Re-traumatization*, in their policing approach, 76.8% of the respondents agreed, 21.4% were Neutral, while only 1.7% disagreed. Among those who disagreed and indicated a lower level of application, the most cited barrier was lack of opportunity to use the techniques (38.9%) followed by difficulty in recalling the content (27.8%). Additional reasons include competing priorities (11.1%), and uncertainty about effectiveness (16.7%).

*Please note that for the above question, the total will not add up to 100% since respondents were able to select more than one option.

Question 21 (4Rs L3): Since the training, I have successfully applied the 4 R's of Trauma-Informed Practice (Realize, Recognize, Respond, Avoid Re-Traumatization) to my policing approach.




The following questions explored the extent to which participants reported application and understanding of the individual components of the 4 R's of trauma-informed practice:

Realize: When asked whether they understand how trauma impacts an individual's behaviour, emotions, and responses, 85.8% agreed, 13.3% were neutral, and 0.9% disagreed.

Recognize: In response to whether they recognize that certain interactions unintentionally trigger past trauma, 85.9% agreed, 13.3% were neutral, and 0.9% disagreed.

Respond: When asked if they appropriately adjust their communication and actions to support individuals who may have experienced trauma, 85.2% agreed, 14.1% were neutral, and 0.7% disagreed.

Avoid Re-traumatization: Regarding whether they take steps to ensure their actions and language do not inadvertently re-traumatize others, 84.8% agreed, 14.6% were neutral, and 0.8% disagreed.




Police Resiliency

The Police Resiliency module focused on emotional regulation, wellness strategies, and adaptive coping practices designed to support long-term resilience in policing. The Police Resiliency module received an overall average score of 3.87 out of 5. A total of 79.8% of responses agreed, 20.1% were neutral, and 1.1% disagreed.


When asked whether they developed or improved a habitual exercise routine following the training, 75.4% of respondents agreed. 21.3% were neutral, while 3.2% disagreed. This question resulted in the highest rate of disagreement within the section. Respondents who disagreed were directed to a follow-up question exploring potential barriers. The most selected reason was having other, higher priorities, followed by “other” which included open-ended responses such as already having an established routine prior to training, or attributing their fitness habits to personal motivation or non-work-related influences. Some respondents noted “no time” while others cited personal disinterest. Additional responses included lack of opportunity, uncertainty about the effectiveness of the training, lack of resources and limited knowledge and skills.

Question 27 (4Rs L3): After Police Resiliency training, I developed/improved a habit of exercise routine to reinforce a healthy and active lifestyle.




Responses to the next two questions (29-30) focused on mindset and emotional regulation, resulting in 78.3% of respondents agreeing that the training helped them understand the difference between fixed and growth mindsets and how embracing challenges could improve personal resilience. Neutral responses accounted for 20.8%, while only 1.0% disagreed. Similarly, when asked whether they actively engage in strategies to foster positive emotions and build resilience, 77.4% agreed 21.9% were neutral and 0.8% disagree.

Question 29 (PR L2): The Police Resiliency training helped me understand fixed and growth mindsets and how embracing challenges, can improve my resilience.




Question 30 (PR L3): After attending the Police Resiliency training, I actively engage in strategies to foster positive emotions and resilience in my role.




Question 31 asked whether respondents had, within the last six months, explored the wellness resources introduced in the training. This had the lowest agreement rate in the section, with only 58.4% of respondents agreeing. A significant portion, 31.0%, were neutral, while 10.6% disagreed. This was the highest neutral and negative response rate within the module.

Question 31 (PR L3): In the last 6 months, I have looked into the wellness resources shared in the training to build resilience and prevent burnout.



The final question in this section asked whether they feel confident in building strong, supportive relationships to maintain emotional resilience and navigate the challenges of policing, 80.2% of respondents indicated agreement. Neutral responses made up 18.8%, and 1.0% selected disagreement.

Question 32 (PR L2): I feel confident in building strong, supportive relationships to maintain emotional resilience and navigate the challenges of policing.




Dynamic Simulation Training

The D.S.T. module is a scenario-based module that reinforced key communication and decision-making skills through judgment simulations. One of the structured communication approaches embedded in this module is the Issuing, Referring, Proposing and Describing (I.R.P.D.) model (definition mentioned below) which provides officers with a step-by-step formula for engaging P.I.C. This approach involves:

1. **Issuing** a validation statement
2. **Referring** to the relevant law or policy
3. **Proposing** a choice
4. **Describing** the desirable outcome

The I.R.P.D. model, received an overall average score of 3.93. A total of 77.9% of respondents agreed, 20.8% were neutral, and 1.3% disagreed. Respondents were asked whether the I.R.P.D. model introduced during Day 2/3 of training helped them feel more confident when engaging a person in crisis. A total of 76.3% of the respondents agreed, 22.2% were neutral, and 1.6% disagreed.


Question 33 (DST L2): During Day 2/3 of IST training the I.R.P.D. model (a structured approach to verbal de-escalation) was introduced, and this helped me feel more confident when engaging with a Person in Crisis (PIC).



Respondents who disagreed with the I.R.P.D. model providing them more confidence were directed to a follow-up question asking why they had not applied it in practice. The most frequently selected reason was a lack of opportunity, or that officers did not remember what they had learned. Other responses included having higher priorities, or that they did not have a clear picture of what was expected, and that they did not think what they learned would work.


Following this question, respondents were asked whether D.S.T. increased their confidence in issuing “validation statements” (these statements were introduced in the I.R.P.D. curriculum as a communication strategy when engaged with a person in crisis), such as “I think I would feel the same given the circumstances”. A total of 78.6% agreed, 20.7% were neutral, and 1.1% disagreed. When asked whether D.S.T. increased their confidence in using policies, laws, and standards to explain decisions when de-escalating a P.I.C., a total of 78.5% of respondents agreed with the statement, 20.0% were neutral, and 1.5% disagreed.

Question 35 (DST L2): Since completing the training, I feel more confident in Issuing validation statements, such as "I think I would feel the same given the circumstances"




Similarly, when asked whether they actively propose "if" statements (also introduced in the I.R.P.D. curriculum) to help guide individuals towards cooperation, 78% agreed, 20.8% were neutral, and 1.4% disagreed.

Question 37 (DST L3): I actively propose "if" statements to help guide individuals toward cooperation (e.g., "IF you come outside with me, then we can discuss how to resolve this situation in a way that works for both of us")



When asked whether they use "then" statements to highlight a desirable and achievable outcome, 78.6% of respondents agreed. Neutral responses accounted for 20.6%, while 0.9% disagreed.

Question 38 (DST L3): I use "then" statements to highlight a desirable and achievable outcome, reinforcing why cooperation benefits the individual in crisis.



Appendix B: Summary list of all courses and training completed by all Toronto Police Service members in 2024

Category type	Definition
Section/Unit	This refers to the section or unit that delivers training.
Course	This is an identification code that is unique from other courses and is re-used from session to session.
Title	The title provides readers with a brief description of the material covered in each course.
Sessions	This represents the number of times the course was delivered. <i>*Note - courses delivered by e-learning format are not catalogued by session as they are asynchronous.</i>
No. of participants	This represents the number of service members who completed courses and trainings.

Appendix B.1: 2024 Courses Delivered by the Toronto Police College.

Section	Course	Title	Sessions	No. of Participants
Administration	S00237	Human Resource Management System (H.R.M.S) for Training Instructors	5	19
Administration	110041	O.H.S. Awareness	14	502
Administration	110044	Resolving Conflict	2	28
Administration	TM0113	Health & Safety for Supervisors	1	2
Administration	TO0001	Joint Health and Safety Certification (J.H.S.C.)Part 1	2	22
Administration	TO0002	Emergency Services Sector Police Specific Hazards (E.S.S.)	2	22
Administration	TR0001	First Aid Automated External Defibrillator (A.E.D.) and Cardio Pulmonary Resuscitation (C.P.R.) Level C	126	1922
Administration	TR0004	First Aid Renewal	19	249
Administration	TR0009	Police Range Safety First Aid	2	18
Administration	100041	Naloxone Alcohol Withdrawal Syndrome (A.W.S.) Presentation	23	636
Administration	100042	Joint Health and Safety Certification (J.H.S.C.) Refresher	2	16
Administration	TR0010	First Aid for Tourniquets	6	136
Administration	TR0033	YIPI First Aid & C.P.R. (Level C)/A.E.D.	12	195
Administration	TR0034	Tourniquet Training Program	96	1818
Administration	TM0122	O.H.S. for Workers	1	2
Sub - Total			313	5,587
Armament	TF0010	Glock 27 Compact	5	79
Armament	TF0028	C8 Carbine Requalification	63	885
Armament	TF0035	C8 Carbine Rifle User	17	242
Armament	TF0039	Taser 7 Conducted Energy Weapon	69	860
Armament	110025	Taser 7 Instructor	1	12
Armament	TU0062	Shotgun Requalification	1	9
Armament	100069	CZ Scorpion EVO Requalification	1	3
Armament	TF0004	MP5 Recertification	1	3

Section	Course	Title	Sessions	No. of Participants
Sub - Total			158	2,093
Community Policing	100039	Direct Entry Versadex Intro	1	5
Community Policing	TH0036	Crime Prevention Including Environmental Design	3	61
Community Policing	TM0026	Pre-Aylmer Recruit Training	4	366
Community Policing	TM0027	Uniform Coach Officer	6	172
Community Policing	TM0107	Post-Aylmer Recruit Training	4	383
Community Policing	TR0026	Lateral Entry PC	2	23
Sub - Total			20	1,010
Investigative	100031	Provincial Statutes Seminar	5	95
Investigative	100032	Traffic Generalist Seminar	5	95
Investigative	TC0013	General Investigators Blended/Criminal Investigators	10	190
Investigative	TC0042	Domestic Violence Investigator	4	83
Investigative	TC0052	Death Investigators	3	63
Investigative	TC0091	Search Warrant Drafting	6	83
Investigative	TC0092	Sexual Assault Investigators	4	71
Investigative	TC0027	Sexual Assault Investigators Update	1	22
Investigative	TC0108	Police Services Act Course	1	25
Investigative	TC0110	Investigative Interviewing Part 1	5	75
Investigative	TC0111	Impaired Driving Investigation	7	151
Investigative	TC0124	Plain Clothes Investigate/Source Handler	4	97
Investigative	TC0125	Human Trafficking Investigations	2	38
Investigative	TC0127	High Risk Vehicle Takedown	6	93
Investigative	TC0116	Investigative Interviewing Part 2	1	12
Investigative	110037	Vulnerable Seniors Symposium	1	70
Investigative	TC0130	Ontario Major Case Management and Power Case Command (O.M.C.M. & P.C.C.)	6	113
Investigative	TC0043	Financial Crimes	1	38
Sub - Total			72	1,414

Section	Course	Title	Sessions	No. of Participants
Incident Response Team	100086	Reintegration Course	2	19
Incident Response Team	TU0061	Reset Use of Force	19	693
Incident Response Team	TU0070	Senior Officer Use of Force	33	81
Incident Response Team	TU0090	Senior Officer Use of Force Reset	8	11
Incident Response Team	TO0071	Auxiliary Use of Force Requalification	11	114
Incident Response Team	TU0088	In Service Training Program Includes X2 TF0037 & G27 TF0038	91	4216
Incident Response Team	100045	Body Worn Camera	37	516
Incident Response Team	TF0002	Less Lethal Shotgun New User	36	375
Incident Response Team	TU0084	Less Lethal Shotgun Requalification	54	736
Incident Response Team	TU0080	Patch Use of Force 90 Day Recertification	36	535
Sub - Total			327	7,296
Technology Integration	100093	Evidence.com (E.D.C.) Disclosure Training	7	182
Technology Integration	110013	E.D.C. for D.S.C. Training	3	20
Technology Integration	110039	A.I. & Deepfake Symposium	1	108
Technology Integration	110042	Tech Ambassador	4	44
Sub - Total			15	354
Learning Developments & Standards	TM0032	Effective Presentation	4	39
Learning Developments & Standards	TP0004	S/Sgt Promotional Onboarding	1	41
Learning Developments & Standards	TP0054	Sgt Promotional Onboarding	2	79
Learning Developments & Standards	LDS008	Effective Teaching Adult Learners	7	54

Section	Course	Title	Sessions	No. of Participants
Learning Developments & Standards	TH0031	Ethics and Inclusivity	3	30
Sub - Total			17	243
Police Vehicle Operations	TV0001	Civilian Driving	28	161
Police Vehicle Operations	TV0003	Police Officers Vehicle Operations	3	6
Police Vehicle Operations	TV0019	Truck (Wagon) Operator	47	51
Police Vehicle Operations	TV0020	Command Post Course	1	1
Police Vehicle Operations	TV0023	Bicycle Patrol Officer	77	188
Police Vehicle Operations	TV0025	All Terrain Vehicle Course	6	36
Police Vehicle Operations	TV0028	Bicycle Instructor	1	6
Police Vehicle Operations	TV0040	Driver Assessment	1	1
Police Vehicle Operations	TV0041	Truck Operator Train Trainer	3	8
Police Vehicle Operations	TV0042	Safe Skills Emergency Driving	32	122
Police Vehicle Operations	TV0057	Advanced Bicycle Patrol	2	8
Police Vehicle Operations	TV0061	Side by Side All-Terrain Vehicle	5	9
Police Vehicle Operations	TV0064	Bicycle Patrol Recertification	67	200
Police Vehicle Operations	TV0065	Vehicle Dynamics Course	2	7
Police Vehicle Operations	TV0068	Trailer	1	1
Police Vehicle Operations	TV0072	Post OPC Recruit Vehicle OPS	30	436
Police Vehicle Operations	TV0074	DSC Patrol	4	60
Sub - Total			310	1,301
Grand Total			1432	18,944

This table is a listing of e-learning modules completed by Toronto Police Service members on the Canadian Police Knowledge Network (C.P.K.N.)

Section	Course	Title
Canadian Police Knowledge Network		Child Abduction - America's Missing: Broadcast Emergency Response (AMBER) Alert
Canadian Police Knowledge Network		Court Testimony
Canadian Police Knowledge Network		Fentanyl Production & /Trafficking
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9013	OPVTA 078 Edged Weapons
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9014	OPVTA 079 Live Wires
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9015	OPVTA 082 Meth Labs
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9016	OPVTA 083 First Officer at the Scene
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9017	OPVTA 087 Armed & Dangerous (Characteristics of an Armed Person)
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9019	OPVTA 090 Suicide Intervention
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9020	OPVTA 091 Death Notification
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9021	OPVTA 095 Foot Pursuit
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9022	OPVTA 096 Stolen Innocence: A Police Guide to Online Child Exploitation
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9024	OPVTA 097 Seized Firearm Safety
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9025	OPVTA 098 Taking a Statement
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9027	OPVTA 104 Domestic Violence
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9028	OPVTA 105 Terrorism: The Threat Within
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9029	OPVTA 106 Invisible Threat: Communicable Diseases
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9030	OPVTA 107 Motorcycle Enforcement
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9031	OPVTA 109 Spontaneous Disorder
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9032	OPVTA 110 Prescription Drug Enforcement for Patrol Officers
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9033	OPVTA 112/113 Faith Diversity
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9034	OPVTA 115 Sex Offenders
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9035	OPVTA 116 Building Searches
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9036	OPVTA 117 Psychosis
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9037	OPVTA 118 Foundations of Warrantless Search

Section	Course	Title
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9038	OPVTA 119 Liquor License Act
Canadian Police Knowledge Network		Intro to Criminal Intelligence Analysis
Canadian Police Knowledge Network		Intro to Evidence-Based Policing
Canadian Police Knowledge Network		MedicAlert Police Awareness
Canadian Police Knowledge Network		Police Investigative Process into Currency Counterfeit
Canadian Police Knowledge Network		Police Response to Hate Crimes
Canadian Police Knowledge Network		Public Alert Awareness
Canadian Police Knowledge Network		Scenario Based Mental Health De-escalation Training
Canadian Police Knowledge Network		Sexual Offence Investigations
Canadian Police Knowledge Network		Training on Hate Crimes and Incidents for Frontline Officers in Canada
Canadian Police Knowledge Network		Understanding Community Safety and Well-Being
Canadian Police Knowledge Network		Criminology
Canadian Police Knowledge Network		OPVTA 185 De-Escalation
Canadian Police Knowledge Network		Finding Your Way® Dementia Response Training
Canadian Police Knowledge Network		Indigenous Awareness & Cultural Awareness
Canadian Police Knowledge Network		OPVTA 184 Mental Health Apprehensions
Canadian Police Knowledge Network		Occupational Health & Safety for Supervisor
Canadian Police Knowledge Network		Ontario Sex Offender Registry
Canadian Police Knowledge Network		OPVTA 190 Pursuit Prevention & Termination Tactics
Canadian Police Knowledge Network		OPVTA 164 Railway Investigations
Canadian Police Knowledge Network		OPVTA 182 Resilience
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	CP3801	Using Trauma Informed Approach
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9052	OPVTA 135 Impaired Driving
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9053	OPVTA 136 Cover & Concealment
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9040	OPVTA 121 Training to Succeed: Surviving Lethal Encounters
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9041	OPVTA 122 Head to Toe: Search of Persons
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9042	OPVTA 123 Firearm Seizures
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9043	OPVTA 124 From Call to Court

Section	Course	Title
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9044	OPVTA 125 The Balanced Life: Emotional Survival for Police Officers
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9045	OPVTA 126 Obstruct Police?
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9046	OPVTA 127 CEW Tactics
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9047	OPVTA 128 Trauma Doesn't Bleed
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9048	OPVTA 129 Suspect Apprehension Pursuits
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9049	OPVTA 130 Social Media for Policing
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9050	OPVTA 131 Entry Warrants
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9051	OPVTA 132 Sexual Assault
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9054	bOPVTA 140 Freeman on the Land
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9055	OPVTA 137 Investigative Detention: Traffic Stop Articulation
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9056	OPVTA 138 Every Step Counts
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9057	OPVTA 088 The Driving Zone
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9059	OPVTA 100 Plastic Attack: The World of Debit and Credit Card Fraud
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9066	OPVTA 108 Investigative Detention: Watcher in the Woods
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9067	OPVTA 141 Reliability & Credibility on the Stand
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9068	OPVTA 142 Federal Parolees: Staying a Step Ahead
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9069	OPVTA 94 Vehicle Search Authorities & Articulation
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	CP8125	Supervisor Health and Safety - in 5 Steps
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	CP8137	Suspect Apprehension Pursuit Basic Refresh
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	CP8157	Risk Effective Decision Making
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	CP8163	Courtroom Testimony Skills
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	CP8180	Basic Online Investigations
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	CP8182	Autism Spectrum Disorder
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	CP8183	Cybercrime Investigations L1
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	CP8190	Crisis Intervention & De-escalation

Section	Course	Title
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	CP8191	Epilepsy & Seizure Response Training for Police Officers
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	CP8300	The Authentic Leader
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	CP8307	Anti-Racism & Unconscious Bias for Workplaces
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	CP8308	Managing Unconscious Bias
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9000	OPVTA 024 Life in the Fast Lane
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9001	OPVTA 030 Blue Canaries
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9002	OPVTA 036 Seven Sins of Testifying
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9003	OPVTA 037 Crack
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9006	OPVTA 055 Guaranteed Safe Arrival
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9008	OPVTA 063 Active Killers
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9010	OPVTA 068 Grow House Menace
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9011	OPVTA 069 Video: Best Witness
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9012	OPVTA 070 Conditional Sentences
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP3060	Introduction to Human Trafficking
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP3062	Information Security Learning Series
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9071	OPVTA 144 Confidential Informant
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9072	OPVTA 147 Ebola 2014: Lessons Learned
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9073	OPVTA 146 Aftermath
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9074	OPVTA 145 - Metal Thefts Affect Me
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9075	OPVTA 133 Human Trafficking
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9076	OPVTA 148 Investigative Detention: Articulation
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9078	OPVTA 150 Justice Panel
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9079	OPVTA 153 - Chemical Suicide
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9080	OPVTA 152 – Fentanyl: Killing More Than Pain
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9083	OPVTA 155 X2 C.E.W.
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	OP9129	OPVTA 192 Hybrid & Electric Vehicle Safety for Police
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP0001	Foundations of Islam & Islamophobia
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP0002	Police & Community Interactions

Section	Course	Title
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP0003	Body Worn Camera and Statement Taking Training
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP0011	Foundations of Judaism and Understanding Antisemitism
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP0012	Missing Persons Risk Assessment
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP0013	Vehicle Pursuit Training 2024
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP0014	A.L.P.R. (Automated Licence Plate Recognition) Training
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP0054	Race Based Data Collection
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP0056	Search of Persons 2020
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP3005	Drinking and Driving
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP3016	Items of Religious Significance: Sikh Religion
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP3020	A.O.D.A. - Working Together
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP3021	Items of Religious Significance: Hindu Religion
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP3025	Items of Religious Significance: Religion of Islam
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP3026	Worker Health and Safety - 4 Steps
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP3030	Police & Community Interaction
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP3032	A.O.D.A. Module 3 – Part 1
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP3033	A.O.D.A. Module 3 – Part 2
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP3034	A.O.D.A. Module 3 – Part 3
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP3035	A.O.D.A. Module 3 – Part 4
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP3037	I.M.S. (Incident Management System)- 100 - Final Assessment
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP3042	Internet Facilitated Investigations – Level 1
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP3050	Spit Shield Training
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP3051	Intro to the Federal and Ontario Cannabis Legislation
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP3052	Versadex Supervisor Review of General Occurances
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP3053	Body Worn Camera e-Learning
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP3055	Promoting Healthy & Safe Workplace
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP3056	Coroner's Verdict Recommendations - Chapman
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP3061	Paid Duty Management System TTA
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP3062	Info Security Learning Series
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP3063	Let's Talk: How Anti-Black Racism Impacts Impartial Policing

Section	Course	Title
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP3064	Search of Persons Update - Procedures and Templates
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP3065	Hand Held Metal Detector Training
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP3066	Intro to the Indigenous Experience
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP3067	Show Cause & Synopses Drafting
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP3068	Missing Persons Act Training Video
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP3069	Gender Diversity and Trans Inclusion - Non-Uniform Civilian Members Part 1
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP3070	Gender Diversity and Trans InclusionPart 1 – All Uniform Members – Sworn and Civilian
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP3071	Military Veterans Wellness Program
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP3073	Gender Diversity and Trans Inclusion Part 2 – All Uniform Members – Sworn and Civilian
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP3075	Paid Duty – Maple Leaf Sports & Entertainment Venue Training
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP3076	Paid Duty - Mobile Paid Duty Escort Training
Canadian Police Knowledge Network	TP3077	Remotely Piloted Aircraft Systems Visual Lite-of-Sight Regulations & Enforcement
CPKN - Total		41,565

**Appendix B.2: 2023 Courses Delivered by Toronto Police Service Units (T.P.S.), or
to T.P.S. members by O.P.C./C.P.C./C.I.S.O.**

Unit	Course	Title	Sessions	No. of Participants
Communications	TO0044	Communication Operators Coach & Mentoring Course	2	43
Communications	TS0002	Police Communication/ Call Taker Course	2	59
Communications	TS0006	Police Communication/ Dispatcher Course	2	28
Sub - Total			6	130
Community Partnerships & Engagement Unit	100043	Violence Threat Risk Assessment Level 1	3	80
Community Partnerships & Engagement Unit	100082	Divisional Crisis Support Officer (D.C.S.O.)	11	254
Community Partnerships & Engagement Unit	TM0114	Neighbourhood Officer Course (N.C.O.)	2	54
Community Partnerships & Engagement Unit	TO0080	Mobile Crisis Intervention Team (M.C.I.T.)	1	45
Community Partnerships & Engagement Unit	TO6001	Auxiliary Recruit Training	2	47
Sub - Total			19	480
Courts	100011	Deoxyribonucleic Acid (D.N.A.) Biological Biometrics	2	15
Courts	100014	Prisoner Transport Section Wagon Video	2	55

Unit	Course	Title	Sessions	No. of Participants
Courts	TU0087	Court Officer Use of Force	40	750
Courts	100097	Special Constable Recruit Program	3	85
Courts	110008	Security Control Rooms: O.C.J.T.	11	11
Courts	110018	Parking Enforcement Officer (P.E.O.) Training Program	14	265
Courts	110043	Prisoner Transportation Operations	33	106
Courts	T00003	Courts X-Ray Safety Awareness	3	57
Courts	TM0028	Civilian Coach Officer	1	38
Courts	TU0076	Booking Hall Safety Versadex	5	89
Sub - Total			114	1, 471
Corporate Communications	S00215	Social media in Communications	3	57
Sub - Total			3	57
Accounting	S00162	Systems Applications & Product	5	32
Sub - Total			5	32
Parking Enforcement	PEO001	Parking Enforcement Officer Recruit Training	2	59
Sub - Total			2	59
TPOC	LMD001	Duty Senior Officer Orientation	2	19
Sub - Total			2	19
Analytics & Innovation	110028	Analytics & Innovation Training	5	66
Sub - Total			5	66
Strategy Management	110029	Coaching for Performance Improvements	5	78

Unit	Course	Title	Sessions	No. of Participants
Strategy Management	110030	Effective Business Writing	4	65
Strategy Management	110031	Critical Thinking	2	39
Strategy Management	110033	Interview Skills for Candidate	6	99
Sub - Total			17	281
Equity Inclusions & Human Rights	100033	Special Constable E.I.H.R.	27	627
Sub – Total			27	627
Emergency Task Force	100035	Advanced Tactical Rope Access	1	9
Emergency Task Force	100036	Tactical Rope Access Instructor	2	14
Emergency Task Force	TO1001	Basic Tactical Orientation Emergency Task Force (E.T.F.)	1	13
Emergency Task Force	TO1004	Hostage Rescue Emergency Task Force (E.T.F.)	1	12
Emergency Task Force	TO1007	Basic Sniper/Observer Course Emergency Task Force (E.T.F.)	1	6
Emergency Task Force	TO1010	Advanced Sniper/Observer Course Emergency Task Force (E.T.F.)	1	10
Emergency Task Force	TO1015	Urban Sniper Operations Emergency Task Force (E.T.F.)	2	10
Emergency Task Force	T01016	E.T.F. – Tactical Breacher	7	59
Emergency Task Force	TU0065	Use of Force Emergency Task Force (E.T.F.)	13	94
Emergency Task Force	110047	Tactical Emergency Casualty Care	1	19
Sub - Total			30	246

Unit	Course	Title	Sessions	No. of Participants
Forensic Identification Services	TC0048	Scenes of Crime Officers Course	6	69
Forensic Identification Services	TO0039	Intellibook/Livescan Fingerprinting	9	50
Sub - Total			15	119
Intelligence Unit	TC0126	Online Investigations Level 2&3	4	124
Intelligence Unit	TC0121	Advanced Online Investigations Level IV	1	16
Sub – Total			5	140
Marine Unit	TO2011	Marine Basic First Aid	1	9
Sub - Total			1	9
People & Culture	100055	Foundations - Leadership Development	7	139
People & Culture	100087	Advanced Leadership Development Program	1	18
People & Culture	110005	Project Management	4	43
People & Culture	110006	Change Management	2	45
People & Culture	110007	Process Management	2	38
People & Culture	110014	Is Management for Me?	2	46
People & Culture	110016	Mastering Difficult Conversations	9	297
Sub - Total			27	626
Police Dog Services	TO0007	Police Dog Services (P.D.S.) – Gen Purpose Dog Training	1	1

Unit	Course	Title	Sessions	No. of Participants
Police Dog Services	TO0052	P.D.S.: Explosives & Firearms Detection Dog	1	2
Sub - Total			2	3
Emergency Management & Public Order	100005	Less Lethal Weapons Qualification	3	25
Emergency Management & Public Order	100025	Incident Command 200	7	150
Emergency Management & Public Order	100095	Public Order Scribe	1	12
Emergency Management & Public Order	110020	Incident Command 300	1	9
Emergency Management & Public Order	110004	Explosive Familiarization Investigator	1	19
Emergency Management & Public Order	TO3008	Incident Management System 200	5	79
Emergency Management & Public Order	TO3019	Public Order Unit (P.O.U.) Block A Training	6	448
Emergency Management & Public Order	TO3025	Use of Force/Fitness Qualification	6	444
Emergency Management & Public Order	TO3027	Block B Training	6	452
Emergency Management & Public Order	TO3031	First Responder Operation Search Tactics	11	238

Unit	Course	Title	Sessions	No. of Participants
Emergency Management & Public Order	TO3035	Remotely Piloted Aircraft System (R.P.A.S.)-Ground School	4	29
Emergency Management & Public Order	TO3036	SARTopo (Search and Rescue Topography) and G.P.S. (Global Positioning System)	4	11
Sub - Total			55	1,916
Records Management Services	100051	Transcription	1	4
Sub - Total			1	4
Talent Acquisition	110036	2024 Sergeant Promotional Exam	1	213
Sub – Total			1	213
Traffic Services	100016	Stationary Radar - Theory	4	65
Traffic Services	100018	Laser Imaging, Detection, and Ranging (L.I.D.A.R.) - Theory	20	509
Traffic Services	100020	Mobile Radar - Theory	4	65
Traffic Services	100071	Practical Traffic Direction	3	61
Traffic Services	100080	Basic Camera Operator Level one (1)	5	11
Traffic Services	100081	Collision Scene Photography Level two (2)	15	15
Traffic Services	SFST2	Standard Field Sobriety Testing	6	74
Traffic Services	TO0073	Approved Screening Devices Alcotest 6810	14	292
Traffic Services	TT0001	At Scene Collision Investigations	1	15
Traffic Services	TT0002	Technical Collision Investigations	1	9
Traffic Services	TT0005	Collision Reconstruction Level four (4)	1	11

Unit	Course	Title	Sessions	No. of Participants
Traffic Services	TV0059	Motorcycle Very Important Person (V.I.P.) Escort Refresh	1	19
Traffic Services	TV0069	Police Motorcycle Operator Level one (1)	2	18
Traffic Services	TV0071	Motorcycle Operator Level two (2) Refresher	1	1
Traffic Services	TV0073	Police Motorcycle Instructor	1	2
Sub - Total			79	1,167
Conferences - Seminars & Continuing Education Courses		Women who Molest Children		1
Sub - Total				1
Canadian Intelligence Services Ontario	I00022	Tech Intercept of Private Communications		1
Canadian Intelligence Services Ontario	I00024	C-24 Lawful Justification		4
Sub - Total				5
Canadian Police College	C00014	Executive Development in Policing	1	1
Canadian Police College	C00016	Forensic Identification	1	1
Canadian Police College	C00019	Tactical Intelligence Analysis	1	1
Canadian Police College	C00021	Major Crime Investigative Tch	1	6
Canadian Police College	C00027	Police Explosives Validation	4	4
Canadian Police College	C00030	Post Blast Scene Technician	2	2

Unit	Course	Title	Sessions	No. of Participants
Canadian Police College	C00052	Police Explosives Technicians	1	1
Canadian Police College	C00072	Using Internet as Intelligence Tool	2	2
Canadian Police College	C00075	Crisis Negotiators	2	2
Canadian Police College	C00087	Digital Technologies for Investigations	1	1
Canadian Police College	C00096	Hazardous Environment Recognition	1	1
Canadian Police College	C00104	M.C.M.- Team Commander	1	1
Canadian Police College	C00123	Advanced Open-Source Intelligence	1	1
Canadian Police College	C00127	Court Expert and Testimony	1	2
Canadian Police College	C00135	Unsolved & Historic Death Investigations	2	2
Canadian Police College	C00137	Tactical Police Explosive Tech	1	2
Sub - Total			18	30
Ontario Police College	P00019	Use of Force Trainer		8
Ontario Police College	P00036	Major Case Management		14
Ontario Police College	P00067	Communication Centre Supervisors Course		13
Ontario Police College	P00084	Basic Constable Training		183
Ontario Police College	P00096	Death Investigation Course		1

Unit	Course	Title	Sessions	No. of Participants
Ontario Police College	P00098	D.N.A. Data Bank, Warrant and Consent Sample Collection - Train-the-Trainer		1
Ontario Police College	P00101	Gang Investigation Course		2
Ontario Police College	P00104	Managing Investigations Using PowerCase		16
Ontario Police College	P00106	Math & Physics for Bloodstain Pattern Analysis		1
Ontario Police College	P00123	Friction Ridge Analysis		3
Ontario Police College	P00134	Scenes of Crime Officer Trainer		1
Ontario Police College	P00141	PowerCase for the Command Triangle		1
Ontario Police College	P00148	Multi Jurisdictional M.C.M. (Major Case Management)		1
Ontario Police College	P00157	Incident Command 100		2867
Ontario Police College	P00158	Incident Command 200		22
Ontario Police College	P00165	O.P.C. Virtual Academy (O.P.C.V.A.) IMS 100 Final Test		8
Ontario Police College	P00175	Crisis Negotiator Course		3
Ontario Police College	P00176	Criminal Investigators Training		30
Ontario Police College	P00112	Synthetic Drug Operations		1
Ontario Police College	P00123	Friction Ridge Analysis		1

Unit	Course	Title	Sessions	No. of Participants
Ontario Police College	P00134	Scenes of Crime Officer Trainer		1
Sub - Total				3,142
Grand Total*				10,843

* In previous years, totals were listed by delivery location (T.P.S., C.I.S.O./O.P.C./C.P.C. and other). In 2024, as a result of the C.S.P.A. coming into effect, the T.P.C. began seeking accreditation or certification to deliver O.P.C. courses in-house. The location versus course-owner therefore changed throughout the year for several courses. As such, this report (and future reports during the C.S.P.A. transition period) includes courses from these organizations/agencies within the above T.P.S. training table, regardless of the location the training was delivered.

Conferences, Seminars & Continuing Education

Title	No. of Participants
Home Safety Seminar	
Hate Motivated Graffiti	
Source Management Training	40
Glock Armour Course	
IAPro/EIPro	
Alcohol and Gaming Commission of Ontario	30
Professional Standards (P.R.S.) Investigative Training (two sessions)	70
Muslim Community Consultative Committee	
International Women's Day	
Newcomers Meet and Greet	
Wellness – Trillium Health Partners (two sessions)	30
Mental Health Innovation/Peer Support	30
Dean Crisp Training (two sessions)	
Fentanyl Conference	200
OPC Firearm Analyst	
Substance Use & Law Enforcement	100
Ontario Services – Women in Policing	
South Asians in Law Enforcement Internal Support Network (S.A.I.L. I.S.N.)	180
SARTopo (Search and Rescue Topography)	10
Information Session for Detective Services	30
Analytics and Innovation Team Development	60
Antisemitism training for T.P.S. Members	
Auto Theft Investigation	
Workplace Harassment	30

Title	No. of Participants
Elder Abuse Symposium	
Hate Crime Consultative Committee (two sessions)	120
O.A.C.P. Reintegration	30
Advanced Leadership Development	12
Tactical Drone	30
United Way Ambassador Training	
Interview Skills Workshop	25
Critical Thinking	
Black Internal Support Network	
Virtual Reality Training	10
Master Difficult Conversations	45
Chief's Youth Advisory Committee	12
Artificial Intelligence Symposium	200
Missing and Missed working group (two sessions)	24
Wellness Day	400
Senior Officers Development Day – Social Media Strategy	
Source Management Symposium	200
Islamic Heritage Month	
German Federal Police	
Unit Commander Training for Sergeants Promotional Process	
Impaired Driving Symposium	
C.P.C. Conference	
Human Trafficking Training Centre Training Event	200
P.D.S. Information Session	
Live Video Tech Focus Group	30

Title	No. of Participants
Provincial Auxiliary Coordinator's Symposium	30
Take Your Kids to Work Day	
Toronto Shield	150
Young Presidents	25
Police Fitness Personnel of Ontario	30

*The listed number of participants, if provided, is an estimate as not all seminars reported detailed attendance data.

Appendix C: Phase One Preliminary Report: *A Multimethod Examination of Toronto Police Service's Annual In-Service Training Program by Humber Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning*

As part of an ongoing partnership, Humber College and the Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) are evaluating the 2023/2024 annual In-Service Training Program (I.S.T.). This multi-phase initiative is focused on understanding how effectively training is being applied in the field, with the goal of strengthening knowledge transfer and supporting improved community engagement and outcomes.

Phase 1 involved a review of I.S.T. content and delivery methods, identification of learning outcomes, and consultation with instructors. The findings outlined below highlight key strengths and areas for improvement that will inform future training cycles and guide the next phases of the evaluation.

The full Phase 1 report is included below.

A MULTIMETHOD EXAMINATION OF TORONTO POLICE SERVICE'S ANNUAL IN-SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM



PHASE ONE PRELIMINARY REPORT

August 2024

Ashley Hosker-Field, PhD
Ann Wallington, M.A., LL.M
Daniel Bear, PhD
Ashelyn Fung, MBA



HUMBER

Centre for Social Innovation
Centres of Innovation Network

**Phase One Preliminary Report:
A Multimethod Examination of Toronto Police Service's Annual In-Service Training
Program**

Ashley Hosker-Field, PhD
Ann Wallington, M.A., LL.M
Daniel Bear, PhD
Ashelyn Fung, MBA

Research Assistants:
Cheyenne-Raine Lynch, M.Ed
Laura Bannon
Meghan Martone
Radika Tennessee

Center for Social Innovation
Faculty of Social and Community Services
Humber Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning
Toronto, Canada

August 2024

Table of Contents

List of Appendices	iv
Executive Summary	1
Literature Review: Best Practice Andragogy for Police Officers as Experienced Adult Learners. 3	
1. Content Areas for Police Training	4
1.1 Content Currently Taught in Law Enforcement.....	4
1.2 Opportunities in Training to Successfully Engage People in Mental Distress	7
2. Ways in Which Adults Learn	9
2.1. Several Key Adult Learning Theories.....	9
2.2 Best Practices for and Experiences of Adult Learners.....	13
2.3 Experiential Training in Police Education	18
3. The Kirkpatrick Model	25
Conclusion	29
General Overview of 2024 In-Service Training (IST).....	30
Ethnographic Observations of In-Service Training	33
Observational Reflections and Recommendations	34
Recommendation Mapping and Connection to Teaching.....	43
Method	43
Teaching Strategies	43
Evaluation Methods	44
Qualitative and Quantitative Research: Feedback from In-Service Training Instructors.....	46
Method	47
Participant Recruitment	47
Qualitative Data Collection.....	47
Quantitative Data Collection.....	48
Proposed Timeline for Data Analysis and Compilation of Results.....	49
Continuation of Research.....	50
IST Review: Phase 2 Overview	50
IST Review: Phase 3 Overview	51
Expanding Beyond In-Service Training.....	52
Scope of Work.....	52
Tentative Timeline	53
References.....	55

List of Appendices

Appendix A	Humber Research Ethics Board Clearance Certificate
Appendix B	In-Service Training Observation Checklist
Appendix C	IST Instructor Interview Guide
Appendix D	IST Instructor Questionnaire
Appendix E	Research Team Biographies

Executive Summary

Humber College and the Toronto Police Service have been working collaboratively on a research-based initiative designed to evaluate the Toronto Police Service's annual In-Service Training (IST) Program. This work is ongoing and includes several phases of research. The primary purpose of phase one of the project is to a) examine whether the content, instructional approaches, and learner evaluation methods used during IST reflect empirically based best practice andragogical strategies (methods and principles for adult education), b) to assess whether current IST practices and procedures align with recommendations provided by oversight bodies, and c) to analyze IST instructors perspectives regarding IST andragogy, officer engagement, and effective transfer of learning when on the job or in the field.

A multi-method approach is being employed and involves a) an empirical literature review conducted to identify best practice andragogy with police officers and experienced adult learners, b) a foundational review and mapping of recommendations provided by oversight bodies in relation to content included and educational approaches used during IST training, c) ethnographic observations of IST and d) qualitative interviews and quantitative questionnaires designed to elicit feedback about the effectiveness of IST from IST Instructors.

As this work is ongoing, the current report summarizes the research methodology employed, examines the literature related to adult education and police training, and provides preliminary findings that have emerged to date from this phase of the research initiative. A final report detailing phase one findings is expected to be available by the end of 2024.

This report concludes with an overview of the proposed research approach to be implemented during subsequent phases of this research initiative. Phases two and three will be

primarily focused on examining training effectiveness and transfer of learning, and proposes a multimethod research approach that includes questionnaires, interviews, and focus groups, eliciting participation and feedback from TPS officers, supervisors, and local community groups.

In this preliminary report, we identify that the ongoing efforts to provide TPS officers with meaningful, engaging, and relevant training sessions at IST are being undertaken by a thoughtful and well-informed team of instructors. The topics presented to officers in the classroom sessions align to the most pressing challenges facing street-level officers, and continuous efforts to develop the courses highlight the commitment of the Toronto Police College staff. However, we also identify that important andragogical practice are not always undertaken, too much content is presented in too short a time, and that a lack of apparent motivation by participants hinders the efficacy of the training sessions. Further analysis of these issues will be presented in our final report, but we felt it was important to bring information from our initial analysis to bear as quickly as possible to both highlight the successes of the IST and describe some of the challenges so work could begin on addressing them during the fall period when next year's IST framework is being constructed.

Ashley Hosker-Field, PhD
Ann Wallington, M.A., LL.M
Daniel Bear, PhD
Ashelyn Fung, MBA

August 2024

Literature Review: Best Practice Andragogy for Police Officers as Experienced Adult Learners

Adult education is a complex subject that, when applied to law enforcement, is further intensified by the intricacies of the technical, tactical, and interpersonal skills required by police officers. As the needs of educational content for policing evolve, evidence-based andragogical approaches must also be strategically applied to create lasting impact and positive outcomes (Bennell et al., 2021). Best practices for adult learning can be applied to enhance the evidence-informed content used to train police officers, and this review of the existing literature will help shape future recommendations emerging from this project.

Police are required to be experts in both soft skills (effective communication) and hard skills (use-of-force, proper arrest procedures) to manage any situation (O'Neill et al., 2019). As such, curriculum must be continuously evaluated to maximize learning outcomes amidst pivotal societal changes and shifting community needs (Yang, 2023). Educational police content that is designed and evaluated using evidence-informed approaches is foundational to prepare officers for such dynamic environments. Yet no matter how robust, content alone cannot fully prepare officers; motivating individual accountability through self-directed learning is key for increasing engagement. Greater engagement supports more critical thinking for real-life situations, ownership for applicable lifelong learning, and effective behaviour change. In conjunction with self-directed learning by officers, trainers who utilize memory and retention strategies also enhance the educational experience for adult learners and drive improved outcomes for training programs and organizational success. By evaluating the effectiveness of knowledge transfer and behaviour change, we can identify the impact of police training initiatives on the community and highlight areas for future focus. One method commonly used is the Kirkpatrick Model, which

evaluates training effectiveness at multiple levels and identifies areas that may be underprioritized (Steensma & Groeneveld, 2010).

1. Content Areas for Police Training

1.1 Content Currently Taught in Law Enforcement

Rapid advancements in technology, social systems and public awareness of equity-related issues demand ongoing training in policing and other public-serving fields (Chew et al., 2021, Kratcoski & Kratcoski, 2021). It is imperative that officers receive continuous education and training to ensure that their role in safely protecting and serving the public can be performed at the highest level (Fischetti & Greco, 2017, Kratcoski, 2017). While there is no universal curriculum for police training, Canadian law enforcement officers typically learn a range of skills regarding federal and provincial laws, evidence, traffic, use of force, communications, officer safety (Schulenberg & Warren, 2009), and contemporary issues surrounding ethics and diversity (Giwa, 2018; Christmas, 2013).

This diverse set of skills is taught through various means depending on the content, such as in-class or field learning. For example, multiple studies demonstrate that in-class instruction is more effective for knowledge retention of theoretical and academic content (Raab & Bogner, 2021; Geier & Bogner, 2010; Schneiderhan-Opel & Bogner, 2021) such as legal studies or patrol techniques (Justice Institute of British Columbia, 2009). Application of learned knowledge and skills can be facilitated through class discussions and problem-based learning to help officers contextualize and apply their knowledge to real-world problems (Glenn, 2003; Schulenberg & Warren, 2009). Davis (2014) argues that academy training alone does not adequately prepare officers to be fully competent in all necessary skills; it is also argued that lack of regular in-

service training reduces officers' confidence in their abilities. In a profession where practitioners regularly need to engage in high-stress situations, confidence in one's capabilities is imperative. In-service training focuses on sharpening skills like proper use of force and community interactions and is mandatory in many police departments across North America (Papazoglou & Andersen, 2014; Lee et al., 2010). Since officers work in dynamic, ever-changing communities, in-service training is necessary to ensure that officers' skills and competencies are regularly practiced, reduce complacency, improve techniques, and remain relevant in the current social climate (Kordaczuk-Wąs & Sosnowski, 2011). While some of the content and ways of learning discussed are applicable to several means of training, this report will focus primarily on best practices related to in-service training.

Use of force

Use of force training continues to develop with a greater focus on de-escalation techniques and non-lethal tactics due to past incidents (Boivin & Lagace, 2016; Christmas, 2013). Use of force policies and procedures have changed over the years to adapt to the current social climate and its demands (Butler, 2020; Glenn, 2003). The Black Lives Matter movement and the death of George Floyd are two events that catalyzed advancements in use of force training that minimize violence and encourage communication tactics to coerce individuals to behave differently (Campbell, 2024; Palmiotto, 2016). A study from the Canadian Criminal Justice Association reviewing data from Canadian police departments in 2019 found that use of force rates ranged from as low as 30.6 (Niagara) to 420.9 reports (Edmonton) per 100,000 people (Wortley et al., 2021). Research confirms the importance of continuous in-service training for use of force to ensure officers develop and enhance the competencies needed to preserve order in

society and protect civilian lives and themselves (Palmiotto, 2016; O'Neill et al., 2019).

Untrained personnel or improper use of force during an incident may lead to serious injury, compromise public trust and social cohesion, and/or delegitimize law enforcement and the criminal justice system (Wortley et al., 2021; Sergevnin & Ross, 2016).

Defensive Tactics

Research shows that officers are far more likely to use nonlethal tactics over lethal tactics when using force (O'Neill, 2019; Hyland et al., 2015). These techniques require a high proficiency in defensive tactics (Wortley et al., 2020). The importance of in-service defensive tactics training is further emphasized by studies that found as low as 17% of cadets properly performed disarming tactics after initial academy training (O'Neill, 2019). This demonstrates a significant need for continued in-service training, as the implications of incorrect performance—injuries, loss of control, etc.—can be serious. The importance of managing these situations with as little harm as possible is highlighted in the fact that techniques such as pressure-point control, ground defense, and weapon retention are commonly taught and practiced in 85-99% of police departments in North America (Reaves, 2016). In-service training improves performance due to increased focus on situational awareness, anticipation of attacks, and primary-reflex-based physical defensive skills (Butler, 2020; Schlosser & Gahan, 2015). Officers report that the more defensive tactics training they receive, the more confident they are in their abilities to handle situations (Ellifritz, 2013). While these tactics can be highly effective in certain situations, use of force or defensive tactics should be exercised carefully to prevent unnecessary harm or misconduct (Mijares & Wall, 2012).

Police Ethics

The literature is clear that training for public sector professions must teach practitioners to be ethical decision-makers (Cohen, 2022; Maesschalck, 2004; Stevulak & Brown, 2011), most notably in law enforcement (Johnson & Cox, 2004). Historically, researchers believed that ethics and morals are inherent and cannot be taught (Delattre, 1996), but modern training challenges this through instruction and practice of ethical decision-making and problem-solving skills (Blumberg et al., 2019). Ongoing in-service training helps to ensure that officer behaviour reflects the integrity of the profession, as their choices and actions are closely monitored and scrutinized by the public unlike any other profession (Taggart et al., 2023; Cohen, 2022). Key rationale for including ethics in police training are limiting liability and enhancing public perception (Cohen, 2022). Police ethics should be inclusive, equity-informed, and relevant to the communities served (Manning, 2010), and even the most intensive evidence-based curriculums need to be adapted to keep up with shifting social contexts (Cohen, 2022).

1.2 Opportunities in Training to Successfully Engage People in Mental Distress

A major challenge of the dynamic nature of community needs is that some areas can outpace how they are being served. Many studies have highlighted the frequent and increasing interactions between police officers and individuals with mental health or substance use issues (Bennell et al., 2020). The period of de-institutionalization in the mid 20th century is one of the several factors that has led to increased police involvement in crisis intervention (Marcus & Stergiopoulos, 2022). The transition from institutionalization to community care for individuals with complex mental health needs, combined with insufficient resources for community-based services, has resulted in police officers becoming de facto mental health providers (Marcus &

Stergiopoulos, 2022), often serving as primary responders to mental health crises (Bennell et al., 2020). These encounters between police officers and people experiencing mental illnesses are often reported as negative experiences (van der Meulen et al. 2021) as they frequently involve an increased use of force, which is a significant concern highlighted in several studies (Hallet et al. 2021; Kesic et al. 2013; Moribito et al. 2017). This elevated use of force contributes to a higher likelihood of severe outcomes, such as avoidable fatalities (Fuller et al. 2015; Saleh et al. 2018). These patterns show the urgent need for improved training and intervention strategies to mitigate the risks and enhance the safety of interactions between police officers and those experiencing mental health crises.

In the context of law enforcement, reducing danger and tension in situations that could potentially escalate is a daily task for police officers. While officers possess a wide range of skills, inadequacies in training specific to mental health crisis responses still exist (Coleman and Cotton, 2014; Dubé, 2016; Pelfrey and Young, 2020). Marcus & Stergiopoulos (2002) report between 23% and 70% of fatalities during police encounters were related to people experiencing mental health or substance use concerns in Canada. Whereas in the United States, 25% of fatal police shootings in 2015 involved people in emotional distress. Appropriate training to identify these signs can help officers employ crisis intervention strategies, complementing their existing skills to intervene safely during a crisis event (Oliva et al., 2010). Many recommendations to address these concerns have emerged, including a focus on developing and delivering “specialized police response” training for frontline officers designed to enhance their understanding of mental illness and prioritize de-escalation techniques (Lavoie et al., 2022).

According to Lavoie et al. (2022), officers receive insufficient training needed to respond to mental health crises and specifically have training gaps in de-escalating these situations.

Reports from officers show a fear of injury, worry, uneasiness and feeling threatened when interacting with individuals experiencing mental illness (Lavoie et al., 2022). Police uncertainty in how to respond in a mental health crisis heightens the risk of danger and increases the likelihood of use of force (Lavoie et al., 2022). Evidence-informed de-escalation and use of force training is more likely to effectively enhance officers' response during public interactions, thereby decreasing the chances of unnecessary harm to all parties (Bennell et al., 2020).

2. Ways in Which Adults Learn

2.1. Several Key Adult Learning Theories

Understanding how adults learn is fundamental for effective police training. Three theories provide insights into how best to structure learning activities to identify common themes: Knowles' Andragogical Model, Mezirow's Transformative Learning Theory, and Kolb's Experiential Learning Theory. They emphasize self-directed learning, giving learners ownership and fostering continuous learning. Knowles highlights practical application and prior experiences; Mezirow focuses on critical reflection and perspective transformation; and Kolb underscores learning through experience and reflection. Together, these theories support a framework for training that imparts knowledge and transforms perspectives and behaviors, resulting in more effective police training.

Knowles' Andragogical Model

Malcolm Knowles' Andragogical Model is a foundational theory in adult education, emphasizing that adults learn differently from children. While no single theory fully explains adult learning, andragogy offers a valuable framework (McClusky et al., 2014). Knowles identified six assumptions about adult learners (Clardy, 2005; McClusky et al., 2014): (1) as

individuals mature, their self-concept shifts from dependency to self-direction; (2) adults accumulate a wealth of experience, serving as a rich learning resource; (3) adults' readiness to learn is closely related to their social roles and developmental tasks; (4) adults' time perspective changes from future-oriented learning to immediate application, making them more problem-centered than subject-centered (Knowles, 1980, as cited in McClusky et al., 2014); (5) internal motivations are more potent for adults than external ones (Knowles & Associates, 1984, as cited in McClusky et al., 2014); and (6) adults need to understand the reason for learning something (Knowles, 1984, as cited in McClusky et al., 2014).

Self-directed learning is critical for enhancing the effectiveness of mandatory adult training programs. Adults seek control over their learning, value their experiences, and desire practical solutions to real-life problems (Clardy, 2005). This approach encourages adults to take charge of their own learning (Lemmetty et al., 2023). Knowles (1975) argues that proactive learners retain information better than passive ones (as cited in Smith, 2002). By fostering self-direction, organizations can enhance the relevance and impact of their training, meeting the diverse needs of adult learners.

Pedagogy vs. Andragogy

Pedagogy is often used to describe teaching practices taking place at all levels but does not apply to the current discussion. Pedagogy focuses on teaching children, whereas andragogy prescribes specific procedures tailored to adult learners and their unique characteristics (Clardy, 2005). Under pedagogy, the instructor's role is to provide answers and implement the learning process. In andragogy, the instructor's job is to design a process that involves learners in creating and implementing their learning (Clardy, 2005).

Critical differences between the two, as outlined by Knowles (1970), include:

	Pedagogy	Andragogy
Concept of the Learner	Learners depend on the teacher, who determines what, when, and how learning occurs.	Adults move towards self-directed learning, with teachers encouraging and nurturing this progression.
Role of Learners' Experience	Learners' experiences are considered of little value; the focus is on the teacher's expertise.	Adults' accumulated experiences are valuable learning resources. Experiential learning techniques such as discussions, problem-solving, and field experiences are emphasized.
Readiness to Learn	Learning is based on societal expectations and standardized curricula.	Adults are ready to learn when they must address real-life tasks or problems. Educators should help learners discover their needs and organize learning around life applications.
Orientation to Learning	Learning is subject-centered, focusing on content that will be useful later.	Learning is performance-centered and aims to develop competencies for immediate application.

Thus, andragogy recognizes that adults have distinct learning needs and approaches, necessitating different educational strategies compared to traditional pedagogy. This approach fosters self-directed, experience-rich, and application-oriented learning environments for adults.

Transformative Learning Theory

Transformative Learning Theory, introduced by Jack Mezirow in the 1970s, explains how adults change their thinking through critical reflection, focusing on experiences, reflection, and rational discussion (Dirkx, 1998). It aims to transform problematic frames of reference to become more inclusive, open, reflective, and emotionally capable of change, enhancing self-awareness, critical thinking, discourse, and perspective transformation (Mezirow, 2009).

Key elements include critical reflection on assumptions and dialectical discourse to validate reflective judgment (Mezirow, 2009). The theory involves active participation, with

learners co-creating experiences and engaging meaningfully with content within their life contexts, aiming to foster a democratic vision of society and individual self-actualization (Dirkx, 1998). It typically follows phases such as experiencing disorienting dilemmas, self-examination, critical assessment of assumptions, exploring options, acquiring knowledge and skills, trying new roles, building confidence, and reintegrating new perspectives (Mezirow, 2009).

Experiential Learning Theory

Experiential Learning Theory (ELT), developed by David Kolb, highlights the importance of experience in adult development. ELT outlines a four-stage learning cycle: concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization (forming theories), and active experimentation (testing theories in new situations) (McLeod, 2017). Effective learning needs engagement in all four stages, as no single stage is sufficient on its own (McLeod, 2017).

ELT also suggests that learning involves balancing opposing abilities. For example, some individuals prefer concrete experiences, while others favor abstract analysis. Similarly, some prefer reflective observation, while others lean towards active experimentation (Kolb et al., 1999). Different experiences will appeal to different types of learners and best enable them to reach a state of deep reflection.

Integrating Knowles' Andragogical Model, Mezirow's Transformative Learning Theory, and Kolb's Experiential Learning Theory into police training caters to adult learners' needs by fostering adaptive, reflective, and practical environments. Knowles' model emphasizes self-direction, prior experiences, and immediate application, aligning with police work's practical demands. Mezirow's theory promotes critical reflection and perspective transformation, leading to better decision-making and continuous improvement. Kolb's ELT focuses on learning through

experience and reflection, enhancing problem-solving skills. All three theories support self-directed or co-created learning, facilitating a transformative experience where learners take initiative in their learning journey (Knowles, 1975, as cited in Smith, 2002). Enabling a deep sense of reflection not only increases engagement but also strengthens the theoretical learning process. Together, these three frameworks support learner-centered training programs, ensuring effective internalization and application of skills necessary for policing.

2.2 Best Practices for and Experiences of Adult Learners

Incorporating diverse teaching methods for multiple ways of learning is essential for effective training within organizations. Best practices emphasize a dynamic application of personalized, interactive, and collaborative learning through the integration of technology, and memory and knowledge retention strategies. These methods ensure that training is adaptable, engaging, and responsive. By integrating personalized, interactive, and collaborative methods with the principles of self-directed learning, organizations can create training programs that are not only comprehensive and effective but also empower adult learners. Control over one's educational journey enhances retention and application of mandatory training by acknowledging adult learners' desire for autonomy and relevance to real-life problems. These practices foster motivation, enhance learning outcomes, and improve organizational effectiveness.

Types of Learning for Instructors to Address

Personalized Learning

Personalized learning addresses apathy by engaging learners through their interests and strengths, which fosters motivation and success (Hughey, 2020) and tailors the pace and

instructional approach to better meet the evolving demands of employers, employees, and learners (U.S. Department of Education, 2017, as cited in Hughey, 2020). Effective instructors understand the importance of adjusting to each learner's style and managing emotional factors like passion, frustration, and satisfaction to enhance the learning experience (Martinez, 2002).

Key themes in personalized learning include a student-centered approach, student agency, flexible learning, competency mastery, and a holistic view of the learner (DeMonte, 2018). Understanding the impact of emotions and intentions also helps educators appreciate why individuals learn differently (Martinez, 2002). Some learners excel in collaborative environments, others in competitive settings, and some enjoy new challenges for long-term goals, while others resist learning they perceive as irrelevant (Martinez, 2002). Effective personalized learning sparks curiosity through meaningful, relevant activities that promote individual development. Videos for educational tutorials exemplify the shift towards accessible, engaging learning opportunities (Hughey, 2020), however video content will not automatically ensure engagement if the content on display is not relevant to the learner or interactive.

Interactive Learning

Interactive learning actively captures adult students' attention, stimulates critical thinking, and fosters responsibility (Oprea, 2014). Interactivity involves mutual relationships where students transform information into personal knowledge, building new meanings through exploration, problem-solving, and applying information in new contexts (Oprea, 2014)

According to Oprea (2014), the key principles of interactive teaching include constructing meanings and negotiating goals. Promoting alternatives encourages diverse teaching, learning, and assessment methods, while trans-disciplinary tasks involve information

from multiple disciplines for a multidimensional analysis. Reflective assessment incorporates alternative assessment methods, while learning through discovery promotes problem-solving, creativity, and hands-on learning (Oprea, 2009, as cited in Oprea, 2014). Interactive learning transforms cognitive structures through active intellectual and psychomotor engagement, redefining roles with students as active agents and teachers as guides, fostering self-confidence and motivation for future learning (Oprea, 2014).

Collaborative Learning

For effective collaborative learning, instructors must create environments conducive to mutual problem-solving, starting with arranging the physical space to promote interaction rather than one-way information transmission (Knowles, 1985, as cited in Gitterman, 2004). Instructors should guide and encourage students to share ideas, ensuring peer discussions are structured and meaningful (Gitterman, 2004). They must also relinquish the role of sole expert, fostering a supportive climate that respects and trusts students' abilities to learn, think critically, and explore new areas through active, cooperative education.

Creating a supportive and trusting psychological and social climate is even more important than the physical setting. When learners feel respected and trusted by the instructor, they are more likely to respect and trust each other. Conversely, a lack of respect and trust can hinder the learning process (Knowles, 1985, as cited in Gitterman, 2004). Instructors should focus conversations, offer new perspectives, and foster a climate where students are invested in each other's learning (Gitterman, 1992, as cited in Gitterman, 2004). By sharing the responsibility for learning, instructors encourage students to collaborate, develop ideas, and form principles, building a classroom community dedicated to collective success. Engaging adult

learners effectively requires interactive and collaborative methods that leverage their unique experiences, promoting active participation, critical thinking, and mutual respect (Oprea, 2014; Gitterman, 2004).

Integration of Technology in Adult Education

Integrating technology into adult education and organizational training facilitates personalized, interactive, and collaborative learning environments. The development of technology and e-learning platforms has accelerated post COVID lockdowns, extending technology's reach across various sectors (González et al., 2022). This integration aligns with adult learning principles, enhancing the learning experience by addressing the unique needs of adult learners. In training, technology can facilitate personalized learning pathways, allowing employees to progress at their own pace and customize their learning materials to fit their needs (Constantakis, 2016).

Technology can be used to support a balanced approach that integrates pedagogy and andragogy, technological advancements, and curriculum design to optimize learning opportunities (Inverso et al., 2017). Modern technological tools significantly enhance access and learning outcomes in adult education and workplace training (Constantakis, 2016; Newman, 2015), provided efforts are undertaken to plan and execute on data collection and analysis goals. Blended learning, which combines face-to-face and online instruction, has been shown to be more effective than either method alone (Lloyd-Smith, 2010). Implementing a systematic model of deliberate technological integration enhances instructional design, demonstrating its value in both higher education and corporate training contexts (González et al., 2022).

Memory and Retention Strategies

While the types of learning and technology used for instruction are important, memory and retention strategies must be employed so that the transfer of learning creates a lasting impact. Transfer of learning is essential in education and training, enabling individuals to apply skills and knowledge to new situations, rather than starting from scratch (Ritter et al., 2013). In the workplace, this means applying learned skills to job performance (Taylor, 1997). Effective training systems aim to enhance performance and ensure skill retention (Ritter et al., 2013).

According to Ritter et al. (2013), knowledge retention occurs in three stages. Initially, knowledge resides in declarative memory, which degrades without use, leading to performance issues, while frequent use strengthens it. As learning progresses, knowledge transitions from declarative to procedural memory. Declarative knowledge may be forgotten with disuse, causing errors, but procedural memory remains robust. In the final stage, performance is driven by procedural memory, which does not decay, enabling effective task performance even if declarative knowledge degrades.

Effective retention strategies after training include follow-up support, where trainers engage with learners to discuss skill application and offer assistance (Taylor, 1997). Evaluation surveys conducted 30 to 60 days post training help remind trainees of learned skills and encourage their use. Sharing survey results and recognizing early successes reinforces learning. Recognition strategies, such as celebrating trainee achievements, further motivate continued skill application. Brief refresher sessions summarizing key concepts and facilitating problem-solving discussions effectively address retention issues.

Knowledge transfer is key in adult learning, aiming to apply skills in various contexts, but often falls short (Taylor, 1997). Effective transfer requires modeling, practice, feedback, and

cooperative learning. For example, successful literacy instruction allows students to apply new strategies across tasks when supported by ample practice and feedback (Mikulecky et al., 1994). Cooperative learning also enhances interaction and understanding, further supporting knowledge transfer (Taylor, 1997).

The best training practices for adult learners that were discussed in this section are fundamental for developing successful training programs. By tailoring instruction to individual needs, fostering active participation, leveraging technology, and ensuring knowledge retention, organizations can create a dynamic and supportive learning environment. These practices not only enhance the educational experience for adult learners but also drive improved outcomes and organizational success. Embracing these strategies ensures that training is not just a one-time event but a continuous journey of growth and development.

2.3 Experiential Training in Police Education

Understanding ways of learning specifically relevant to police education is vital for developing effective training programs. Experiential training often integrates elements of personalized, interactive, and collaborative learning both in and outside classroom settings. It has gained traction in many fields for its efficacy at translating information through immersive real-world scenarios (Kratcoski & Kratcoski, 2021; Shore & Dinning, 2023). Traditional block-didactic training that relies on memorization can overwhelm learners with an influx of information (Litmanovitz, 2016; Lettic, 2015), whereas experiential learning has shown to improve decision-making, self-reflection, and communication skills, and leads to overall better learning outcomes (Phelps et al., 2018; Richards et al., 2018). It is especially effective for

teaching a relational policing approach including core competencies related to de-escalation and mental health crisis responses (Lavoie et al., 2022).

This section explores Problem-Based Learning (PBL), Scenario-Based Learning (SBL), Simulation-Based Training (SBT), and Field-Based Training (FBT), examining how each method contributes to a comprehensive educational experience for policing. As with more general types of learning, memory and retention strategies are essential to support experiential training to ensure that knowledge and skills are effectively transferred. Effective retention methods, such as follow-up support and reflective assessments, are vital for addressing the challenges of learning transfer, allowing learners to successfully apply their training in real-world situations.

Problem-Based Learning (PBL)

Problem-Based Learning (PBL) is a learner-centered approach that highlights problem-solving and interpersonal skills, generally in a classroom setting. Facilitators guide small groups through solving ill-structured problems that provide limited information, requiring students to engage in higher-order thinking. It typically combines work in small groups with self-directed learning to strengthen critical thinking and analysis skills and improve overall decision-making. This format facilitates collaboration between trainees to develop solutions for complex problems by applying their training (Nilson, 2010; Wood, 2003).

Originally designed by Howard Barrows for medical education, PBL has been adapted for police education to improve real-world problem-solving and knowledge application (Barrows, 1986, as cited in Shipton, 2023). PBL integrates learning across the curriculum using

mnemonics like POLICE (Procedure, Officer safety, Legislation, Investigation, Communication, Ethics) to structure knowledge (Shipton, 2023).

PBL enhances teamwork, responsibility, and professional decision-making by encouraging collaboration and self-directed learning, addressing concerns about police misuse of power (Shipton, 2023). Through decision-making scenarios, PBL helps students consider legal and professional aspects, developing reasoning and emotional intelligence (Blumberg et al., 2019). Key elements include realistic problems, cooperative learning, learner-centered approaches, tutor guidance, and time for self-directed learning (Wijnia et al., 2019). However, the effectiveness of PBL can be compromised if not properly implemented by police academies, underscoring the importance of correct application.

Scenario-Based Learning (SBL)

Scenario-Based Learning (SBL) emulates realistic experiences, enhancing learning by applying concepts to hypothetically actualized circumstances. This type of learning engages trainees in critical incidents, particularly high stress or high-risk circumstances, through role-playing exercises that strengthen problem solving, reinforce application of taught skills, and provide trainees with opportunities to explore detailed interactions in a safe and controlled manner (Farokhi et al., 2023).

SBL is increasingly used in police education but often falls short due to poor learning design and limited facilitator skills (Shipton, 2023). Effective SBL requires clear lesson plans, structured teaching processes, and methods to prompt student thinking. By addressing intellectual, technical, and moral dimensions, it encourages active responses and knowledge transfer to real policing situations while fostering communication and teamwork skills.

While SBL is highly flexible, its flexibility can also be a limitation. Poor application, inconsistent cooperative learning, and ineffective facilitation hamper engagement. SBL is often narrowly applied within legal or investigative contexts, neglecting broader ethical dimensions. Effective lesson design should balance these signature dimensions across the curriculum (Shipton, 2023).

Simulation-Based Learning and Training (SBT)

Simulation-based learning and training (SBT) in policing involves students performing typical police tasks in controlled environments, offering real-time, hands-on experience that contrasts with classroom-based methods like Problem-Based Learning (PBL) and Scenario-Based Learning (SBL) (Shipton, 2023). SBT engages students actively, requiring them to act as police officers in realistic scenarios, which enhances practical skills and application. In recent years, advancements in technology also have improved substantially to facilitate immersive participation in realistic replications of scenarios. Interactive technologies such as video training, virtual reality, and artificial intelligence models are designed to provide learning experiences that strengthen learners' problem-solving and interpersonal skills in real-time through mock situations that parallel realistic encounters that officers face (Lateef, 2010).

SBT is dynamic but often limited by traditional, behaviorist methods that oversimplify evaluation, restricting critical reflection and deeper learning. The best practice model for SBT integrates it within a broader curriculum, optimizing its potential to consolidate learning from SBL and PBL (Shipton, 2023). Effective SBT is useful both as a final-stage learning tool, allowing for reflection and integration of various topics, and as an early-stage tool for practicing professional roles in a safe environment (Shipton, 2023). However, SBT in police education

faces challenges such as inconsistent application and a narrow focus on legal and investigative tasks, which often emphasizes checklist-based actions over understanding underlying principles (Blumberg et al., 2019). This check-list based approach can limit the development of essential skills. Effective SBT requires well-designed activities, curriculum alignment, and structured reflection, with real-time performance scrutinized by peers and facilitators (Shipton, 2023).

Field-Based Training and Learning (FBT)

Field-Based Training (FBT) encompasses learner-centered training outside the classroom where learners have direct, real-world interaction with their environment. This hands-on experience allows learners to illustrate taught concepts through a higher understanding and appreciation for environmental influences that necessitate consideration (Nicholson, 2011).

FBT provides hands-on experience and reinforces behaviors through practical assessment checklists, focusing on procedural skills (Shipton, 2023). However, it often fails to promote deeper learning and reflection, with field training officers (FTOs) sometimes deviating from curriculum guidelines and lacking proper preparation (Shipton, 2023). The commonly used 'watch and learn' method limits articulation of thinking and overlooks prior learning experiences (Campbell, 2008, as cited in Shipton, 2023).

FBT involves public student performance commensurate with their capabilities, making them visible and accountable to their communities. For instance, student trainees might act as police officers during traffic collision investigations by interacting with community members and emergency personnel in challenging situations (Shipton, 2023). Experienced police officers in re-training would handle a more complex scene by managing the flow of traffic, assisting the injured, and gathering statements from witnesses. Due to the public nature, mismanagement of

this situation can impact their reputation and progression (Shipton, 2023). FBT addresses these issues by encouraging students to articulate their thinking during tasks and reflect on their actions afterward (Shipton, 2023). However, traditional FBT has struggled with promoting integrity, often due to inconsistent applications and a focus on legalistic procedures over soft skills. These inconsistencies and negative cultural aspects undermine the effectiveness of FBT programs in fostering integrity (Bergman, 2017).

Common Themes in Experiential Training in Police Education

Active learning and engagement are central to Problem-Based Learning (PBL), Scenario-Based Learning (SBL), Simulation-Based Training (SBT), and Field-Based Training (FBT). They immerse students in realistic scenarios both in and out of the classroom, fostering active problem-solving and direct knowledge application. SBL engages students in realistic scenarios, whereas SBT requires real-time policing tasks in controlled environments. PBL challenges students with complex problems for deep engagement and FBT involves real-world activities.

These methods emphasize realism and authenticity, mirroring qualities of actual policing situations. PBL presents complex policing challenges, SBL puts forth real-world examples, SBT simulates the circumstances, and FBT immerses students in practical environments. To support integration of theoretical knowledge with practical skills, PBL combines multiple topics for holistic understanding, SBL promotes knowledge transfer, SBT emphasizes procedural and social skills, and FBT bridges classroom learning with field experiences.

Developing higher-order thinking skills is a primary goal, encouraging analysis, evaluation, and solution creation. PBL engages students in resolving complex problems, SBL fosters deep learning, SBT demands real-time decision-making, and FBT promotes critical

thinking. Collaboration and communication are also essential skills to develop. PBL utilizes small groups for cooperative learning, SBL encourages teamwork, SBT involves group activities with feedback, and FBT requires collaboration with peers and community members. Reflective practice deepens learning and improves future performance. To do so, PBL encourages reflection on the problem-solving process, SBL includes guided reflection, SBT reflects through debriefs, and FBL utilizes reflective journals or discussions. Facilitators guide and support students, providing structured guidance, lesson plans, supervision, feedback, and necessary scaffolding.

Problem-Based Learning (PBL), Scenario-Based Learning (SBL), Simulation-Based Training (SBT), and Field-Based Training (FBT) collectively enhance police education by promoting active engagement and ensuring knowledge retention to develop well-rounded officers. Each method offers unique benefits, from enhancing critical thinking and problem-solving skills to providing hands-on experience and promoting teamwork. Realistic scenarios prepare officers for complex policing tasks, while integrating theoretical and practical skills fosters comprehensive development. Emphasizing critical thinking equips officers to handle unpredictable situations, whereas fostering communication and teamwork mirrors the collaborative nature of police work. Reflective practice encourages continuous improvement, and supportive learning environments enhance student confidence and competence. Memory and retention strategies also play an essential role in ensuring that the knowledge and skills acquired during training are retained and effectively applied in professional settings. By integrating these types of training with retention practices, police training programs can ensure that their trainees are well-rounded, prepared, and ready to face the complexities of policing.

3. The Kirkpatrick Model

The changing landscape of society requires law enforcement to adapt training and support ongoing learning throughout officers' careers (Finkel, 2020). New approaches to policing are developed to address current issues as older techniques are abandoned or revised (Kratcoski & Kratcoski, 2021), and evolving diversity, equity, and community organization skills are implemented (Birzer, 2003). To maximize learning outcomes amidst these changes, continuous evaluation of curriculum content and teaching methods is necessary (Yang, 2023).

The Kirkpatrick Model is a leading structured framework to evaluate workplace training by analyzing curriculum interventions, learner responses, and knowledge retention (Paull et al., 2016). Praised by many organizations from a wide range of fields, it is a “simple and fairly accurate way to measure the effectiveness of adult learning events (La Duke, 2017); the “most widely utilized training evaluation model in private and governmental sectors around the world” (Yaqoot et al., 2021); and the “worldwide standard” or “chosen paradigm” for evaluating training effectiveness (Kirkpatrick Partners, 2017; Nik Nazli et al., 2022).

The Kirkpatrick Model acts as a roadmap that incorporates evaluative measures from the start to gather evidence about the value of learning activities throughout the program (DeSilets, 2018). It also measures knowledge more than once in its evaluation (Steensma & Groeneveld, 2010), allowing for a stronger understanding of how individual behaviours may be affected by the training. Training can be simplified to two factors: the processing of information by the learner, and the active application of the training in the field (Steensma & Groeneveld, 2010). Measures for reactions and learning (levels 1 and 2) assess the internal validity of the training, or the direct impacts of training on the individuals' attitudes, learning and skill retention (Andrade,

2018). Measures for behaviour and results (levels 3 and 4) assess the training's external validity, indicating how well those skills are applied to real-world situations and contexts (Berry, 1998).

Through outcomes analysis at four levels—reaction, learning, behaviour, and results—the Kirkpatrick Model can help determine how much information is lost during the transition from in-class learning to in-field practice (Kirkpatrick, 2007). The model allows for integration of multiple data collection and interpretation strategies depending on the context in which its being used (Paull et al., 2016) and the level of analysis. For example, the first level can be most effectively measured through surveys, questionnaires or interviews to obtain first-hand input from trainees. Both qualitative and quantitative measures can be utilized at each level, either measuring learners' performance or knowledge before and after training, or by comparing a training group with a control (non-training) group (Kirkpatrick, 2007).

Analysis at the reaction level (level one) highlights engagement: the learners' perspectives provide valuable insight into how the training is perceived while also valuing their input and suggestions for improvement. Engagement with the material leads to improved retention, reducing the likelihood of skills being forgotten due to lack of opportunity for application (Engel et al., 2020). The degree to which a learner enjoys and values their training strongly correlates with how much the learner retains (La Duke, 2017). However, this level of analysis should go further than simply whether the learners liked the training or not. To receive tangible feedback, this stage should concentrate on learners' reactions to course content, the physical learning environment, and the instructor's presentation skills (La Duke, 2017).

The learning level (level 2) analyzes the extent to which learning occurred by measuring learners' knowledge retention, skill-building, and overall attitude (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2005). Adult learners tend to focus more on content that is relevant to their careers, draws from

prior experiences, and involves problem-solving strategies (Herrmann et al., 2022). By utilizing andragogical learning techniques, knowledge transfer is more effective, and skill retention is greater and longer lasting (Gitterman, 2004). This level helps determine if current teaching methods sufficiently and effectively address the skills needed for officers and highlights subject areas that may need further clarification or elaboration (Peace, 2006).

Transferring learning to behaviour is often the most challenging and important part of training (Kirkpatrick, 2005). The behaviour level (level 3) measures the extent of behavioural change because of the training. Training curricula should prioritize the skills and knowledge used most in the field because overwhelming learners with too much material can obscure key takeaways (Herrmann et al., 2022). Resistance to change, apathy, or disinterest from officers are common barriers to organizational change within police services, but they can be overcome by increasing organizational support and access to resources, encouraging leadership, and improving public service motivation (Homberg, 2016). Level 3 evaluates officers' actions in service and the extent to which they utilize their training or adapt to new policies or procedures.

Analysis at the results level (level 4) determines the overall impacts of training by measuring performance before and after training (Smidt et al, 2009), which can also help identify any unintended consequences. For example, by looking at overall impacts of training programs on the community, officer performance and morale, and the organization itself, training can be adapted and developed to fit the needs of the community while maximizing efficiency and employee satisfaction.

Depending on available resources, many organizations restrict training evaluation to the reaction level (level one). The reaction level is a necessary first step to gain feedback and determine employee satisfaction with the training, but it is insufficient on its own as it fails to

provide the information needed to establish a causal link between training and long-term outcomes (Steensma & Groeneveld, 2010).

The real-world implications of police training and conduct are serious, as officers often respond to potentially dangerous situations, and an officer's core competencies can be the difference between safety and injury. While other types of organizations may choose to omit the latter half of the Kirkpatrick model levels, all four levels of the model are necessary. By using the Kirkpatrick model, training efficacy can be evaluated within the context of law enforcement to identify critical safety points (La Duke, 2017), particularly through analysis at the behaviour and results levels. Expanding on reactions (level 1), levels 2 and 3 evaluate if training fulfilled expectations, while level 4 analyses long-term impacts for officers and their communities (Steensma & Groeneveld, 2010).

Much of the literature reviewed for this report supports the use of the Kirkpatrick Model for analyzing training outcomes in fields like law enforcement, nursing, and psychiatry, which involve high-risk situations with the public that need high levels of response competency (Engel et al., 2020; Herrmann et al., 2022; LaDuke, 2017; White & Helsop, 2012). While traditional police training models focused on incident response, newer models focus on crime prevention, community involvement, problem-solving, and de-escalation (Chappell, 2008). The Kirkpatrick Model is valuable as it evaluates training related to these skills at multiple levels to allow for a stronger understanding of exactly which areas may be underprioritized in current training programs (Steensma & Groeneveld, 2010). It is highly recommended that this approach be integrated more frequently for organizational change, training and development (Pfeffer & Sutton, 2006).

Conclusion

In police education, both the educational content and instructors' approaches for officers to learn are best designed through evidence-based decisions. The literature is clear that successful adult education must enable learner ownership and deep engagement to facilitate meaningful behaviour change with a lasting impact. Motivated and accountable self-directed learning, even within curriculum, can be achieved through several ways, including personalized, interactive, and collaborative forms of learning, integrating technology, and supplementary memory and retention strategies. However, police forces are not made up of homogenous learners, which is why a wide variety of methods and a conscious effort to meet the student where they are at must be applied.

To best understand what content and which ways of officer learning should be prioritized in a training program, continuous evaluation is required. This both allows underprioritized areas to be identified based on the actual impact in the community and further connects to officer buy-in for their own continued education. Evaluation requires robust work and, particularly when resources may be limited, strategic focus. As suggested by the Kirkpatrick Model, many organizations only have the capacity or understanding for a level 1 review, which is insufficient. Returning to research and evidence-informed approaches can help apply level 3 and 4 evaluations with greater precision for deeper insights.

The scale of the challenge for the Toronto Police College to serve the needs of the Toronto Police Service and meet the provincial annual training requirements for police officers is far greater than the more than 5,000 officers who attend the IST training each year. Nevertheless, our initial examination of the IST and the training taking place at the college shows that this work is being undertaken with a clear and thoughtful approach that employs many of the best

available practices to meet the needs of TPS officers. Our future works will further identify strengths in their approach, opportunities for growth and improvement, and the impact of new training approaches when those skills are deployed on the road.

General Overview of 2024 In-Service Training (IST)

Constables, Sergeants, and Staff Sergeants with Toronto Police Service (TPS) are required to take part in annual In-Service Training (IST), which involves in-class and applied skills sessions at the Toronto Police College (TPC). The training is dispersed across three days whereby day 1 involves in-class sessions delivered in a lecture/seminar style format, and days 2 and 3 primarily include applied learning sessions which involve indoor, outdoor, and virtual dynamic simulation judgement training, defensive tactics training, and firearms, OC, and CEW training and re-certification/qualification. Module content is developed by IST instructors based on a wide range of supporting literature and materials, including relevant empirical research articles and books, independent reviews, and publications produced by government agencies and non-government or non-profit organizations, as well as current laws, and TPS policies and procedures. Starting in October, learning objectives, teaching points, and evaluation standards for each module are established and documented in lesson plans prior to commencing a new cycle of annual training each February.

The in-class modules addressed in the 2024 IST include Adverse Childhood Experiences, Centering Black Experiences, Indigenous Experiences, Intimate Partner Violence, Police Resiliency, the Incident Response Lecture, and Mental Health and Crisis Awareness. Notably,

some module topics, including Indigenous Experiences and Centering Black Experiences among others, appear to remain consistent year over year, although the content included in these modules is revised and updated annually. Other module topics, such as Adverse Childhood Experiences and Intimate Partner Violence (offered in 2024) and Peer Intervention and Right to Counsel (offered in 2023) change annually based on perceived needs, current crime trends, current social concerns, and recommendations from oversight bodies. As per the documented lesson plans, evaluation standards include knowledge checks, group activities and discussions, surveys, and instructor observation, debriefing, and feedback. Officers participating in the training are also required to write an exit exam on day 1 to assess learning.

As noted, days 2 and 3 of training primarily involve applied learning aspects. The indoor, outdoor, and virtual simulations are developed and revised by IST instructors based on the needs of the service, relevant societal concerns, and current crime trends in the city. For example, the 2024 outdoor dynamic simulation judgement training includes a carjacking as part of the scenario to reflect the increasing occurrence of this type of crime in the city. Similarly, the 2023 indoor dynamic simulation judgement training involved a threatened suicide wellness check for a person struggling with their gender identity, reflecting current societal concerns related to mental health and supporting the needs of the 2SLGBTQQIA community. This aspect of the training is intended to provide officers with an opportunity to apply the skills and strategies that are discussed on day 1 in a safe and supportive learning environment. Learner evaluation standards for the dynamic simulations primarily focus on confidence and competence, application of de-escalation strategies and appropriate tactical responses, and involve instructor observation and thorough verbal debriefing sessions with the learners. For firearms, OC, and CEW training learners receive a pass or fail based on TPS and provincial qualification standards. Additional

situational based exercises are incorporated into firearms training that are taught utilizing diagrams, video demonstrations, and instructor guided application. For defensive tactics training, IST instructors identify the skills and techniques to be reviewed and taught. Instructors utilize videos, step-by-step demonstration, and guided practice to assist officers in acquiring the necessary skills. Evaluation involves practical demonstration, instructor observation, and discussion and feedback. As noted in the executive summary, Toronto Police Service has partnered with Humber College to review the annual In-Service Training program briefly outlined above to support their efforts in pursuing excellence in police training.

Ethnographic Observations of In-Service Training

As part of this project, the research team from Humber College was invited to sit in and observe the three-day IST program. Observations took place in the spring and summer of 2024 and researchers utilized an observational checklist as a reference and guide when observing training (see appendix B). In developing the checklist, researchers consulted with educational development experts in the department of Innovative Learning at Humber College. The checklist includes eight general assessment areas, and the following seven dimensions are discussed below for this preliminary report: learning objectives and content, instructional design, engagement, real-world application, assessment and feedback, inclusion, and technology use.

Learning objectives and content	Includes criteria such as presentation of a clearly defined agenda, clear communication of learning objectives to learners, and a clear connection between the stated learning objectives and the content that is presented/included in the learning module.
Instructional design	Focuses on the structure and logical progression and sequencing of the course, as well as the clarity and format used to present the information.
Engagement	Addresses inclusion of interactive opportunities, class discussions, and opportunities to reinforce learning.
Real-world application	Focuses on the inclusion and presentation of applied examples, opportunities for learners to apply learning and to reflect on the content, skills, and strategies within real world contexts.

Assessment and feedback	Examines whether there are assessments in place to support learning, whether learners are provided with valuable and constructive feedback, and if learners have an opportunity to ask questions and seek clarification when needed.
Inclusion	Seeks to assess whether the content covered is culturally sensitive and meets the diverse learning needs of the individuals in the learning environment.
Technology	Addresses the use of technology in the learning environment, with a particular focus on addressing reliability, ease of use, and effectiveness of the application.

Four Humber researchers observed and recorded detailed reflections in each of these areas for all IST modules covered during the three-day training. The following represents a general summary of the observations. The final report is expected to be completed in late 2024/early 2025 and will include a more detailed overview of the ethnographic findings and empirically supported best practice recommendations.

Observational Reflections and Recommendations

Learning Objectives, Content, and Instructional Design

Both the civilian and officer instructors that are involved in teaching all aspects of IST appear to have extensive experience and knowledge in their respective areas of instruction. In-class learning modules which generally occur on day 1 of IST are primarily lecture based and include the use of PowerPoint slides, video clips, and some large and small group discussion.

There appeared to be good use of multiple instructional techniques on days 2 and 3 during the practical and scenario-based learning modules, which included verbal and visual demonstrations with videos and diagrams, physical demonstrations, and instructor supported drills. With very few exceptions, the learning objectives and expectations were clearly communicated to officers at the outset of the learning modules across all three days of training, although some instructors reviewed these objectives more thoroughly than others.

Toronto Police Service and the instructors at Toronto Police College work diligently to incorporate and address current societal concerns and issues when designing and facilitating IST. For example, instructors have included training in relation to intimate partner violence in the 2024 IST after observing a rise in cases over the past few years. After observing a rise in car hijackings across the city, instructors also incorporated a car hijacking element into the 2024 outdoor dynamic active shooter scenario. Owing to the extensive number of mental health related calls and incidences Toronto police officers are involved in, instructors focus heavily on teaching de-escalation techniques and strategies during both the in-class and practical/applied learning modules across days 1, 2, and 3 of IST training. There is also a continual focus and active effort to address and discuss bias and the systemic discrimination experienced by marginalized communities through the Indigenous Experiences and Centering Black Experiences modules covered each year during Day 1 of IST training. In previous years, IST learning modules and dynamic scenarios have also addressed the importance of peer intervention and supporting the 2SLGBTQQIA community.

There seems to be clear continuity of concepts addressed across the content areas covered during IST. For example, the concepts of trauma informed care, resiliency, and adverse childhood experiences were highlighted during several learning modules across all three days of

IST. There is also repeated reference to specific strategies and models' officers are encouraged to use when involved in situations that require de-escalation, both during training and in the field. These strategies appear to be addressed year over year and across multiple learning modules throughout the 3 days of training. For example, the five stages of intervention REACT model (recognize, evaluate, action, compassion, talk) was highlighted across multiple learning modules, as were the IRPD formula (issue a validation statement, refer to law, policy, rule, or standard, propose a choice, describe the desirable outcome), and Behavioural Influence Stairway model (MORE PIES; minimal encouragers, open ended questions, mirroring/reflecting, emotional labelling, paraphrase, I messages, effective pauses, summary)

Instructors across all three days of IST training also make repeated references to available community and social services and resources officers can connect with for referrals and supports. While some services are culturally responsive and specific to particular communities (i.e., Native Women's Resource Centre of Toronto, RITES for Black and African-Canadian Youth), others are available to diverse communities (i.e., Toronto Community Crisis Services, the Community Asset Portal, FOCUS Toronto).

Instructors appear to make a considerable effort to cultivate a safe and positive learning environment to help bolster officer confidence. Particularly on days 2 and 3 of IST, the instructors model active engagement and appear heavily invested in and passionate about the importance of the material and skills being covered. It would be helpful for the modelling of active engagement and enthusiasm to extend more fully to the in-class components of IST, as this may assist in increasing officer engagement and buy in. Although, it is recognized that instructors may be trying to build connections and rapport with the learners in the room by

demonstrating empathy and acknowledging the learners' attitudes about engaging in required in-class training.

One of the most significant areas identified for potential consideration and revision in future iterations of IST centers around the amount of content covered during day 1 and in-class learning modules. All modules are allotted approximately 1 hour and 20 minutes of instructional time, but cover a very high number of ideas in each session. Including too much content requires instructors to move through the material too quickly, deliver content in a primarily lecture-style format that leads to passive learning, and leaves little time for processing, discussion, and active learning and engagement. It may be helpful to identify a few key points that are of most significance within each topic area and allow more time to review relevant materials, process video examples, and engage in applied learning activities and case study-based discussions.

It is also important to ensure that the module content is consistent with the module topic area. When the relevancy of the content to the topic is not inherently obvious, it would be helpful for instructors to spend some time to make the connections clear and explicit for the learners. For example, youth diversion procedures were covered during the Indigenous Experience's module. While the procedural information covered was extremely valuable to the officers and relevant for all youth, it would be helpful to clarify more explicitly why this information was included in this particular learning module.

Whereas officers in the learning environment appear to clearly identify the importance and job relevancy of the content covered on days 2 and 3 of IST (defensive tactics, firearms training and requalification, dynamic simulation training, etc.), this does not always appear to extend to the content addressed during the in-class components of IST. It may be helpful for

instructors to engage in clear and explicit discussion highlighting the continuity and relevancy of concepts covered on day 1 with respect to the applied training that occurs on days 2 and 3.

The classroom portion (versus the practical sessions) of the In-Service Training tends to be primarily lecture based. In most modules, there is little time given for the learners to actively engage in the material and process it in relation to their job. An exception to this is the module Centering Black Experience. This module does contain several opportunities for learners to critically reflect, discuss and report back on the material. It may be useful to identify strategies that emphasize the importance and personal relevance of the content taught in the classroom by drawing stronger connections between the content/concepts and the on-the-job experiences of the officers in the room. This may help bolster officer engagement as it highlights the relevancy and importance of the materials in the context of their day-to-day operations. Including additional discussion and activities that focus on applied skills, strategies, and techniques on Day 1 may also help in this regard.

Two of the modules (Crisis Intervention and Incident Response) did not provide the learners with learning outcomes, though a list of topics was presented by the instructor in the Crisis Intervention module. Without learning outcomes, learners may not focus on the key aspects of the module. Additionally, teaching strategies and evaluation methods should align with the learning outcomes. In several cases the verbs used in various learning outcomes (e.g. identify, interpret) did not align with the formative or summative assessments used in the module. This makes it difficult to ascertain if the officers are meeting the learning outcomes, and very difficult to evaluate their long-term retainment and implementation of the lessons of IST.

Engagement and Real-World Application

As days 2 and 3 of IST are primarily practical, application-based learning modules (i.e., defensive tactics, firearms training and re-qualification, dynamic scenario training, etc.) officer engagement and application of skills during these sessions is required and therefore extensive. Yet even with existing engagement, instructors continuously make an effort to further enhance engagement by encouraging rapport, identifying improvements based on officer suggestions from the previous year, and creating opportunities for new officer feedback. Eliciting active engagement and incorporating skill application during Day 1 and in-class learning modules is more challenging. Instructors appear to use a variety of techniques to increase learner engagement. For example, instructors often utilized Mentimeter, which is an online platform that allows officers to share responses with the larger group anonymously, to actively engage the learners. Instructors also incorporated video clips to demonstrate concepts, and several videos included TPS officers which helps to show job relevancy of the concepts being covered. Instructors also worked to incorporate relevant, real-world examples in the form of video clips and case studies to highlight the concepts being addressed in the learning module. Instructors frequently shared personal on the job experiences relevant to the module concepts being addressed in an effort to demonstrate job relevancy and to connect with the officers in the learning environment.

Future iterations of IST could work towards finding ways to incorporate additional opportunities for officer engagement and application. Doing so will increase active learning and decrease passive engagement which will promote better retention of the material and concepts addressed in the learning environment. This may involve incorporating more opportunities for reflection and large and small group-based discussions utilizing concept relevant videos or case

studies. Asking officers to share, discuss, and/or reflect on personal on-the-job experiences relevant to the concepts being covered may also be beneficial. This can be done in small groups, or independently. Having officers engage in small group activities that promote critical thinking and application of concepts more frequently would also help with retention of the learning materials. Reducing the amount of content covered during each in-class learning module may be necessary to allow for more time to devote to engagement and application.

It was noted that the officers in the learning environment did not have notebooks or laptops and were not actively taking notes. It would be helpful if the officers were provided with copies of the slides for each in-class learning module. Providing officers with access to this information will allow them to reference the strategies, skills, and resources covered during IST when they are back in the field. It is particularly important that the officers be provided with easily accessible information about the social and community services and resources that are continually outlined for them throughout the three days of IST training.

Assessment and Feedback

Regarding assessment and feedback, IST instructors appear to provide immediate, relevant, and thorough feedback to officers throughout the day 2 and 3 practical applied learning modules (i.e., dynamic simulation training). The assessment and feedback process used during the dynamic scenario training gives officers an opportunity to explain their actions and promotes immediate reflection on their behavioural choices during the applied scenarios. There also appears to be ongoing one-on-one feedback and assessment that occurs during defensive tactics training. Officers seem to be responsive to the feedback received during the practical and applied components of IST that occur on Days 2 and 3. Whereas assessment of officer performance in

the dynamic simulation scenario training is more subjective in nature, evaluation for other training aspects such as the firearms re-qualification is standardized and results in a pass or failure. When officers have not met the standard, they are required to participate in remedial training and re-testing to demonstrate the required skills and core competencies.

Instructors have made efforts to incorporate opportunities to provide informal feedback to officers during Day 1 and in-class learning modules as well. This appeared to occur during the infrequent small and large group-based discussions where officers shared their thoughts and reflection in relation to questions, cases studies, and video clips. Incorporating additional opportunities for informal feedback during in-class learning modules would be beneficial to enhance self-reflection and retention of the material. As previously noted, reducing the amount of information covered during each in-class learning module may be one strategy to permit more time for discussion, reflection, and feedback.

The primary method of assessment for the Day 1 in-class learning modules is the exit test. The exit test is available for officers to complete online, and learners appear to be given access to the test before they have completed all learning modules. Setting aside time for officers to complete the exit test at the end of the day after they have engaged with all learning modules would be optimal. It was also noted that the mental health and crisis intervention in-class session typically occurs on day 2 or 3. This in-class session includes important and job relevant content that could also be included in the exit test. During in-class learning modules, instructors often give officers direction about what content will appear on the exit exam. While this approach helps to target attention and memorization of small and specific pieces of information, resulting in higher test scores, it can also inhibit deeper learning which is important in terms of impacting long-term behavioural change.

Inclusion and Technology

As previously noted, across all three days of IST training, instructors have incorporated the use of various types of technology including PowerPoint slides, video demonstrations, QR codes to disseminate information, and interactive software such as Mentimeter to allow for anonymous engagement. The videos used appear to be culturally diverse, however it would be helpful to consistently include closed captioning when displaying videos, particularly in the in-class setting.

Recommendation Mapping and Connection to Teaching

Method

The Toronto Police Service provided a list of recommendations taken from various reports dating between 1999 and 2022. The recommendations focused on creating strategies and tools to evaluate the effectiveness of training, which will be included in the larger project. As a preparatory step, we aligned these recommendations with the content for the 2024 version of In-Service Training. The initial focus was a review of the learning outcomes, teaching strategies and observed methods of evaluation for each module to determine how well they aligned with each other.

Teaching Strategies

Each module has between four and seven learning outcomes (LOs). The learning verbs used in the LOs include: define, explain, recognize, describe, identify, cultivating, explore, learn, utilize, apply, interpret, demonstrate, understand, define, know, and list. These verbs do not always appear to align with how the material is assessed (in both formative and summative evaluations). Most often the material was presented in lecture format without time for learners to process the material. The significant volume of information presented seemed to be the contributing factor for this teaching strategy.

Given the limited amount of time available, and the substantial content included in the presentations, it might be beneficial for key LOs to be identified and become the focus of learning and evaluation. Those learning outcomes should reflect the key knowledge, skills, or attitudes that officers should be able to demonstrate after IST. The learning verbs used should also align with formative and summative evaluations, and teaching strategies. As an example, if

officers are required to “apply” specific knowledge, the teaching method/learning strategy should include the opportunity for them to do this (E.g. case studies, group discussions, self-reflection, etc.).

Evaluation Methods

The module *Centering Black Experience* requires the learners to work in table groups to process and apply the material in relation to scenario-based questions. This type of learner engagement best supported the learning outcomes, which included learning verbs such as “demonstrate” and “utilize strategies”. Of note, a recommendation from the 2017 inquest into the death of Andrew Loku suggested that training in anti-black racism include both a written and oral exam. All table groups were required to present their answers to the class, and questions from this module were included on the exam. These evaluation strategies meet the suggestions in the recommendation.

The other classroom-based modules tended to focus primarily on lecture style information sharing with limited opportunity for the learners to engage and show that they understood the relationship of the information to their role. The significant amount of information presented may be hindering the ability for learners to engage with the material. These modules seem to have been solely assessed on the multiple-choice exam that learners completed on their phones during day one. The exam was presented to the learners prior to the completion of all modules. Learners were able to share answers to the questions, although this was not done in a formal way.

Information sharing without learner application does not give learners the opportunity to demonstrate how they could or would apply the information when they are in the field.

Additionally, knowledge-based questions in multiple-choice format do not provide a means of evaluating application of knowledge. Evaluating how officers apply training in the field is a consistent suggestion in the recommendations. Creating key LOs and aligning teaching strategies and evaluation methods would provide a deeper learning experience and may be a better indicator of how training will be applied in the field.

The learning outcomes in the *Dynamic Simulation Training* module seemed to mirror report recommendations most closely, in particular the call for training dealing with de-escalation, communication, people in crisis, and peer intervention. The instructors who participated as “actors” in the scenarios provided a consistent live scenario that responded to the learners’ interactions and behaviours. The instructors used the Course Training Standards as a guide for the de-brief sessions. Both the teaching and learning strategies supported a deeper learning process. Learners were required to demonstrate the required skills/knowledge and were assessed on that demonstration.

Qualitative and Quantitative Research: Feedback from In-Service Training Instructors

Phase one of this research initiative included active engagement with current IST instructors to assess their perspectives regarding IST andragogy, officer engagement, and effective transfer of learning when on the job or in the field. To this end, researchers conducted a quantitative survey and qualitative interviews with IST instructors in the spring and summer of 2024. The qualitative and quantitative data collection tools were developed to align with the Kirkpatrick model of training evaluation discussed in the introductory section of this report. Specifically, the interview and survey questions sought to elicit feedback from IST instructors regarding the effectiveness of IST, particularly with respect to the content covered, the teaching methods and approaches used, the learner evaluation and feedback strategies in place, and IST instructor perspectives regarding learner engagement, transfer of learning, and IST's alignment with TPS's overall mission, vision, and values. IST instructors are uniquely positioned to provide invaluable and informative feedback regarding the aspects of IST that are working well, that resonate with officers during training, and that illicit a high degree of officer engagement. Instructors are also able to provide useful insights into the areas of IST that are more challenging to develop and to promote officer engagement, and to provide suggestions and strategies to increase officer engagement with the learning materials, and to encourage and evaluate application of acquired attitudes, skills, and core competencies while on the job.

Method

Participant Recruitment

Participants for both the interviews and the questionnaire were recruited via email. A recruitment script approved by the Humber research ethics board was provided to contact persons at the Toronto Police College. The research involvement request was disseminated to IST instructors by the Training Standards Lead at Toronto Police College and recruitment efforts were further supported by section heads involved with IST. The research protocol was approved by the Humber research ethics board and data collection took place in the spring and summer of 2024. All participants provided informed consent and were provided with debriefing forms containing the contact information of the Humber researchers involved with the project. Quantitative data was collected utilizing Qualtrics, and qualitative interview data was audio recorded when consent was provided. Interview notes were recorded manually when consent for audio recording was not provided.

Qualitative Data Collection

The qualitative data collection involved semi-structured interviews with IST instructors at Toronto Police College. The interview protocol included 12 questions along with a series of probes to elicit the desired information from participants (see appendix C). Each interview took approximately 60 minutes. The general areas of discussion included IST content, teaching strategies, and methods of learner evaluation. Interviewees were asked to provide their opinions and insights regarding the strengths and areas for improvement in each of the aforementioned areas. Interviewees were also asked to discuss learner engagement strategies, perceived transfer of learning, and awareness of, or recommendations for, systems or processes designed to

encourage application of IST knowledge and skills while on the job. Finally, IST instructors were also asked to reflect on how IST training improves job performance and officer responsiveness to the needs of the community.

Members of the research team are also working towards developing a protocol to be used in follow-up interviews with individuals in supervisory roles at Toronto Police College to obtain a better understanding of the policies and procedures that guide the development of the IST program.

Quantitative Data Collection

The IST instructor survey included 55 questions, divided into four sections (see appendix D). Section one asked participants to consider the in-class sessions of IST (i.e., Peer Intervention, Adverse Childhood Experiences, Centering Black Experiences, Indigenous Experiences, etc.). It included three subscales designed to align with levels 1, 2, and 3 of the Kirkpatrick model of training evaluation. Subscale 1 examined officer satisfaction, engagement, and job relevancy (6 items), subscale 2 assessed officer learning and attitudes, and confidence and commitment (6 items), and subscale 3 evaluated perceived transfer of learning (6 items). Section two asked participants to consider the applied learning components of IST (i.e., dynamic simulation judgement training, defensive tactics, firearms and CEW training and re-qualification) and incorporated the same three subscales included in section one. Section three includes nine items and was designed to assess level 4 of the Kirkpatrick model of training evaluation by examining the overall impact of IST in relation to the TPS mission, vision, and values. Participants were asked to respond to all items in section one, two, and three on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Descriptive statistics for individual items will be

analysed, and total scores will be computed for each subscale to reflect over all scores for each level of the Kirkpatrick model of training evaluation. Higher scores for both individual items, and for total computed scores will be indicative of better and more effective training. Lower scores will help to identify areas for improvement. Section four of the questionnaire included demographic items such as age, sex, gender, race, years of service with TPS and TPC, and which IST training modules the participants were involved with.

Proposed Timeline for Data Analysis and Compilation of Results

At the time of writing, the data collection for phase one is ongoing. Quantitative data will be analyzed using IBM SPSS statistical software and qualitative data will likely be transcribed utilizing Amazon Web Transcribe Medical transcription software and analysed using Nvivo qualitative data analysis software. Data analysis is expected to be completed in the fall academic term of 2024 (September to December), and a final report outlining the findings of phase one of this project is expected to be available by the end of 2024.

Continuation of Research

IST Review: Phase 2 Overview

Phase two of the IST review is expected to begin in the Fall of 2024. The research team will work towards developing a multimethod research design that aligns with the Kirkpatrick model of training evaluation and the primary focus is on assessing IST training effectiveness and transfer of learning from the officer's perspective. Quantitative questionnaires will be developed to assess content delivered across all three days of IST and will seek to examine the application of skills taught during both the in-class and applied learning components of IST. Members of the Humber research team will collaborate with IST instructors to ensure that the most relevant and important content and the core skills and competencies are addressed in the questionnaires, with the aim of developing tools that can be administered by TPS on an ongoing basis. The research team will work towards obtaining research ethics board approval from Humber college once the research protocol has been developed. A preliminary pilot survey will be conducted and analysed in late 2024/early 2025, prior to launching the finalized phase 2 data collection measures with the 2025 IST cohort. Ideally phase 2 quantitative data collection will occur when officers attend IST sessions and will be ongoing for a period of 6 to 7 months.

The qualitative component of phase 2 will involve interviews, and potentially focus groups, with officers in the 2025 IST cohort. Interview and focus group protocols will be developed in the Fall of 2024 and members of the Humber research team will once again work collaboratively with IST instructors to ensure the most pertinent topic areas are addressed during the data collection process. Phase 2 qualitative data collection will begin early 2025 and be ongoing throughout the spring and summer. Phase 2 qualitative and quantitative data analysis

will be conducted in the Fall and Winter of 2025 with the aim of having a final phase 2 report compiled late 2025, early 2026.

IST Review: Phase 3 Overview

Toronto Police Service has expressed the importance of including community voices when conducting training evaluations. As such, phase 3 will involve focus groups and/or round table discussions with various Toronto community groups. The Humber research team will work collaboratively with TPS staff to identify the most important and relevant points of discussion in relation to training and to develop connections with appropriate community groups. The primary aim is to explore whether the impact of training is being observed at the community level. The Humber research team will also use TPS data (i.e., use of force statistics, number and nature of complaints and remedials, etc.) to explore the transfer of learning to on-the-job action.

In line with the Kirkpatrick model of training evaluation, phase 3 will also involve a review of policies, procedures, and systems that are currently in place to reinforce, encourage, and reward on the job application and demonstration of the critical attitudes and the core skills and competencies that are addressed during IST. To this end, members of the research team may also conduct interviews with officers in supervisory roles.

Phase 3 research design and protocol development is expected to take place in the spring of 2025 with data collection launching in the summer and ongoing into the Fall. Data analysis will take place late 2025/early 2026 and the projected completion date of the final phase 3 report is Spring of 2026.

Expanding Beyond In-Service Training

As the IST evaluation progresses and wraps up, the Humber research team will engage in discussions with TPS to identify additional training initiatives that may benefit from a more thorough review. Preliminary discussions suggest that recruit training may be one possible area for further training evaluation.

Scope of Work

At the time of writing, the action items listed below were included in the scope of work (SOW) that is currently under review by both Toronto Police Services and Humber College.

1. Review current in-service training modules
2. Use TPS data to explore the effectiveness of knowledge transfer of current in-service training modules on service member actions
3. Establish pre-and-post measures to assess service members attitudes towards, and self-assessment of, training effectiveness
4. Make recommendations for curriculum revision based on empirical findings
5. Review and measure the learning outcomes for specialized training (i.e. peer intervention)

Tentative Timeline

The tentative timeline included herein highlights deliverables that align with each SOW action item. Note that the timeline is flexible and subject to change based on organizational demands and resources.

- Jan – April 2024
 - Develop measures and research protocol for Phase 1
 - Phase 2 REB approval
- May – June 2024
 - Begin Phase 1 data collection
- July - August 2024
 - **Preliminary Phase 1 Report (SOW 1, 4)**
 - Complete Phase 1 data collection
- September – December 2024
 - Phase 1 data analysis
 - **Phase 1 Final Report (SOW 1, 4)**
 - Develop measures and research protocol for Phase 2
 - Phase 2 REB approval
 - Pilot phase 2 research tools with 2024 IST cohorts
 - Begin reviewing TPS data from 2023 Transfer of Learning Survey
- January – February 2025
 - **Preliminary Feedback based on pilot data for 2024 IST cohort (SOW 3, 5)**
 - Launch phase 2 quantitative data collection with 2025 IST cohorts
 - Launch phase 2 qualitative data collection
- March - April 2025
 - **Report based on data from the 2023 Transfer of learning survey conducted by TPS (SOW 2, 4)**
 - Ongoing phase 2 data collection
- May – June 2025
 - Develop research protocol and measurement tools for Phase 3
 - Phase 3 REB approval
 - Ongoing phase 2 data collection
- July – August 2025
 - Launch phase 3 data collection
 - Begin phase 2 data analysis
 - **Phase 2 & 3 Progress Report (SOW 2, 3, 4, 5)**

- September – December 2025
 - Begin process of identifying additional opportunities for training evaluation (i.e., recruit training)
 - Begin phase 3 data analysis
 - Complete phase 2 data analysis
 - **Phase 2 Final Report (SOW 3, 4, 5)**
- January – April 2026
 - Complete phase 3 data analysis
 - **Phase 3 Final Report (SOW 2, 3, 4, 5)**
 - Develop research protocols for additional training evaluations
- May 2026 – December 2026
 - Continue work on additional training evaluation areas
- January 2027 – December 2028
 - Continue work on additional training evaluation areas.

References

- Alla, X. (2024). Lifelong learning. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research and Development*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.56345/ijrdv11n105>
- Alsop, A. (2013). Lifelong learning and continuing professional development. *Continuing professional development in health and social care*, 1-11.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118782859.ch1>
- Andrade, C. (2018). Internal, external, and ecological validity in research design, conduct, and evaluation. *Indian Journal of Psychological Medicine*, 40(5), 498-499.
https://doi.org/10.4103/IJPSYM.IJPSYM_334_18
- Beers, G. W., & Bowden, S. (2005). The effect of teaching method on long-term knowledge retention. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 44(11), 511-514.
<https://doi.org/10.3928/01484834-20051101-07>
- Bennell, C., Blaskovits, B., Jenkins, B., Semple, T., Khanizadeh, A.-J., Brown, A. S., & Jones, N. J. (2021). Promising practices for de-escalation and use-of-force training in the police setting: A narrative review. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 44(3), 377-404. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PIJPSM-06-2020-0092>
- Bergman, B. (2017). Reflexivity in police education: Voices of Swedish police officers on field training of probationers. *Nordisk Politiforskning*, 4(1), 68-88.
<https://doi.org/10.18261/issn.1894-8693-2017-01-06>
- Berry, J. W. (1998). Acculturation and health. *Cultural clinical psychology: Theory, research, and practice*, 39-57. Oxford University Press. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1998-07553-002>

- Birzer, M. L. (2003). The theory of andragogy applied to police training. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 26(1), 29-42.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/13639510310460288>
- Blumberg, D. M., Schlosser, M. D., Papazoglou, K., Creighton, S., & Kaye, C. C. (2019). New directions in police academy training: A call to action. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16(24), 4941. <https://www.mdpi.com/1660-4601/16/24/4941>
- Boivin, R. & Lagace, M. (2016). Police use-of-force situations in Canada: Analyzing the force or resistance ratio using trichotomous dependent variable. *Police Quarterly*, 19(2), 180-198.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1098611115613953>
- Butler, J.M. (2020). *A multi-method investigation of police defensive tactics training using a social cognitive framework* [Dissertation]. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Available from Nursing & Allied Health Premium; ProQuest Central.
<https://www.proquest.com/docview/2595065878/fulltextPDF/F38CEFE274CF4608PQ/1?%20Theses&accountid=11530&sourcetype=Dissertations%20>
- Campbell, T. (2024). Black Lives Matter's effect on police lethal use of force. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 141, 103587. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jue.2023.103587>
- Chappell, A. T. (2008). Police academy training: Comparing across curricula. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 31(1), 36-56.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/13639510810852567>
- Chew, M., Das, P., Aujla, M., & Horton, R. (2021). Advancing racial and ethnic equity in science, medicine, and health: A call for papers. *The Lancet*, 398(10308), 1287-1289.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(21\)02095-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)02095-X)

- Christmas, R. (2013). *Canadian policing in the 21st century: A frontline officer on challenges and changes*. McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Clardy, A. (2005). Andragogy: Adult learning and education at its best? Education Resources Information Center. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED492132.pdf>
- Cohen, G. (2022). In pursuit of police ethics: An analysis of ethics content and state-mandated basic police training curricula. *Public Integrity*, 24(3), 292-305.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10999922.2021.1933340>
- Coleman, T. and Cotton, D. (2014). TEMPO: Police interactions, a report towards improving interactions between police and people living with mental health problems. Mental Health Commission of Canada. <https://mentalhealthcommission.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/TEMPO-Police-Interactions-082014.pdf>
- Constantakis, P. (2016). Integrating digital tools for adult learners: Four critical factors. Digital Promise. https://digitalpromise.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/dp-integrating_digital_tools.pdf
- Davis, K. (2014). Minimum training doesn't create competence. *Officer.com*,
<https://www.proquest.com/trade-journals/minimum-training-doesnt-create-competence/docview/1550576217/se-2>
- Delattre, E. J. (1996). *Character and cops: Ethics in policing*. American Enterprise Institute.
<https://books.google.ca/books?hl=en&lr=&id=29wECCW3mtsC&oi=fnd&pg=PR13&dq=delattre+1996+ethics&ots=cQEDwxdBhN&sig=qKFgdZ5YJ--ruaQJxUdussZ7e-U#v=onepage&q=delattre%201996%20ethics&f=false>

- DeMonte, J. (2018). Micro-credentials for teachers: What three early adopter states have learned so far. American Institutes for Research.
<https://www.air.org/sites/default/files/downloads/report/Micro-Creditals-for-Teachers-September-2017.pdf>
- Desilets, L. D. (2018). An update on Kirkpatrick's model of evaluation: Part two. *The Journal of Continuing Education in Nursing*, 49(7), 292-293. <https://doi.org/10.3928/00220124-20180613-02>
- Dirkx, J. M. (1998). Transformative learning theory in the practice of adult education: An Overview. *PAACE Journal of Lifelong Learning*, 7, 1-14.
<https://skat.ihmc.us/rid=1LW068032-1XZRLTS-1Z5M/Copy%20of%20Dirkx%20article%20on%20Transformative%20Learning.pdf>
- Dubé, P. (2016). A matter of life and death: Investigation into the direction provided by the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services to Ontario's Police Services for de-escalation of conflict situations. Ontario Ombudsman.
https://www.ombudsman.on.ca/Files/sitemedia/Documents/OntarioOmbudsmanDeescalationEN_1.pdf
- Ellifritz, G. (2012). Police defensive tactics training: Are officers getting enough? *Active Response Training*. Retrieved from <http://www.activeresponsetraining.net>
- Engel, R. S., McManus, H. D., & Herold, T. D. (2020). Does de-escalation training work?: A systematic review and call for evidence in police use-of-force reform. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 19(3), 721-759. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12467>

- Farokhi, M. R., English, D. K., Boone, S. L., & Amaechi, B. T. (2023). Health professions learners' evaluation of e-learning scenario-based case study design: Reinvigorating flipped classroom modalities. *Journal of Dental Education*, 87(12), 1754-1765.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/jdd.13379>
- Finkel, E. (2021). Police reforms begin with training. *Community College Journal*, 91(3), 16.
<https://www.ccdaily.com/2021/01/police-reforms-begin-with-training/>
- Fischetti, F., & Greco, G. (2017). Multilateral training as an innovative didactic method to support continuous education in police. *Form@re*, 17(3), 303.
<https://doi.org/10.13128/formare-20801>
- Fuller, D., Lamb, H., Biasotti, M. & Snook, J. (2016). Overlooked in the undercounted: The role of mental illness in fatal law enforcement encounters. Treatment Advocacy Center: Office of Research and Public Affairs. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.1.1655.9128
- Geier, C. S., & Bogner, F. X. (2010). Student-centered anti-smoking education: Comparing a classroom-based and an out-of-school setting. *Learning Environments Research*, 13, 147-157. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-010-9069-4>
- Gitterman, A. (2004). Interactive andragogy: Principles, methods, and skills. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, 24(3-4), 95-112. https://doi.org/10.1300/J067v24n03_07
- Giwa, S. (2018). Community policing in racialized communities: A potential role for police social work. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 28(6), 710-730.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10911359.2018.1456998>
- Glenn, R.W. (2003). *Training the 21st century police officer: Redefining police professionalism for the Los Angeles Police Department*. RAND Public Safety & Justice.

- González, J. L., Castillo, B. S., Pauca, M. J., & Chávez, M. del. (2022). Educational technology applied to adult education. *International Journal of Health Sciences*, 6(S1), 142-148.
<https://doi.org/10.53730/ijhs.v6ns1.4758>
- Hallett N, Duxbury J, McKee T, Harrison N, Haines A, Craig E, O'Brien AJ (2021). Taser use on individuals experiencing mental distress: An integrative literature review. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing*, 28(1), 56-71. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpm.12594>
- Herrmann, L. E., Jones, Y. O., Kinnear, B., Rule, A., Piper, L., Shah, S. S., & Klein, M. (2022). Development and evaluation of a pediatric hospital medicine board review course. *BMC Medical Education*, 22(1), 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-022-03862-1>
- Homberg, F., Vogel, R., & Weiherl, J. (2019). Public service motivation and continuous organizational change: Taking charge behaviour at police services. *Public Administration (London)*, 97(1), 28-47. <https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12354>
- Hughey, J. (2020). Individual personalized learning. *Educational Considerations*, 46(2).
<https://doi.org/10.4148/0146-9282.2237>
- Hyland, S., Langton, L., & Davis, E. J. (2015). Police use of nonfatal force, 2002-11. US Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Inverso, D. C., Kobrin, J., & Hashmi, S. (2017). Leveraging technology in adult education. Literacy New York.
<https://www.literacynewyork.org/documents/Leveraging%20Technology%20in%20Adult%20Education%20Summer%202017.pdf>
- James, S., Fridell, L., & Jennings, W. (Eds.). (2021). *Police training*. Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/humber/detail.action?docID=6680456>.

- Johnson, T. A., & Cox, R. W. (2004). Police ethics: Organizational implications. *Public Integrity*, 7(1), 67-79. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10999922.2004.11051270>
- Justice Institute of British Columbia. (2009). *POLADV687 - School liaison officer*.
<http://learning.jibc.ca/TP2005/tp2000web.dll/Public%20Course/COURSENO=COUR2001062814002903408453>
- Kaminski, R. J., & Martin, J. A. (2000). An analysis of police officer satisfaction with defense and control tactics. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 23(2), 132-153. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13639510010333697>
- Kesic D, Thomas SDM, Ogloff JRP (2013). Estimated rates of mental disorders in, and situational characteristics of, incidents of nonfatal use of force by police. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 48, 225-232. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-012-0543-4>
- Kirkpatrick, D., & Kirkpatrick, J. (2005). *Transferring learning to behavior: Using the four levels to improve performance*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Kirkpatrick, D.L. (2007). *The four levels of evaluation*. The American Society for Training & Development. <https://learning.oreilly.com/library/view/four-levels-of/9781562864842/cover.xhtml>
- Kirkpatrick, J. & Kayser-Kirkpatrick, W. (2015). An introduction to the new world Kirkpatrick model. Kirkpatrick Partners Newnan, GA. <https://www.kirkpatrickpartners.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Introduction-to-The-New-World-Kirkpatrick%C2%AE-Model.pdf>
- Kirkpatrick Partners. (2024). *What is the Kirkpatrick model?*
<https://www.kirkpatrickpartners.com/the-kirkpatrick-model/>

Knowles, M. S. (1970). The modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to andragogy.

Semantic Scholar.

<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/8948/296248bbf58415cbd21b36a3e4b37b9c08b1.pdf>

Kolb, D. A., Boyatzis, R. E., & Mainemelis, C. (1999). Experiential learning theory: Previous research and new directions. *Perspectives on thinking, learning, and cognitive styles*.

<https://learningfromexperience.com/downloads/research-library/experiential-learning-theory.pdf>

Kordaczuk-Wąs, M., & Sosnowski, S. (2011). Police in-service training and self-education in Poland. *Police Practice & Research*, 12(4), 317-324.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/15614263.2011.563967>

Kratcoski, P. C., & Kratcoski, P. C. (2017). *Correctional counseling and treatment*. Springer International Publishing.

Kratcoski, P.C., & Kratcoski, P.C. (2021). *Experiential education and training for employment in justice occupations*. Springer International Publishing.

La Duke, P. (2017). How to evaluate training: Using the Kirkpatrick model. *Professional Safety*, 62(8), 20-21. <https://ezproxy.humber.ca/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/how-evaluate-training-using-kirkpatrick-model/docview/1928996197/se-2>

Lateef, F. (2010). Simulation-based learning: Just like the real thing. *Journal of Emergencies, Trauma, and Shock*, (4),48-352. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0974-2700.70743>

Lavoie, J., Alvarez, N., Baker, V., & Kohl, J. (2023, October 31). Training police to de-escalate mental health crisis situations: Comparing virtual reality and live-action scenario-based approaches. OUP Academic.

<https://academic.oup.com/policing/article/doi/10.1093/police/paad069/7334458>

- Lavoie, J. A. A., Alvarez, N., & Kandil, Y. (2022). Developing community co-designed scenario-based training for police mental health crisis response: A relational policing approach to de-escalation. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, 37(3), 587-601.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11896-022-09500-2>
- Lee, H., Jang, H., Yun, I., Lim, H., & Tushaus, D. W. (2010). An examination of police use of force utilizing police training and neighborhood contextual factors: A multilevel analysis. *Policing*, 33(4), 681-702. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13639511011085088>
- Lemmetty, S., Hämäläinen, K., & Collin, K. (2023). Adult learners in police and technology work in Finland: Andragogical features behind learning at work. *Australian Journal of Adult Learning*, 63(3), 298-423.
<https://ezproxy.humber.ca/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/adult-learners-police-technology-work-finland/docview/2903935079/se-2?accountid=11530>
- Lettic, S. (2015). *Problem based learning (PBL) in police training: An evaluation of the recruit experience* (Doctoral dissertation, Capella University).
<https://www.proquest.com/docview/1738989821?pq-origsite=gscholar&fromopenview=true&sourcetype=Dissertations%20&%20Theses>
- Litmanovitz, Y. (2016). *Moving towards an evidence-base of democratic police training: the development and evaluation of a complex social intervention in the Israeli border police* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oxford). <https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:168d66e3-5a50-4e85-bde6-577fe6ffe23e>
- Lloyd-Smith, L. (2010). Exploring the Advantages of Blended Instruction at Community Colleges and Technical Schools. *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, 6(2). https://jolt.merlot.org/vol6no2/lloyd-smith_0610.pdf

- Maesschalck, J. (2004). The impact of new public management reforms on public servants' ethics: Towards a theory. *Public administration*, 82(2), 465-489.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10999922.2004.11051267>
- Manning, P. K. (2010). *Policing contingencies*. University of Chicago Press.
- Marcus, N., & Stergiopoulos, V. (2022). Re-examining mental health crisis intervention: A rapid review comparing outcomes across police, co-responder and non-police models. *Health & Social Care in the Community*, 30(5), 1665-1679. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hsc.13731>
- Martinez, M. (2002). What is personalized learning? The Learning Guild.
<https://www.learningguild.com/pdf/2/050702dss-h.pdf>
- McClusky, Illeris, & Jarvis. (2014). Knowles's andragogy and models of adult learning.
https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Knowles%E2%80%99s-Andragogy%2C-and-Models-of-Adult-Learning/7044e5c0d5622fe07b0a4786c781b55a78e27d66?utm_source=direct_link
- McLeod, S. (2017, October). Kolb's learning styles & experiential learning cycle. Simply Psychology. <https://www.simplypsychology.org/learning-kolb.html>
- Mezirow, J. (2009). An overview on transformative learning. *Contemporary theories of learning: Learning theorists... in their own words*.
https://www.normfriesen.info/files/Mezirows_overview_transformative.pdf
- Mijares, T. C., & Wall, M. L. (2012). *Training the SWAT trainer: legal mandates and practical suggestions for improving police tactical performance*. Charles C Thomas.

Mikulecky, L., Albers, P., & Peers, M. (1994). Literacy transfer: A review of the literature.

University of Pennsylvania National Center on Adult Literacy.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/2545907_Literacy_transfer_A_review_of_the_literature

Mlambo, M., Silén, C., & McGrath, C. (2021). Lifelong learning and nurses' continuing professional development, a metasynthesis of the literature. *BMC Nursing*, 20(1).

<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-021-00579-2>

Moribito MS, Socia K, Wik A, Fisher WH (2017). The nature and extent of police use of force in encounters with people with behavioral health disorders. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 50, 31-37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlp.2016.10.001>

Newman, A. (2015, March). Learning for life: The opportunity for technology to transform adult education. Search Issue Lab. <https://search.issuelab.org/resource/learning-for-life-the-opportunity-for-technology-to-transform-adult-education-part-l-interest-in-and-aptitude-for-technology.html>

Nicholson, D. T. (2011). Embedding research in a field-based module through peer review and assessment for learning. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 35(4), 529-549. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03098265.2011.552104>

Nik Nazli, N.N.N., Hizam, S.M., Abu Hasan, N.N., & Abdullah, A.S. (2022). Theory of training effectiveness evaluation by Kirkpatrick: Background of theory. *The handbook for management theories*. Abrn Asia Publication.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/359578804_THEORY_OF_TRAINING_EFFECTIVENESS_EVALUATION_BY_KIRKPATRICK_Background_of_theory

- Nilson, L. (2010). *Teaching at its best: A research-based resource for college instructors* (3rd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Oliva, J.R. (2010). A practical overview of de-escalation skills in law enforcement: Helping individuals in crisis while reducing police liability and injury. *Journal of Police Crisis Negotiations*, 10(1/2), 15-29. <https://doi.org/info:doi/>
- O'Neill, J., O'Neill, D.A., Weed, K., Hartman, M.E., Spence, W., & Lewinski, W.J. (2019). Police academy training, performance, and learning. *Behavioural Analysis in Practice*, 12(2), 353-372. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40617-018-00317-2>
- Oprea, C. L. (2014). Interactive and creative learning of the adults. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 142, 493-498. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.07.654>
- Palmiotto, M. J. (Ed.). (2016). *Police use of force: Important issues facing the police and the communities they serve*. Taylor & Francis Group.
- Papazoglou, K., & Andersen, J. P. (2014). A guide to utilizing police training as a tool to promote resilience and improve health outcomes among police officers. *Traumatology: An International Journal*, 20(2), 103. <https://psycnet.apa.org/fulltext/2014-18267-001.html>
- Paull, M., Whitsed, C., & Girardi, A. (2016). Applying the Kirkpatrick model: Evaluating an interaction for learning framework curriculum intervention. *Issues in Educational Research*, 26(3), 490-507. <https://search.informit.org/doi/abs/10.3316/ielapa.509274814654719>
- Peace, R. J. (2006). Probationer training for neighborhood policing in England and Wales: Fit for purpose? *Policing*, 29(2), 335-346. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13639510610667691>

- Pelfrey, W. V. and Young, A. (2020). Police crisis intervention teams: Understanding implementation variations and officer-level impacts. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, 35(1), 1-12.
- Pfeffer, J., & Sutton, R. I. (2006). *Hard facts, dangerous half-truths, and total nonsense: Profiting from evidence-based management*. Harvard Business Press.
- Phelps, J. M., Strype, J., Le Bellu, S., Lahlou, S., & Aandal, J. (2018). Experiential learning and simulation-based training in Norwegian police education: Examining body-worn video as a tool to encourage reflection. *Policing: a journal of policy and practice*, 12(1), 50-65.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/police/paw014>
- Raab, P., & Bogner, F. X. (2021). Knowledge acquisition and environmental values in a microplastic learning module: Does the learning environment matter? *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 71, 101091. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2021.101091>
- Reaves, B.A. (2016). *State and local law enforcement training academies, 2013*. US Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. <https://bjs.ojp.gov/content/pub/pdf/slleta13.pdf>
- Richards, P., Roberts, D., Britton, M., & Roberts, N. (2018). The exploration of body-worn video to accelerate the decision-making skills of police officers within an experiential learning environment. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*, 12(1), 43-49.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/police/pax017>
- Ritter, F., Baxter, G., Kim, J. W., & Srinivasmurthy, S. (2013). Learning and retention. Research Gate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/255950544_Learning_and_retention
- Saleh AZ, Appelbaum PS, Liu X, Scott Stroup T, Wall M (2018) Deaths of people with mental illness during interactions with law enforcement. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 58, 110-116. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlp.2018.03.003>

- Schlosser, M., & Gahan, M. (2015). Police use of force: A descriptive analysis of Illinois police officers. *Law Enforcement Executive Forum*, 15(2), 1-12.
- Schneiderhan-Opel, J., & Bogner, F. X. (2021). Cannot see the forest for the trees? Comparing learning outcomes of a field trip vs. a classroom approach. *Forests*, 12(9), 1265.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/f12091265>
- Schulenberg, J.L., & Warren, D.M. (2009). Content and adequacy of specialized police training to handle youth-related incidents: Perceptions of trainers, supervisors, and frontline officers. *International Criminal Justice Review*, 19(4), 456-477.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1057567709340403>
- Sergevnin, V. A., & Ross, D. L. (2016). Prevention and Training. *Police use of force*, 185-200. Routledge.
- Shipton, B. (2023a). Field training. *Signature pedagogies in police education*, 83–96.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-42387-1_7
- Shipton, B. (2023b). Problem-based learning. *Signature pedagogies in police education*, 53–67.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-42387-1_5
- Shipton, B. (2023c). Scenario-based learning. *Signature pedagogies in police education*, 39–52.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-42387-1_4
- Shipton, B. (2023d). Simulation training. *Signature pedagogies in police education*, 69–82.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-42387-1_6
- Shore, A., & Dinning, T. (2023). Developing student's skills and work readiness: An experiential learning framework. *Journal of Work-Applied Management*, 15(2), 188-199.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/JWAM-02-2023-0016>

- Smidt, A., Balandin, S., Sigafoos, J., & Reed, V. A. (2009). The Kirkpatrick model: A useful tool for evaluating training outcomes. *Journal of Intellectual & Developmental Disability*, 34(3), 266-274. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.humber.ca/10.1080/13668250903093125>
- Smith, M. (2002). Malcolm Knowles, informal adult education, self-direction and andragogy. *The Encyclopedia of Informal Education*.
https://www.academia.edu/475107/Malcolm_Knowles_informal_adult_education_self_direction_and_andragogy
- Steensma, H., & Groeneveld, K. (2010). Evaluating a training using the “four levels model.” *The Journal of Workplace Learning*, 22(5), 319-331.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/13665621011053226>
- Stevulak, C., & Brown, M. P. (2011). Activating public sector ethics in transitional societies: The promise of integrity. *Public Integrity*, 13(2), 97-112. <https://doi.org/10.2753/PIN1099-9922130201>
- Taggart, T., Smiley, S. L., & Ritchwood, T. D. (2023). Advancing public health and social equity through research, training, and action. *American Journal of Public Health*, 113(S2), S98-S101. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2023.307340>.
- Taylor, M. (1997). Strategies to enhance the transfer of learning. National Literacy Secretariat.
<https://www.bcit.ca/files/lrc/pdf/transfer.pdf>
- van der Meulen E, Chu SKH, Butler-McPhee J (2021). “That’s why people don’t call 911”: Ending routine police attendance at drug overdoses. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 88, 103039. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugpo.2020.103039>

- White, D., & Heslop, R. (2012). Educating, legitimising or accessorising? Alternative conceptions of professional training in UK higher education: A comparative study of teacher, nurse and police. *Police Practice & Research*, 13(4), 342-356.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15614263.2012.673290>
- Wijnia, L., Loyens, S. M., & Rikers, R. M. (2019). The problem-based learning process. *The Wiley handbook of problem-based learning*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119173243.ch12>
- Wood, D. F. (2003). Problem based learning. *BMJ*, 326(7384), 328-330.
<https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.326.7384.328>
- Wortley, S., Owusu-Bempah, A., Lanning, E. & Henry, C. (2021). Police use of force in Canada: A review of data, expert opinion, and the international research literature. *Canadian Criminal Justice Association*. <https://www.ccja-acjp.ca/pub/en/wp-content/uploads/sites/8/2021/08/Full-Report-PUF.pdf>
- Yang, Z. (2023). Innovation and practice of public security police training curriculum and education system in the age of information technology with police professional competence as the core. *Applied Mathematics and Nonlinear Sciences*, 9.
<https://doi.org/10.2478/amns.2023.2.01443>
- Yaqoot, E. S. I., Noor, W. S. W. M., & Isa, M. F. M. (2021). The predicted trainer and training environment influence toward vocational training effectiveness in Bahrain. *Journal of Technical Education and Training*, 13(1), 1-14.
<https://doi.org/10.30880/jtet.2021.13.01.001>

Appendix A

Humber Research Ethics Board Clearance Certificate

**HUMBER**

Research Ethics Board

May 16, 2024

Ashley Hosker-Field
Humber College

Dear Ashley,

Your application, **A Multimethod Examination of Toronto Police Services Annual In-Service Training Program** has been approved by the Humber Research Ethics Board for one year, **May 16, 2025**. Your protocol number is **REB-0383**.

If you amend your research methodology in any way, or if you would like to extend your approval, please visit the Humber Research Ethics Board website www.humber.ca/ppdr/humber-research-ethics-board to locate the appropriate form.

Upon completion of your project, please submit a Project Completion Form, which can also be found on the Humber Research Ethics Board website.

Best wishes as you pursue your research interests.

Sincerely,

Audel Cunningham
LLM, LL.M, LL.B
Chair, Humber Research Ethics Board

Note on Institutional Approval: All internal and external researchers planning to conduct research involving the collection of data from Humber staff, faculty, students, or access to institutional data/resources, must obtain institutional approval in addition to Humber Research Ethics Board (HREB). HREB approval does not automatically constitute Institutional Approval, and vice versa. Institutional Approval is granted by the Office of the Senior Vice-President, Academic. To request Institutional Approval, please visit the Institutional Approval website (<https://humber.ca/ppdr/research-institutional-approval>) to download the form or contact institutionalapproval@humber.ca

Appendix B

Toronto Police College: In-Service Training Observation Checklist

Day 1: In-Class Training	
Learning Objectives: Clearly defined agenda Communicated to learners Supported with appropriate content	
Instructional Design: Well-structured course Logical progression Clear instructions & presentation of information	
Engagement: Interactive opportunities Class discussion Opportunities to reinforce learning	
Real-world Application: Use of applied examples Opportunities to apply learning Opportunities for reflection	
Assessment & Feedback Assessments in place Constructive feedback Opportunities for questions & clarification	
Inclusion: Culturally sensitive Meets diverse learning needs	
Technology Use Reliable, easy, & effective	
Continuous Improvement: Mechanism for collecting feedback	

Toronto Police College: In-Service Training Observation Checklist

Day 2/3: Applied Training	
Learning Objectives: Clearly defined agenda Communicated to learners Supported with appropriate content	
Instructional Design: Well-structured course Logical progression Clear instructions & presentation of information	
Engagement: Interactive opportunities Class discussion Opportunities to reinforce learning	
Assessment & Feedback Assessments in place Constructive feedback Opportunities for questions & clarification	

Appendix C

IST Instructor Interview Guide

Introduction

“Thank you for agreeing to chat with me today. I really appreciate you taking the time out of your schedule.”

“My name is _____ name _____, and I am a _____ position _____ at Humber College. I am part of the team involved with the IST examination project that TPS has asked us to collaborate on.

“Before we get started, do you mind if I record the interview for transcription and analysis purposes and so we don’t miss any of the information you provide?”

In the interview today, we are looking to get your general thoughts and perspectives on the IST program. I can assure you that your responses will be kept confidential, any reports or publications that are written may include direct quotes but will not include your name or any identifying information. You can refuse to answer any questions that you are not comfortable with, and you can withdraw from the interview at any time. The interview should take approximately 60 minutes of your time.”

Consent Forms

“I have a consent form for you to sign, there are two copies, one is for our records, and one is for you to keep. Can you take a minute to read through the form and sign at the bottom if you are comfortable participating in the interview. Happy to answer any additional questions you have.”

Interview Questions

Current Role

“I’d like to start by chatting about your involvement with TPS and about your current role.”

A. Are you an officer or civilian instructor?

1. How long have you been with TPS?
2. How long have you been employed as an IST instructor?
3. What is your current position/title?
4. Can you tell me a bit about your responsibilities in your current role?
 - a. What aspects/components of training do you teach?
 - b. Are you involved in the development of training materials?
 - c. Are you responsible for evaluation of officer learning?

IST Content, Delivery, and Learning Evaluation Strengths & Areas for Improvement

‘I’d like to get your perspectives on the strengths and potential areas for improvements in terms of a) the topics that are addressed, b) the way in-service training is delivered, and c) the way officer learning is evaluated.’

IST Content (Level 1 assessment – relevancy to work in the field)

5. From your perspective, what are the most important and job relevant **topics/content areas** covered during IST and are there any areas or topics you think should be included that are not currently covered?
 - i. What challenges/barriers are there that make it difficult to include these topics or address this content?
- B. Is there anything else you would like to add with respect to the content or topics covered in IST?

IST Teaching Methods (Level 1 assessment – engaging learners/officers)

6. What are the most effective **teaching approaches** used during IST and are there any aspects of the training that you think could be delivered more effectively?
 - i. Are there any barriers or challenges that would make it difficult to implement these changes?
- C. Is there anything else you would like to add with respect to teaching methods or training delivery?

IST Officer Learning Evaluation (Level 2 – officer learning)

7. What are the strengths or benefits of the current approaches used to **evaluate officer learning** and do you see any room for improvement in the way officer learning is evaluated?
 - i. Can you provide examples of effective evaluation strategies used?
 - ii. What changes would you recommend?
 - iii. Are there any tools that might be helpful to you in terms of making evaluations more accurate, consistent, and/or easier to conduct?
 - iv. Are there any barriers or challenges that would make it difficult to implement these changes?
- D. Is there anything else you would like to add with respect to the evaluation of officer learning?

Officer Engagement and Content Relevancy – (Level 1/2 – engagement/learning & Level 3 transfer of learning)

“We’d also like to get your insights on officer learning, engagement, and application of IST knowledge, strategies, and techniques and how IST training aligns with Toronto Police Service mission and values.”

8. From your perspective, are the officers actively engaging with the IST learning materials and are they leaning the content/acquiring the skills that are taught during IST?
 - i. Can you provide some examples to support your thoughts/opinions?
- E. Do you think the content covered is relevant to the work the officers are doing in the field? **(Ask if not covered previously)**
9. Do you believe that officers are applying or using the knowledge or skills they obtain in IST when they are out in the field?
 - i. Can you provide any examples of this transfer of learning?
10. Are you aware of any processes or systems that are currently in place to monitor and encourage application of the attitudes and skills learned in IST while on the job? Can you explain or describe these processes?
 - i. Do you have any thoughts about strategies that can be used to better support or encourage application of the materials/skills taught during IST?

Impact on TSP Mission and Values (Level 4)

Do you feel that the IST training helps officers do their job more effectively and better respond to the needs of the communities they serve?

11. Is there anything else you would like to share about the IST program that we haven’t addressed in the interview today?

Closing and Debriefing Form

“That is all the questions we have for today. Thank you again for taking the time to chat with me and for sharing your thoughts and perspectives about the IST program. Here is a copy of the debriefing form. It contains some more information about the purpose of the IST examination and the interview. It also includes the contact information of the Humber research team if you have any follow-up questions, comments, or concerns.”

Appendix D

IST Instructor Questionnaire

This survey is designed to capture your thoughts and opinions about the annual In-Service Training (IST) program officers are required to complete. Please read each question carefully and answer honestly. Your responses are confidential and anonymous.

PART 1: IST In-Class Sessions

When answering the following questions please reflect on the modules that are generally taught In Class during the IST program (i.e., Peer Intervention, Adverse Childhood Experiences, Centering Black Experiences, Indigenous Experiences, Intimate Partner Violence, Police Resiliency, Mental Health and Crisis Intervention, etc.)

This section focuses on officer satisfaction and engagement, and relevancy of the **in-class** IST sessions. Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements.

1 – strongly disagree, 2 – disagree, 3 – neutral, 4 – agree, 5 – strongly agree

In-Class IST Sessions Level 1 Questions (Satisfaction/Relevancy/Engagement)

1. The materials/skills covered during in-class IST sessions are relevant to the work officers perform in the field
2. The materials/skills covered during in-class IST sessions help officers to perform better when they are on the job
3. Officers are actively engaged with the materials/content covered during in-class IST sessions
4. Officers appear to be satisfied with the content covered during in-class IST sessions
5. Officers appear to be satisfied with the instructional methods used during in-class IST sessions
6. The instructional methods used during in-class IST sessions are effective in helping officers meet the learning outcomes

This section focuses on officer learning and attitudes, and confidence and commitment in applying the content covered during the **in-class** IST sessions. Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements.

In-Class IST Level 2 Questions (Learning/Attitudes/Confidence/Commitment)

7. Officers appear to have a good understanding of the content and concepts taught during in-class IST sessions
8. Officers can competently perform the skills that are taught during in-class IST sessions
9. The materials/skills taught during in-class IST sessions impact officers' attitudes towards marginalized communities
10. The materials/skills taught during in-class IST sessions impact officer implicit and explicit biases

11. Officers appear confident in their ability to use the skills that are taught during in-class IST sessions
12. Officers appear committed to using the skills taught during in-class IST sessions

This section focuses on transfer of learning for the content covered during the **in-class** IST sessions. Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements.

In-Class IST Level 3 Questions (Transfer of Learning and Required Drivers)

13. There are policies and procedures in place to encourage, monitor, and reward officers use of the materials/skills taught during in-class IST sessions when they are in the field
14. Officers apply the materials/skills taught during in-class IST sessions when they are on the job
15. The materials/skills taught during in-class IST sessions help to reduce the number of civilian complaints
16. The materials/skills taught during in-class IST sessions help to reduce the number of use-of-force incidents that occur
17. The materials/skills taught during in-class IST sessions improve officers' ability to de-escalate situations when on the job
18. Officers are expected to be responsible for maintaining the knowledge and skills they learn during in-class IST sessions to improve on the job performance
19. Do you have any other thoughts or opinions about **in-class** IST sessions that you would like to share? (open ended)

PART 2: IST Applied Learning Components

When answering the following questions please reflect on the content that is generally taught during the applied learning components of the IST program (i.e., firearms training and re-qualification, defensive tactics training and re-qualification, CEW re-certification, judgement training/simulation training, etc.)

This section focuses on officer satisfaction and engagement, and relevancy of the **applied learning components** of IST. Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements.

1 – strongly disagree, 2 – disagree, 3 – neutral, 4 – agree, 5 – strongly agree

Applied Learning Components Level 1 Questions (Satisfaction/Relevancy/Engagement)

20. The materials/skills covered during the applied learning components of IST are relevant to the work officers perform in the field
21. The materials/skills covered during the applied learning components of IST help officers to perform better when they are on the job
22. Officers are actively engaged with the materials/content covered during the applied learning components of IST

23. Officers appear to be satisfied with the content covered during the applied learning components of IST
24. Officers appear to be satisfied with instructional methods covered during the applied learning components of IST
25. The instructional methods used during the applied learning components of IST training are effective in helping officers meet the learning outcomes

This section focuses on officer learning and attitudes, and confidence and commitment in applying the content covered during the **applied learning components** of IST. Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements.

**Applied Learning Components Level 2 Questions
(Learning/Attitudes/Confidence/Commitment)**

26. Officers appear to have a good understanding of the content and concepts taught during the applied learning components of IST
27. Officers can competently perform the skills that are taught during the applied learning components of IST
28. The materials/skills taught during the applied learning components of IST training impact officers' attitudes towards marginalized communities
29. The materials/skills taught during the applied learning components of IST impact officers implicit and explicit biases
30. Officers appear confident in their ability to use the skills that are taught during the applied learning components of IST
31. Officers appear committed to using the skills taught during the applied learning components of IST

This section focuses on transfer of learning for the content covered during the **applied learning components** of IST. Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements.

Applied Learning Components Level 3 Questions (Transfer of Learning and Required Drivers)

32. There are policies and procedures in place to encourage, monitor, and reward officers use of the materials/skills taught during the applied learning components of IST when they are in the field
33. Officers apply the materials/skills taught during the applied learning components of IST when they are on the job
34. The materials/skills taught during the applied learning components of IST help to reduce the number of civilian complaints
35. The materials/skills taught during the applied learning components of IST helps to reduce the number of use-of-force incidents that occur
36. The materials/skills taught during the applied learning components of IST improved officers' ability to deescalate situations when on the job

37. Officers are expected to be responsible for maintaining the knowledge and skills they learn during the applied learning components of IST to improve on the job performance
38. Do you have any other thoughts or opinions about the applied learning components of the IST program you would like to share? (open ended)

PART 3: Overall Impact of IST

Think about the broader overall impact of IST training in relation to Toronto Police Services mission, vision, and values. Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements.

1 – strongly disagree, 2 – disagree, 3 – neutral, 4 – agree, 5 – strongly agree

Level 4 Questions (Results/Impact on TPS Overall Mission, Vision, & Values)

39. IST training helps to achieve Toronto Police Service's mission of keeping Toronto safe
40. IST training prepares officers to better respond to the needs of the communities they serve
41. IST training improves overall police-community relations
42. IST training leads to more positive interactions between officers and members of marginalized communities
43. IST training improves officer's ability to work collaboratively with members of the communities they serve
44. IST training helps to reduce potential biases, prejudices, and stereotypes among officers
45. IST training helps to increase empathy and compassion among officers
46. IST training helps officers to make better informed decisions while in the field
47. IST training positively impacts organizational culture at TPS

PART 4: Demographics

48. How old are you?
49. What is your race? (select all that apply)
 - a. Black (e.g., African, Caribbean, African Canadian decent, Caribbean Canadian descent)
 - b. East Asian (e.g., Chinese, Korean, Japanese, Taiwanese descent)
 - c. Indigenous (e.g., Metis, First Nations, Inuit)
 - d. Latino (e.g., Latin American, Hispanic descent)
 - e. Middle Eastern (e.g., Arab, Persian, West Asian descent, Afghan, Egyptian, Iranian)
 - f. South Asian (e.g., Filipino, Vietnamese, Cambodian, Thai, Southeast Asian descent)
 - g. Mixed Race or Biracial
 - h. Other
 - i. I prefer not to say

50. What option best describes your biological sex at birth?
- a. Man
 - b. Woman
 - c. I prefer not to say
51. What option best describes your gender identity (select all that apply)
- a. Cis-Man
 - b. Cis-Woman
 - c. Trans Man
 - d. Trans Woman
 - e. Genderqueer/gender non-conforming
 - f. 2 spirit
 - g. I prefer to self-identify as _____
 - h. I prefer not to say
52. How many years have you been employed with Toronto Police Service?
53. How many years have you been an instructor at the Toronto Police College?
54. Are you an officer or a civilian instructor?
- ☐ Officer
 - ☐ Civilian
55. What modules have you taught during the annual In-Service Training (Select all that apply)
- ☐ I do not teach in the IST Program
 - ☐ Adverse Childhood Experiences
 - ☐ Police Resiliency
 - ☐ Indigenous Experiences
 - ☐ Centering Black Experiences
 - ☐ Intimate Partner Violence
 - ☐ Right to Counsel
 - ☐ Mental Health and Crisis Awareness
 - ☐ Incident Response
 - ☐ Firearms Training and Re-Qualification
 - ☐ Defensive Tactics Training and Re-Qualification
 - ☐ CEW Re-Certification
 - ☐ Judgement Training – Dynamic Simulation Training - Indoor
 - ☐ Judgement Training – Dynamic Simulation Training - Outdoor
 - ☐ Judgement Training – Simulator Training
 - ☐ Other (please specify): _____

Appendix E

Humber Research Team Biographies



Ashley Hosker-Field, PhD

Professor (Humber College Bachelor of Social Science Criminal Justice Degree Program, Faculty of Social & Community Services)

Ashley is the research lead on the project and will be involved in research design, development of assessment tools, and data collection and analysis. Ashley received her Ph.D. in Social Personality Psychology from Brock University. She has previous employment experience working at the John Howard Society, where she was involved in the development and facilitation of supportive programming with court referred youth. Ashley has also been involved in consulting projects commissioned by the Mental Health Commission of Canada and the Canadian Centre for Substance Use and Addiction.

Ashley's previous research initiatives and publications focused on examining psychopathic traits, impulsivity, risk-taking, fear, empathy, and aggression. Since joining the Humber faculty team Ashley has been involved in several NSERC funded, College and Community Social Innovation Fund research projects. These research initiatives include the examination of interagency collaboration and evaluation of youth focused social services, as well as the provision of evidence informed, stigma-free cannabis related education to various populations.



Ann Wallington, M.A., LL.M

Acting Associate Dean (Humber College Faculty of Social & Community Services)

Ann will be overseeing the evaluation of the In-Service Training. She has an extensive background in developing and evaluating learning for organizations and post-secondary institutions and has been teaching in post-secondary for over 15 years. Ann has worked as an adjudicator on the Discipline Committee of the Ontario College of Trades and was a sergeant with the Toronto Police Service.


Ann holds a Master of Laws from York University Osgoode Hall Law School, a Master of Arts from Central Michigan University, a Bachelor of Arts from Laurentian University, a diploma in adult education from St. Francis Xavier University, and a certificate in adjudication from Osgoode Hall Law School/Society of Ontario Adjudicators and Regulators.



Daniel Bear, PhD

Director (Humber College Centre for Social Innovation)

Daniel and the Humber College Centre for Social Innovation are leading the administrative and operational side of this project and support the research activities as needed. Daniel has an extensive background in criminal justice research, policy, and practice. He was previously on the Ontario Parole Board and has conducted evaluations of use of force reduction strategies for the (UK) Ministry of Justice, conducted research on training practices of the Colombian National Police, and worked with the Metropolitan Police Service of London to identify ways of ensuring strategic priorities were aligned with street-level officers' key performance indicators. He has a Master's and PhD in Social Policy from The London School of Economics and was, until recently, a Professor in the Bachelor of Social Science Criminal Justice program at Humber.



Ashelyn Fung, MBA

Project Manager (Humber College Centre for Social Innovation)


As the Project Manager for the Centre for Social Innovation, which is supporting this research project within Humber, Ashelyn supports the operational and administrative management of the TPC evaluation. Ashelyn has a range of expertise from her years at various non-profit and post-secondary organizations in Toronto, Edmonton, and abroad. Functionally, her work has focused on organizational effectiveness, strategy, marketing and communications, impact evaluation, and project management. She holds an MBA from York University (Schulich School of Business), specializing in social sector management and sustainability, and an Honors Bachelor of Arts from the University of Alberta.



Cheyenne-Raine Lynch, M.Ed

Research Assistant

Cheyenne-Raine Lynch is an educator with over three years of experience, holding a Master of Education from the University of Ottawa and an Honours Bachelor of Arts in Communications from York University. She specializes in English, ESL, writing, and research. Cheyenne-Raine is enthusiastic about fostering critical thinking and character development in students, guided by the belief that true education combines intelligence with integrity. She is dedicated to creating inclusive and supportive learning environments that empower students to succeed.



Laura Bannon

Research Assistant

Laura Bannon is a placement student with Humber's CSI and a fourth-year undergraduate student studying Addictions & Mental Health at Humber College (Honours Bachelor of Social Science). She currently works as a Project Manager for the United Nations affiliate Youth Climate Report, as well as volunteers at the Centre for Addictions and Mental Health (CAMH). Laura plans on continuing her education by pursuing a Master's Degree in Counselling Psychology.



Meghan Martone

Research Assistant

Meghan Martone is currently in the Bachelor of Social Science, Criminal Justice program at Humber College.



Radika Tennessee

Research Assistant

Radika Tennessee is an undergraduate student in the Honors Bachelor of Social Science-Addictions and Mental Health program at Humber College and has a Diploma in Social Service specializing in immigrants and refugees from Sheridan College. Currently on the Dean's list, Radika's academic excellence is matched by her dedication to her field and frontline social work experience with several community organizations. She is currently completing her field placements both with Humber's CSI department and Distress Centres of Greater Toronto.



6. Annual Use of Force Report - 2024



PUBLIC REPORT

November 6, 2025

To: Chair and Members
Toronto Police Service Board

From: Myron Demkiw
Chief of Police

Subject: Annual Use of Force Report (2024)

Purpose: ☒ Information Purposes Only ☐ Seeking Decision

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive this report.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications arising from the recommendation contained in this report.

Summary:

This is an Annual Report, which provides an overview of use of force training, updates to governance, and a five-year statistical comparison and trend analysis regarding all levels of reported use of force incidents involving members of the Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.).

Background:

This is the third Annual Report to the Board. Prior to 2022, use of force reporting was included as one chapter of the overall Corporate Risk Management Annual Report. The Toronto Police College (T.P.C.) previously provided stand along reporting on Conducted

Energy Weapon (C.E.W.) use but now provides annual reporting on all things related to use of force.

In addition to providing an overview of use of force-related training and updates to T.P.S. governance, this report provides a five-year statistical comparison (where available) and trend analysis regarding all levels of reportable use of force incidents involving members of the T.P.S.

Conclusion:

This report provides the Board with an overview of the 2024 use of force data.

Interim Chief Administrative Officer Colin Stairs and Superintendent Maher Abdel-Malik of the T.P.C. will be in attendance to answer any questions the Board may have regarding this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Myron Demkiw, M.O.M.

Chief of Police

Toronto Police Service

Annual Use of Force Report (2024)



Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Use of Force Reporting Highlights	1
Factors Influencing Reporting	1
Use of Force Reporting	2
Use of Force Reporting Magnitude	2
Introduction	3
Purpose	3
Context	3
Scope	3
How We Track Use of Force	4
Data Sources	4
Process	4
Limitations	4
Why This Matters	4
Findings	5
Reporting Metrics	5
Operations	8
Officer Information	12
Firearms	14
Conducted Energy Weapon Deployment Trends	16
Effectiveness	17
Perceived Subject Behaviour	18
Perceived Subject Condition	19
Persons in Crisis and Effectiveness	20
Mental Health Act Apprehensions	20
De-escalation	20
Impact	21
Making Sense of the Trends	21
Public Safety Concerns	21
Civic Responsibility	21
Next Steps	22
Digital Transformation	22
Partnerships	22
Conclusion and Future Goals	22

Appendix A – Glossary	23
Acronyms	23
Calculations	24
Definitions	24
List of Figures	27
List of Tables	28
Appendix B – Supplementary Data	29
Appendix C- Legislation and Governance	34
Use of Force Ontario Public-Police Interactions Training Aid (2023)	34
Use of Force Governance Updates	36
Use of Force Governing Authorities	37
Updates to Use of Force Reporting	38
2023 Modernized Use of Force Report	39
Use of Force Options	40
Conducted Energy Weapons	40
Conducted Energy Weapons Governance, Procedure & Reporting Changes	41
Reason(s) for Use of Force	41
Use of Force and Subject Injuries	42
Appendix D – Use of Force Training Highlights	43
Use of Force Training Requirements	43
In-Service Training for Members	43
Equipment and Use of Force	44
Dynamic Scenario Judgement Training	44
Dynamic Simulation Training – Video Training	44
Wellness Supports	44

Executive Summary

Use of Force Reporting Highlights

Use of Force (U.O.F.) reporting for 2024 has seen significant positive trends in some areas. De-escalation continues to be involved in nearly every U.O.F. incident and there have been notable reductions in subject injuries, conducted energy weapon (C.E.W.) deployments, and firearms discharges compared to the previous four-year average (2020-23):




Figure 1. Summary of Positive Trends in U.O.F., 2024

Factors Influencing Reporting

Many factors can impact U.O.F. reporting year-over-year. In comparison to the previous four-year average (2020-23), U.O.F. incidents in 2024 have notably declined by 13.5% (-179 incidents) despite the following factors:

- The City of Toronto's population increased by 6.6% (+197,931 residents)
- Toronto Police Officers increased by 5.0% (+252 police officers)
- Total Calls for Service Attended (C.F.S.A.) increased by 2.7% (+10,689 calls attended)
- Violent C.F.S.A. increased by 2.4% (+1,140 calls attended)
- Total Criminal Code (C.C.) violations increased by 29.4% (+40,081 occurrences)
- Mental Health Act (M.H.A.) Apprehensions increased by 4.4% (+587 apprehensions)
- Arrested persons increased by 39.2% (+9,528 arrested persons)
- Project Resolute resulted in 35k more community policing initiatives/visits (October 2023-24).




Figure 2. Use of Force Factors Visualization, 2020-2024

Use of Force Reporting

The Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019 (C.S.P.A.) and Ontario Regulations (O. Reg.) 87/24 (Training) and 391/23 (Use of Force and Weapons) require members to submit a Use of Force Report (U.F.R.) before going off duty if they:

- draw a handgun in public
- point a firearm at a person
- discharge a firearm
- use a weapon on a person
- draw, display, point or discharge a C.E.W. to gain compliance
- point or discharge a C.E.W. at a person
- use force on another person, including the use of a horse or dog, resulting in an injury requiring medical attention, of which the officer is aware

The Ministry of the Solicitor General in Ontario is responsible for establishing province-wide standards. All members must complete U.O.F. requalification from a certified trainer every 12 months. The T.P.S. training surpasses provincial standards.

Use of Force Reporting Magnitude

Of the 411,607 C.F.S.A. in 2024, 0.46% required a U.F.R. – equating to 1,888 U.F.R.s.

Introduction

Purpose

The T.P.S.'s Annual Use of Force Report provides an overview of incidents in which officers applied reportable force in 2024. The report is prepared for the Board as part of the T.P.S.'s commitment to transparency, accountability, and continuous improvement. It highlights statistical trends, training and governance updates, and operational outcomes, while showing how the U.O.F. fits within the broader context of population growth, calls for service and evolving legislative requirements. Refer to Appendix A – Glossary for a complete list of acronyms, calculations and definitions.

Context

Police officers are entrusted with the authority to use force, in the course of their duties, to protect public safety, preserve life, and respond to threats. This authority is a critical component of policing, but it must be exercised with care, restraint, and in accordance with legal and ethical standards and prescribed training. U.O.F. is not only a tactical decision—it is a profound responsibility that requires transparency and oversight. Refer to Appendix D – T.P.C. Use of Force Training Highlights for more details.

By documenting and analyzing U.O.F. incidents, the T.P.S. ensures that its practices are subject to public scrutiny, internal review, and continuous improvement. The data presented in this report supports informed dialogue, policy development, and training enhancements, all aimed at fostering trust between the police and the communities they serve.

Scope

This report covers all U.O.F. incidents between January 1 and December 31, 2024, requiring a U.F.R. under provincial legislation and T.P.S. Procedure 15-01: Incident Response (Use of Force/De-Escalation). It includes statistical analysis, five-year trends, and detailed findings on C.E.W., firearms, physical control, and other force options. Data on Persons in Crisis (P.I.C.), Mental Health Act (M.H.A.) apprehensions, and subject and officer injuries are also examined. Governance, training, wellness supports, and procedural updates are addressed. Excluded are training exercises, demonstrations, or incidents outside the legislated reporting criteria. Refer to Appendix C – Legislation and Governance for more details.

How We Track Use of Force

Data Sources

The information in this report draws on two primary sources: a relational database system called IAPro containing U.F.R. data and a T.P.C. unit - level Excel tracker which contains C.E.W. Use Report (T.P.S. Form 584) information. Together, these sources provide a comprehensive overview of U.O.F. and C.E.W. usage by T.P.S. members.

Process

U.O.F. reporting follows a structured oversight process designed to ensure accountability and accuracy. Once a U.O.F. incident occurs, the involved officer(s) completes and submits a U.F.R. to their supervisor and Officer in Charge (O.I.C.) for review. Both the supervisor and O.I.C. review the report for accuracy and completeness and review all available Body-Worn Camera (B.W.C.) and In-Car Camera System (I.C.C.S.) footage. It is then escalated to the unit level for further scrutiny and compliance with governance. Following these reviews, the U.F.R. is forwarded to a Use of Force Analyst at the T.P.C., who conducts a comprehensive examination of the submission data from U.F.R.s and C.E.W. Use Reports. The submission data is manually entered into both IAPro and/or the T.P.C. Excel tracker where it is analysed to identify trends.

Limitations

As with any self-reported data, there are inherent limitations. Reports reflect officer perceptions at the time of the incident, which may not capture the full complexity of an encounter. In some cases, system constraints only allow one reason for using force to be extracted, even when multiple factors are present. The introduction of the modernized U.F.R. in 2023 added new fields to the U.F.R., which affect year-over-year comparability. These limitations are noted throughout the report where relevant. Refer to Appendix C – Legislation and Governance of this report for more details.

Why This Matters

Accurate and transparent data is the foundation of accountability. Careful collection, validation, and reporting ensure that the T.P.S., the Board, and the public can have confidence in the findings presented. This approach allows trends to be understood responsibly, supports oversight and governance, and strengthens public trust.

Findings

Reporting Metrics

Both O. Reg. 87/24 and 391/23 of the C.S.P.A. require members to complete a U.F.R. that is to be submitted to the Ministry of the Solicitor General before going off duty if they:

- draw a handgun in public
- point a firearm at a person
- discharge a firearm
- use a weapon on a person
- draw, display, point or discharge a C.E.W. to gain compliance
- point or discharge a C.E.W. at a person
- use force on another person, including the use of horse or dog, resulting in an injury requiring medical attention, of which the officer is aware

U.O.F. reporting is a complex process that relies on many reporting metrics. As demonstrated in Table 1, the two main reporting metrics are incidents and reports. Incidents are tied to a unique general occurrence number and one or many reports may be submitted by one or more officers to a single incident. These metrics are supported by a unique officer count, meaning the number of distinct officers involved in annual U.O.F. reporting, and the total U.O.F. options they employ alongside a total subject count and the officer-perceived subject weapons they may or may not have access to.

U.O.F. Reporting Metrics (2020-2024)							
Reporting Metric / Year	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	4-Yr Avg (2020-23)	% Chg Avg 4-Yr (2024)
U.O.F. Incidents	1,368	1,248	1,387	1,322	1,152	1,331	-13.5%
U.F.R.s	2,095	1,899	2,105	2,113	1,888	2,053	-8.0%
U.O.F. Unique Officers	-	-	-	1,130	1,043	-	-
U.O.F. Options Applied	2,570	2,283	2,462	2,741	2,575	2,514	2.4%
U.O.F. Total Subjects	-	-	-	1,944	1,714	-	-
U.O.F. Perceived Subject Weapons	1,878	1,566	1,712	1,494	1,374	1,663	-17.4%

Table 1. Summary of U.O.F. reporting metrics, 2020-2024

Note: There is no data beyond 2023 for U.O.F. unique officers and total subjects due to the IAPro database two-year data retention privacy policy and no past reporting records for these metrics. A unique subject count is not possible for privacy reasons. There are 359 "None" U.O.F. officer-perceived subject weapon selections excluded from this chart.

In 2024, there were 1,888 U.F.R.s corresponding to 1,152 U.O.F. incidents, involving 1,043 unique T.P.S. officers. A total of 1,714 subjects were logged across all reports, with potential duplication of individuals across incidents. In total, 2,575 U.O.F. options were used, and 1,374 officer-perceived subject weapons were reported.

The ratio of U.F.R.s to U.O.F. incidents is 1.6. Across, all U.F.R.s, officers applied an average of 1.36 U.O.F. options per report. For every 10 subjects, 8 were perceived by officers to have access to at least one weapon (0.80 average weapons per subject).

Figure 3 shows, both U.F.R.s (-8.3%) and incidents (-13.5%) decreased in 2024 compared to the previous four-year average (2020-23) at 2,058 and 1,331 respectively.




Figure 3. Five-Year comparison of U.F.R.s and U.O.F. incidents, 2020-2024

Table 2 shows the U.O.F. rate per C.F.S.A. at a rate of 0.46% (1 report in 218 events) a decrease of 10.5% compared to the previous four-year average of 0.51%.

Report-based U.O.F. Rates (2020-2024)				
Year	U.F.R.	Total C.F.S.A.	U.F.R. / C.F.S.A. Rate	% Chg 4-Yr Avg (Report/Call Rate)
2020	2,095	412,332	0.51%	-0.8%
2021	1,899	398,144	0.48%	-6.9%
2022	2,105	385,609	0.55%	6.5%
2023	2,113	407,589	0.52%	1.2%
2024	1,888	411,607	0.46%	-10.5%
4-Yr Avg	2,053	400,919	0.51%	0.0%

Table 2. Summary of U.O.F. rate per Total C.F.S.A., 2020-2024

Table 3 indicates that about one in five officers (19.9%) submitted a U.O.F. report. Among those unique officers who submitted, the average was 1.8 reports per officers, with an average of 2.5 U.O.F. options applied per officer.

Officer-based U.O.F. Rates (2023-2024)							
Year	U.F.R.s	U.O.F. Options Applied	T.P.S. Uniform Members	U.O.F. Unique Officers	Unique Officers / Uniform Members	Reports / Unique Officers	Options Applied / Unique Officers
2023	2,113	2,741	5,029	1,130	22.5%	1.9	2.4
2024	1,888	2,575	5,249	1,043	19.9%	1.8	2.5
% Chg.	-10.6%	-6.1%	4.4%	-7.7%	-11.6%	-3.2%	1.8%

Table 3. Summary of Officer-based U.O.F. rates, 2023-2024

Note: There is no data beyond 2023 for U.O.F. unique officers due to the IAPRO database two-year data retention privacy policy and no past reporting records of this metric.

Table 4 shows that there are many external factors impacting U.O.F. reporting trends. While U.O.F. reporting decreased by 8.0% relative to its previous four-year average, there was a decrease in P.I.C. C.F.S.A., and increases in Toronto's population, T.P.S. uniform members, C.F.S.A., violent C.F.S.A., total C.C. violation occurrences, M.H.A. apprehensions and arrests. Refer to Appendix B - Supplementary Data, Table 1 of this report for more details.

U.O.F. External Factors (2020-2024)							
Indicator	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	4-Yr Avg (2020-23)	% Chg 4-Yr Avg (2024)
City of Toronto Population	2,884,258	2,921,755	2,992,348	3,126,817	3,179,225	2,981,295	6.6%
T.P.S. Uniform Members	5,061	4,972	4,926	5,029	5,249	4,997	5.0%
Calls for Service Attended (C.F.S.A.)	412,332	398,144	385,609	407,589	411,607	400,919	2.7%
Violent C.F.S.A.	48,612	46,629	47,831	46,258	48,472	47,333	2.4%
Total C.C. Violation Occurrences	116,986	119,163	140,211	169,364	176,512	136,431	29.4%
Persons in Crisis C.F.S.A.	33,143	35,393	33,071	31,572	32,644	33,295	-2.0%
M.H.A. Apprehensions	12,409	14,273	13,589	12,760	13,845	13,258	4.4%
Arrests	21,032	21,739	25,249	29,090	33,805	24,278	39.2%

Table 4. Summary of external factors impacting U.O.F. reporting, 2020-2024

Operations

In 2024, the following Sub-Command distribution was reported for U.F.R: West Field Command (38.8%), East Field Command (37.1%), Public Safety Operations (P.S.O.) (primarily the Emergency Task Force (E.T.F.)) (16.9%), and the remaining 7.2% were submitted by Detective Operations, Field Services and Investigative Support (see Figure 4).




Figure 4. U.F.R.s Submitted by Sub-Command, 2024

In 2024, the top five U.O.F. incident types reported account for 78.8% of all U.O.F. incidents. These incident types include weapons call (25.3%), search warrant/warrant related (22.2%), violent crime (non-Intimate Partner Violence [I.P.V]) (15.1%), stolen vehicle (9.3%) and person in crisis/wellness check (6.9%). This is consistent with last year's top incident types where both years saw significant increases in the amount of U.O.F. incident types reported for violent crime (non-I.P.V.) and stolen vehicles. Refer to Appendix B - Supplementary Data, Table 2 of this report for more details.

Use of Force Type of Incident, 2020-2024						
Incident Type	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	% of Total (2024)
Weapons Call	409	429	497	319	291	25.3
Search Warrant/Warrant Related	283	254	216	242	256	22.2
Violent Crime (Non-I.P.V.)	51	34	55	186	174	15.1
Stolen Vehicle	36	32	38	98	107	9.3
Person in Crisis / Wellness Check	77	84	104	140	80	6.9
Remaining Incident Types	512	415	477	337	244	21.2
Total	1,368	1,248	1,387	1,322	1,152	100%

Table 5. Type of Incident When Force Applied, 2020-2024

Note: The following incident types listed in the above table are groupings based on historical reporting practices: Person in Crisis/Wellness Check = Person in Crisis, Wellness/Safety Check; and Violent Crime (Non-I.P.V.) = Active Attacker, Violent Crime (non-I.P.V.). Remaining Incident Types are listed on the current U.F.R. under 'Type of Incident' as selection options and are not included in the groupings presented in the above table. Refer to Appendix B - Supplementary Data, Table 2 of this report for more details.

In 2024, the majority (93.2%) of U.F.R.s were completed by officers assigned to patrol (66.6%), tactical (15.8%), investigation (Criminal Investigations Bureau/Major Crime Unit) (6.3%), and special operations (4.4%) at the time of incident. The remaining 6.8% (129 U.F.R.) are attributed to twenty-one 'other categorized assignments' as reported by officers. Refer to Appendix B – Supplementary Data, Table 3 for the full table details.




Figure 5. Officer Assignment as Reported on U.F.R., 2024

Subject Information

In 2024, there were 1,714 total U.O.F. subjects involved in 1,144 U.O.F. incidents, excluding 8 unintentional/accidental incidents. Figure 6 shows, the majority (73.3%) of U.O.F. incidents involved interactions with a single subject, while 23% involved multiple subjects (11% with two subjects and 12% with three subjects or more). Of the remaining 3.7%, officers had no interaction with a subject in 2.8% incidents and 0.9% involved animals - typically related to the humane dispatch of sick, injured, or aggressive animals posing a threat to public safety.




Figure 6. Number of Subjects Involved per U.O.F. Incident, 2024

Note: There are 8 unintentional/accidental U.O.F. incidents excluded from this chart.

In 2024, there was 89 U.O.F. incidents where subject injuries were reported (see Table 6). This represents 7.7% of all U.O.F. incidents (1,152) and a 48.9% decrease compared to the previous four-year average (174). Furthermore, of these 89 injuries, 60 required medical attention (67.4%). This accounts for 5.2% of all U.O.F. incidents, a 57.8% decrease compared to the previous four-year average (142).

U.O.F. Incidents Reporting Subject Injuries (2020-2024)					
Year	Total U.O.F. Incidents	Injuries		Injury Required Medical Attention	
		No	Yes	No	Yes
2020	1,368	1,147	221	47	174
2021	1,248	1,084	164	21	143
2022	1,387	1,156	231	52	179
2023	1,322	1,242	80	7	73
2024	1,152	1,063	89	29	60

Table 6. U.O.F. Incidents Reporting Subject Injuries, 2020-24

Of the 1,888 U.F.R.s associated to 1,152 U.O.F. incidents in 2024, there was 1,733 selections for factors influencing response related to the subcategory of officers perceiving/believing subjects to have or not have access to weapon (see Figure 7). The majority (79.3% or 1,374 selections) of subjects were perceived by officers to have access to at least one type of weapon during the U.O.F. incident. Across all 1,714 total subjects, officers reported perceived subject weapons in 4 out of every 5 subjects (80%). The remaining 20.7% or 359 selections were for subjects that officers perceived to not have access to a weapon (none).

Figure 7 shows the most reported subject weapons (excluding none) as firearms (61.1%), knife/edge weapon (23.0%), unknown (7.4%), other (5.0%), baseball bat/club (3.3%), animal – no weapon (0.1%) and bottle (0.1%). Refer to Appendix B - Supplementary Data, Table 6 of this report for more details.




Figure 7. Officer-Perceived Subject Weapon(s), 2024

Note: totals represent the reported number of officer-perceived subject weapon selections (1,733) rather than the number of U.O.F. incidents (1,152) or U.F.R.s (1,888) in 2024. There are 359 "None" U.O.F. officer-perceived subject weapon selections excluded from this chart.

Compared to the previous four-year average for officer-perceived subject weapons, Table 7 shows there were increases in total firearms (1.9%), baseball bat/club (33.3%) and none (26.3%) while there were decreases in knife/edged weapon (-8.3%), animal – no weapon (-60.0%), bottle (-77.8%), other (-30.3%) and unknown (-71.1%).

Officer-Perceived Subject Weapons (2020-2024)							
Type of Weapon	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	4-Yr Avg (2020-23)	% Chg. 4-Yr Avg (2024)
Firearms	939	766	711	877	839	823	1.9%
Knife/Edged Weapon	329	285	399	365	316	345	-8.3%
Baseball Bat/Club	25	28	31	51	45	34	33.3%
Animal - No Weapon	4	3	8	5	2	5	-60.0%
Bottle	3	8	5	2	1	5	-77.8%
Other	101	100	109	86	69	99	-30.3%
Unknown	477	376	449	108	102	353	-71.1%
None	189	259	230	459	359	284	26.3%
Grand Total	2,067	1,825	1,942	1,953	1,733	1,947	-11.0%

Table 7. Officer-Perceived Subject Weapons, 2020-2024

Note: Multiple officers may submit a U.F.R. that details multiple subjects being perceived to have access to multiple weapons in a single U.O.F. incident. Therefore, totals represent the reported number of officer-perceived subject weapon selections (1,733) rather than the number of U.O.F. incidents (1,152) or U.F.R. (1,888).

Officer Information

The U.F.R. allows officers to select multiple reasons for using force. The available options listed in order in the report include effect arrest, prevent an offence, prevent escape, protect other officer(s), protect public (including victims), protect self, protect subject(s), unintentional, and other. Officers are instructed to select all that apply, and most reports indicate multiple reasons. This year's report is unable to report on multiple reasons for applying force due to limitations in the IAPro database, which has historically been configured to record only one reason per incident. This issue has been addressed to allow for more accurate reporting in future years.

In 2024, there were 37 U.O.F. incidents where officer injuries were reported (see Table 8). This represents 3.2% of all U.O.F. incidents (1,152) and a 47.7% decrease compared to the previous four-year average (71). Furthermore, of these 37 injuries, 21 required medical attention (56.8%), which accounts for 1.8% of all U.O.F. incidents and a 48.5% decrease compared to the previous four-year average (41).

U.O.F. Incidents with Officer Injuries (2020-2024)					
Year	Total U.O.F. Incidents	Injuries		Injury Required Medical Attention	
		No	Yes	No	Yes
2020	1,368	1,281	87	35	52
2021	1,248	1,179	69	30	39
2022	1,387	1,299	88	51	37
2023	1,322	1,283	39	4	35
2024	1,152	1,115	37	16	21

Table 8. U.O.F. Incidents with Officer Injuries, 2020-2024

In 2024, the majority (98.5%) of U.O.F. options applied were reported as firearms (57.5%), physical control (23.1%), C.E.W. (16.0%) and less lethal shotguns (1.9%) (see Figure 8). The remaining four other U.O.F. options applied (impact weapons, oleoresin capsicum spray, police dog and other) accounted for the remaining 1.5% of U.O.F. options applied. Refer to Appendix B - Supplementary Data, Tables 4 and 5 of this report for more details.




Figure 8. U.O.F. Options Applied, 2024

Note: Multiple officers may submit a U.F.R. that details multiple U.O.F. options applied on multiple subjects in a single U.O.F. incident. Therefore, totals represent the reported number of U.O.F. options applied (2,575) rather than the number of U.O.F. incidents (1,152) or U.F.R.s (1,888) in 2024. Other Types of Force in Figure 8 include Impact Weapons, Oleoresin Capsicum Spray, Other Type of Force and Police Dog.

Compared to the previous four-year average, Table 9 shows there were increases in total firearms (13.1%), physical control (24.1%) and less lethal shotguns (8.9%) while there were decreases in total C.E.W. (-34.1%) and other types of force (-29.7%). Refer to Appendix B - Supplementary Data, Table 4 of this report for more details. The expansion of the C8 carbine program and the modernization of the U.F.R. in 2023 have impacted historical reporting comparisons.

U.O.F. Options Applied (2020-2024)							
U.O.F. Option Applied	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	4-Yr Avg (2020-23)	%Chg 4-Yr Avg (2024)
Firearms	1,361	1,139	1,277	1,455	1,480	1,308	13.1%
Physical Control	489	432	422	572	594	479	24.1%
C.E.W.	633	584	668	622	413	627	-34.1%
Less Lethal Shotgun	36	48	53	43	49	45	8.9%
Other	51	80	42	49	39	56	-29.7%
Grand Total	2,570	2,283	2,462	2,741	2,575	2,514	2.4%

Table 9. U.O.F. Options Applied, 2020-2024

Note: Multiple officers may submit a U.F.R. that details multiple U.O.F. options applied on multiple subjects in a single U.O.F. incident. Therefore, totals represent the reported number of U.O.F. options applied (2,575) rather than the number of U.O.F. incidents (1,152) or U.F.R.s (1,888) in 2024.

Firearms

In 2024, Firearm Discharged Reports (T.P.S. Form 586) indicate that there were 17 instances where individual officers discharged their firearms (4 involving less lethal shotgun discharges), representing a 26.1% decrease compared to the previous four-year average of 23 firearm discharges. Figure 9 illustrates the reasons for firearm discharges, including less lethal firearm discharges for 2024.




Figure 9. Firearms Discharge by Type of Reason, 2024

Note: There were 5 unintentional (administrative) firearms discharges in 2024 that have been removed from this chart.

In 2024, there were 1,480 total firearms U.O.F. options applied, representing 57.5% of all U.O.F. options applied (2,575). Rifles, a subcategory of firearms accounted for 20.2% of firearms U.O.F. options applied with 299 instances reported, representing 11.6% of all U.O.F. options applied. Rifles were reported in 14.9% of all U.F.R.s (1,888) appearing in 281 unique reports with three firearms discharge incidents - all intentional and related to dispatching an animal.

Tables 10 and 11 show the U.O.F. rifle deployment by type of incident and officer assignment by the total U.O.F. options applied (299). Table 10 shows the majority (91.6%) of officer assignments are tactical (60.2%). and patrol (31.4%).

Officer Assignment and Rifle U.O.F. Applied (2024)		
Assignment	Rifle U.O.F. Applied (#)	% of Total
Tactical	180	60.2
Patrol	94	31.4
Guns and Gangs, R.O.P.E., Other	17	5.7
Investigations (CIB/Major Crime)	5	1.7
Other-Type of Assignment	2	0.7
Community Oriented/Directed	1	0.3
Grand Total	299	100.0%

Table 10. Officer Assignment as Reported on U.F.R When Rifle U.O.F. Applied, 2024

Note: Rifle deployment refers to rifle being pointed at a subject.

Table 11 shows the majority (90.0%) of incident types are executing a warrant (59.9%), weapon(s) (20.4%) and violent crime (non-I.P.V.) (9.7%).

Type of Incident When Rifle U.O.F. Applied (2024)		
Type of Incident	Rifle U.O.F. Applied (#)	% of Total
Executing Warrant	179	59.9
Weapon(s)	61	20.4
Violent Crime (non-I.P.V.)	29	9.7
Stolen Vehicle	7	2.3
Disturbance	6	2.0
Person in Crisis	5	1.7
Intimate Partner Violence (I.P.V.)	3	1.0
Property Crime	3	1.0
Assist Other Police Service	1	0.3
Barricaded Subject	1	0.3
Investigation	1	0.3
Other Fed/Provincial Statutes	1	0.3
Person Stop	1	0.3
Wellness/Safety Check	1	0.3
Grand Total	299	100.0%

Table 11. Type of Incident When Rifle U.O.F. Applied, 2024

Note: Rifle deployment refers to rifle being pointed at a subject.

Conducted Energy Weapon Deployment Trends

In 2024, 3,428 members were newly trained on or requalified on either the X2 or T7 C.E.W. platforms. In 2024, there were 347 C.E.W. related incidents with 421 C.E.W.s deployed, compared to 516 C.E.W. related incidents and 642 C.E.W. deployments in 2023 (see Table 12). Of the 421 deployments in 2024, 413 occurred during a U.O.F. incident. In comparison, there were 622 deployments during a U.O.F. incident in 2023. This represents a 33.6% decrease in C.E.W. deployments during U.O.F. incidents from 2023 to 2024. The distinction is made to account for accidental discharges. In 2024, there were 8 accidental/unintentional discharges, representing 1.9% of all reports involving a C.E.W. In 2023, there were 20 accidental/unintentional discharges. All accidental/unintentional discharges in 2024 occurred inside a secure area of a police facility during mandatory spark (function) testing.

Annual C.E.W. Usage (2020-2024)							
Annual C.E.W. Usage	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	4-Yr Avg (2020-23)	% Chg 4-Yr Avg (2024)
Qualified Users	2,322	2,460	2,888	3,480	3,428	2,788	23.0%
C.E.W. Deployments	604	603	688	642	421	634	-33.6%
C.E.W. Related Incidents	488	478	530	516	347	503	-31.0%

Table 12. Annual C.E.W. Usage by Qualified Users, Deployments and Incidents, 2020-2024

There has been a decrease in the number of C.E.W. qualified users by 1.5% compared to 2023, with an increase of 23.0% compared to the previous four-year average. Furthermore, individual C.E.W. deployments have decreased by 33.4% (deployments compared to qualified users). When compared to 2023, there was a slight increase in C.E.W. usage in Drive Stun Mode (3.9% vs 3.4% all C.E.W. uses), while Full Deployment + Drive Stun Mode significantly decreased (0.24% vs 1.6%). In 2024, 72.2% of the C.E.W. reports involved a "demonstrated force presence", which was the same as 2023. C.E.W. Full Deployments were the second highest type of deployment and accounted for 23.7% of the 413 uses in 2024 (accidental/unintentional deployments excluded). This figure is up from 22.8% in 2023. Table 13 illustrates the type of C.E.W. used operationally in the past five years. Accidental/unintentional discharges have been excluded to provide an accurate depiction of C.E.W. use during actual U.O.F. incidents.

Types of C.E.W. Deployment (2020-2024)							
Type of C.E.W Deployment	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	4-Yr Avg (2020-23)	% Chg 4-Yr Avg (2024)
Demonstrated Force Presence	426	396	440	449	298	428	-30.3%
Full Deployment	132	130	177	142	98	145	-32.5%
Drive Stun	25	33	32	21	16	28	-42.3%
Full Deployment + Drive Stun	21	22	19	10	1	18	-94.4%
Total	604	581	668	622	413	619	-33.3%

Table 13. Types of C.E.W. Deployments by Year, 2020-2024

Note: Accidental and unintentional C.E.W. deployments are not included in this table: 2022 (20), 2023 (20) and 2024 (8).

Effectiveness

When necessary and justified, full deployment of a C.E.W is the most effective application of the device, providing officers with distance from the subject which increases the spread of the probes promoting a larger area of neuromuscular incapacitation. However, several factors impact the effectiveness of a C.E.W. in full deployment. If the subject is wearing heavy/bulky or loose clothing, probes may not penetrate the layers, or a single probe can miss or be deflected. Conducting wires are breakable so contact during full deployment could be interrupted, allowing the subject to once again become assaultive. Officers may also have to use a C.E.W in drive stun mode (third point of contact) to maintain control of the subject, this explains incidents where full deployment and drive stun modes were used in combination. Table 14 illustrates the above.

Effectiveness of C.E.W. by Deployment Type (2020-2024)															
C.E.W. Deployment Type	2020			2021			2022			2023			2024		
	Yes	No	% Yes	Yes	No	% Yes	Yes	No	% Yes	Yes	No	% Yes	Yes	No	% Yes
Demonstrated Force Presence	384	42	90.1	344	52	86.9	387	53	88.0	402	47	89.5	242	56	81.2
Full Deployment	90	42	68.2	98	32	75.4	132	45	74.6	107	35	75.4	74	24	75.5
Drive Stun	24	1	96.0	29	4	87.9	26	6	81.3	19	2	90.5	13	3	81.3
Full Deployment + Drive Stun	15	6	71.4	13	9	59.1	11	8	57.9	6	4	60.0	0	1	N/A

Table 14. Effectiveness. of C.E.W. by Deployment Type, 2020-2024

Perceived Subject Behaviour

In situations where an individual is displaying passive or active resistance, T.P.S. procedure prohibits officers from using a C.E.W. in any manner other than a demonstrated force presence. In 2024, the subject's behaviour was perceived as either passive or active resistance at 32.2%. The majority (66.8%) of subject's behaviour was perceived by officers as either assaultive or likely to cause serious bodily harm or death to another person or to themselves (see Table 15). For all C.F.S.A. by members in 2024 (411,607), 347 involved the deployment of one or more C.E.W.s. The C.E.W. was used in 0.08% of all C.F.S.A. In the context of violent C.F.S.A. (48,472), the C.E.W. use rate increases to 0.72%.

Perceived Subject Behaviour at Time of C.E.W. Deployment, 2020-2024										
Subject Behaviour	2020		2021		2022		2023		2024	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Passive Resistant	98	16.2	105	18.1	96	14.4	103	16.6	76	18.4
Active Resistant	109	18.0	135	23.2	82	12.3	83	13.3	57	13.8
Assaultive	230	38.1	227	39.1	271	40.6	223	35.8	138	33.4
Serious Bodily Harm/Death	151	25.0	111	19.1	211	31.6	197	31.7	138	33.4
Not Applicable *	16	2.7	3	0.5	8	1.2	16	2.6	4	1.0
Total Deployments	604	100%	581	100%	668	100%	622	100%	413	100%

Table 15. Perceived Subject Behaviour at Time of C.E.W. Deployment by Year, 2020-2024

Persons in Crisis

Police officers frequently interact with people who are in crisis, under the influence of drugs and/or alcohol, as well as any combination of these factors. Prior to 2022, the T.P.S. continued to see a year-over-year increase in calls for service related to P.I.C. This trend was interrupted in 2022, as officers attended 33,071 calls for service involving a P.I.C., (35,393 in 2021) which represents a 6.6% decrease from 2021. P.I.C. related calls declined again in 2023 with officers attending 31,572 such events, a decrease of 4.5% from 2022. In 2024, P.I.C. related calls increased slightly by 3.4% in comparison to 2023 figures.

In 2024, of the 413 operational uses of a C.E.W., 163 (39.5%) involved persons whom officers believed were in crisis. Overall, however, a C.E.W. was deployed in 0.50% of all P.I.C. C.F.S.A. in 2024, representing a 0.24% decrease when compared to 2023, which saw 235 uses (0.74%) of the total. Members attended 1,072 fewer calls for service involving P.I.C. when compared to 2023, with a decrease in related C.E.W. use. Table 16 shows the type of C.E.W. use on P.I.C. who may or may not have also been perceived to be under the influence of the effects of alcohol and/or drugs. In 2024 deployments, the main type of use reported was demonstrated force presence at 63.2%.

Type of C.E.W. Deployment and P.I.C., 2020-2024										
Type of Use on P.I.C.	2020		2021		2022		2023		2024	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Demonstrated Force Presence	106	62.0	152	59.8	153	53.5	154	65.5	103	63.2
Full Deployment	47	27.5	81	31.9	111	38.8	76	32.3	57	35.0
Drive Stun	5	2.9	14	5.5	14	4.9	5	2.1	3	1.8
Full Deployment + Drive Stun	13	7.6	7	2.8	8	2.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total Uses on P.I.C.	171	100%	254	100%	286	100%	235	100%	163	100%

Table 16. Type of C.E.W. Deployment and P.I.C., 2020-2024

Perceived Subject Condition

Officers often interact with people who are in crisis, under the influence of drugs and/or alcohol, or any combination of these. Officers categorize their perception of the condition of the person at the time of C.E.W. use in the applicable sections of the Conducted Energy Weapon Use Report. An officer's perception is based on experience, knowledge, training and observations made at the time of the incident.

Table 17 categorizes officers' perceptions of the condition of the person at the time of C.E.W. deployment over a five-year period.

C.E.W. Deployment and Perceived Subject Condition, 2020-2024										
Subject Condition	2020		2021		2022		2023		2024	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Alcohol Only	64	10.6	57	9.8	38	5.7	69	11.1	47	11.4
Alcohol + Drugs	26	4.3	18	3.1	23	3.4	33	5.4	17	4.1
Alcohol + Drugs P.I.C.	22	3.6	18	3.1	25	3.7	19	3.2	13	3.1
Alcohol + P.I.C.	23	3.8	20	3.4	17	2.5	18	2.8	11	2.7
Drugs	58	9.6	31	5.3	64	9.6	56	9	36	8.7
Drugs + P.I.C.	14	2.3	55	9.5	53	7.9	37	5.9	22	5.3
P.I.C.	165	27.3	161	27.7	191	28.6	161	25.8	117	28.3
Not Applicable	232	38.4	221	38	257	38.5	229	36.8	150	36.3
Total Uses	604	100%	581	100%	668	100%	622	100%	413	100%

Table 17. C.E.W. Deployment and Perceived Subject Condition, 2020-2024

Persons in Crisis and Effectiveness

In 2015, the T.P.S. began tracking and reporting on the effectiveness of C.E.W. use on P.I.C. In 2024, of the 163 incidents where the involved subjects were reported as in crisis or being in crisis and under the influence of drugs and/or alcohol, 75% of these deployments were deemed to have been effective. Table 18 displays the relative effectiveness of C.E.W. use on P.I.C. as perceived by the officer. Effectiveness can be described as bringing the individual under control safely and effectively. The variation in effectiveness is explained above.

C.E.W. Deployment Effectiveness and P.I.C., 2020-2024														
2020			2021			2022			2023			2024		
Yes	No	% Yes	Yes	No	% Yes	Yes	No	% Yes	Yes	No	% Yes	Yes	No	% Yes
134	37	78.4%	205	49	80.7%	239	47	83.6%	184	51	78.3%	123	40	75.5%

Table 18. C.E.W. Deployment Effectiveness and P.I.C., 2020-24

Mental Health Act Apprehensions

These incidents describe situations where a person was apprehended under the Mental Health Act (M.H.A.) and transported to a psychiatric facility for assessment. Out of 413 C.E.W. deployments, 119 or 28.8% resulted in apprehensions under the M.H.A. The data only shows the apprehensions themselves and does not capture the results of the assessment by a physician.

Not all P.I.C. that interact with police result in apprehensions under the M.H.A. An apprehension may not occur if a P.I.C. voluntarily attends a hospital for assessment or if, during their interactions with police, they are no longer displaying behaviour consistent with the grounds required for a M.H.A. apprehension. Officers are trained to use a C.E.W. in response to the person's behaviour and not because of the person's condition.

De-escalation

Of the 413 operational deployments in 2024, officers reported using or attempting to use de-escalation techniques in 397 of these incidents, representing 96.1% of the total and is the same as the total percentage in 2023. In 2024, 19 C.E.W. deployments were reported where de-escalation was not attempted. Of these, 15 reported "imminent threat-immediate action required".

Impact

Making Sense of the Trends

The patterns emerging from this year's data show that policing is becoming more focused on resolution through communication and de-escalation rather than force. Training, policy updates, and stronger accountability have shaped how officers respond to complex situations, often allowing them to prevent incidents from escalating. Even as calls for service and arrests increase, the decline in force-related reports suggests progress in balancing enforcement with community care. These trends highlight a shift toward safer outcomes and reinforce the importance of continued investment in training and oversight.

Public Safety Concerns

Public safety remains at the centre of every decision an officer makes. While U.O.F. may be necessary in certain high-risk encounters, the T.P.S. continues to emphasize approaches that reduce the likelihood of harm to both the public and officers. The data shows that most interactions are resolved without force, and that when force is used, it is closely monitored through reporting, review, and oversight. Highlighting these safeguards helps the public understand that U.O.F. is guided by necessity, proportionality, and accountability.

Civic Responsibility

The Annual Use of Force Report is more than an internal review; it is part of the T.P.S.'s responsibility to the communities it serves. By openly sharing data, explaining training and oversight, and acknowledging areas for growth, the T.P.S. affirms its commitment to transparency and public trust. Civic responsibility means ensuring that policing practices reflect community expectations and uphold democratic values. This report is one way to show how the T.P.S. is working toward fair, respectful, and accountable public safety.

Next Steps

Digital Transformation

In consultation with the T.P.S.'s Data Management Pillar, the T.P.S. is advancing its approach to how information is collected, managed, and communicated. Improvements in data governance are strengthening the accuracy and consistency of reporting, while new methods of analysis allow for deeper insights into patterns and outcomes. Enhanced visualization tools are also being developed to present data in a way that is clearer and more accessible for both internal decision-makers and members of the public. These efforts support a modernized, evidence-driven approach to accountability, ensuring that complex information can be better understood and acted upon.

Partnerships

The ongoing work of reporting and oversight is supported by strong partnerships across the organization and community. Collaboration with the T.P.S.'s Data Management Team helps to ensure information is accurate and reliable, while engagement with the Race-Based Data Collection Team brings an important equity lens to the analysis. The Mental Health and Addictions Advisory Panel (M.H.A.A.P.) further contributes by grounding the findings in a broader understanding of crisis response and community impact. Together, these partnerships ensure that the story behind the numbers reflects not only operational realities but also the experiences and concerns of Toronto's diverse communities.

Conclusion and Future Goals

Looking forward, the T.P.S. is committed to strengthening accountability by maintaining transparent, annual U.O.F. reporting. Future goals include building on current data improvements, expanding opportunities for community engagement, and aligning reporting practices with evolving provincial and national standards. By committing to continuous review and refinement, the T.P.S. affirms its responsibility to provide meaningful information that supports trust, oversight, and informed dialogue. This ongoing work ensures that U.O.F. reporting remains not just a compliance requirement, but a cornerstone of democratic policing in Toronto.

Appendix A – Glossary

Acronyms

B.W.C.	Body-Worn Camera
C.C.	Criminal Code
C.E.W.	Conducted Energy Weapon
C.F.S.A.	Calls for Service Attended
C.I.R.T.	Critical Incident Response Team
C.I.B.	Criminal Investigations Bureau
C.P.E.U.	Community Policing Engagement Unit
C.S.P.A.	Community Safety and Policing Act
D.F.P.	Demonstrated Force Presence (C.E.W. Operational Deployment Type)
D.S.M.	Drive Stun Mode (C.E.W. Operational Deployment Type)
E.T.F.	Emergency Task Force
F.D.	Full Deployment (C.E.W. Operational Deployment Type)
I.C.C.S.	In-Car Camera System
I.P.V.	Intimate Partner Violence
I.S.T.	In Service Training
M.C.I.T.	Mobile Crisis Intervention Team
M.H.A.	Mental Health Act
M.H.A.A.P.	Mental Health and Addictions Advisory Panel
O.I.C.	Officer in Charge
O.P.C.	Ontario Police College
P.I.C.	Person in Crisis
P.S.A.	Police Services Act
P.S.U.	Public Safety Unit
P.S.V.	Peer Support Volunteer
R.O.P.E.	Repeat Offender Parole Enforcement
T.P.C.	Toronto Police College
T.P.O.C.	Toronto Police Operations Centre
T.P.S.	Toronto Police Service
T.P.S.B.	Toronto Police Service Board
U.C.C.	Unit Complaint Coordinator
U.F.R.	Use of Force Report
U.O.F.	Use of Force

Calculations

Percentage Change:

Percentage change equals the change in value divided by the absolute value of the original value, multiplied by 100. This calculation is commonly used when the order of the numbers matters and you have a starting and ending value or an “older number” and “new number”. It quantifies the change from one number to another and expresses the change as an increase or decrease.

$$\frac{(V_2 - V_1)}{V_1} \times 100 = ?$$

For Example:

Going from **10** (V_1) in 2023 to **15** (V_2) incidents in 2024 is a **50%** (?) increase in the number of incidents year over year (% chg. 2023-24).

The Four-Year Average:

The four-year average is the mean amount of U.O.F. figures used by the T.P.S. over the four years prior (2020-2023) to the reporting year (2024). It is calculated by adding the total figures for each of those years and dividing by four. This average helps identify patterns and serves as a benchmark for comparing the current year’s figures against recent history. Tracking against this measure smooths out year-to-year fluctuations that may occur because of unusual events and provides a more stable measure of typical figures that clearly illuminates any changes over time.

$$\text{Avg} = \text{total sum all \#s} / \# \text{ of items in set}$$

For Example:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \mathbf{175,} & \mathbf{250,} & \mathbf{125,} & \mathbf{100} & = & \mathbf{650 / 4} & = & \mathbf{162.5 \text{ avg.}} \\ (2020), & (2021), & (2022), & (2023) & & (\text{sum}) / (\text{items}) & & (4\text{yr avg.}) \end{array}$$

Definitions

Accidental Discharge:

An unintentional discharge of a service firearm or less lethal shotgun by a police officer that is not the result of undue care and attention to the prescribed safe handling procedures.

Call for Service:

An emergency or non-emergency call for police service that results in an enforcement action. The call type indicates how a call was characterised based on initial information provided to the Communications Operator.

Critical Incident Response Team (C.I.R.T.):

A team consisting of Peer Support Volunteers coordinated through the T.P.S. to respond to incidents where critical incident stress may occur and to assist members and their families to cope after becoming involved in a traumatic critical incident. C.I.R.T. members are trained in trauma response measures and are qualified to lead defusing sessions. C.I.R.T. members are not counsellors.

Conducted Energy Weapon (C.E.W.):

A weapon that primarily uses propelled wires to conduct energy that affects the sensory and/or motor functions of the central nervous system. The device may be used by an officer in Demonstrated Force Presence, Drive Stun Mode, or Full Deployment mode and an unintentional discharge may occur.

De-escalation:

Ontario Police College (O.P.C.): The use of verbal and non-verbal strategies, intended to prevent escalation or reduce the intensity of a situation without the application of force, and, if force is necessary, reducing the amount of force, if reasonably safe to do so.

Toronto Police Service Procedure 15-01, Incident Response (Use of Force/De-escalation): The use of verbal and non-verbal strategies intended to reduce the intensity of a conflict or crisis encountered by the police, with the intent of gaining compliance without the application of force, or if force is necessary, reducing the amount of force so as not to exceed the amount of force reasonably required.

Demonstrated Force Presence (D.F.P.):

The method of un-holstering and displaying a conducted energy weapon in the presence of a subject with the intention to achieve behaviour compliance.

Dispatching of an Animal:

The discharge of a firearm for the purpose of ending the life of an animal that is potentially dangerous or is so badly injured that humanity dictates that its suffering be ended.

Drive Stun Mode (D.S.M.):

The method of placing a conducted energy weapon in direct contact with the subject and applying the current without the probes being propelled.

Firearm:

For the purposes of use of force, means a T.P.S. issued or authorized firearm.

Firearm Discharge:

When a T.P.S. member discharges a firearm in the performance of their duty, and/or discharges a T.P.S. issued firearm at any time, intentionally or unintentionally, regardless of whether it causes injury or death. This does not include firearm discharges that occur at an authorized range or under the exemption provisions.

Full Deployment (F.D.):

The method wherein the probes of a conducted energy weapon are fired at a subject and the electrical pulse applied. In this mode, the device is designed to override the subject's nervous system and affect both the sensory and motor functions causing incapacitation.

Handgun:

As per Police Services Act, 1990, O. Reg. 926/90, S.2 and Community Safety Police Act, 2019 O. Reg. 391/23 S.1, a firearm that is designed, altered or intended to be aimed and fired by the action of one hand.

Member:

Unless otherwise specified, means any police officer, or any civilian member of the T.P.S.

Peer Support Volunteer (P.S.V.):

A T.P.S. member trained in trauma response measures and available on-call to provide ongoing assistance and support to members and their families after becoming involved in a traumatic critical incident. P.S.V.s are qualified to lead defusing sessions. P.S.V.s are not counsellors. The P.S.V.s will assist members to seek professional treatment, if required.

Person in Crisis (P.I.C.):

A member of the public whose behaviour brings them into contact with emergency services, either because of an apparent need for urgent care within the mental health system, or because they are otherwise experiencing a mental, emotional or substance use crisis involving behaviour that is sufficiently erratic, threatening or dangerous that emergency services are called in order to protect the person or those around them. This includes persons who may require assessment under the Mental Health Act.

Qualified in the Use of a C.E.W.:

A police officer qualified by the T.P.C. - Armament Section to use a C.E.W. and who has attended and passed C.E.W. training before the 12-month expiry of the date of certification of the previous year.

Service Member's Perception Data:

Information derived from a member making a determination with respect to the race of an individual by observation, solely on the basis of that member's own perception.

List of Figures

Figure 1. Summary of Positive Trends in U.O.F., 2024.....	1
Figure 2. Use of Force Factors Visualization, 2020-2024.....	2
Figure 3. Five-Year comparison of U.F.R.s and incidents, 2020-2024.....	6
Figure 4. U.F.R.s Submitted by Sub-Command, 2024.....	8
Figure 5. Officer Assignment as Reported on U.F.R., 2024.....	9
Figure 6. Number of Subjects Involved per U.O.F. Incident, 2024.....	10
Figure 7. Officer-Perceived Subject Weapon(s), 2024.....	11
Figure 8. U.O.F. Options Applied, 2024.....	13
Figure 9. Firearms Discharge by Type of Reason, 2024.....	14

List of Tables

Table 1. Summary of U.O.F. reporting metrics, 2020-2024.....	5
Table 2. Summary of U.O.F. rate per Total C.F.S.A., 2020-2024.....	6
Table 3. Summary of Officer-based U.O.F. rates, 2023-2024.....	7
Table 4. Summary of external factors impacting U.O.F. reporting, 2020-2024.....	7
Table 5. Type of Incident When Force Applied, 2020-2024.....	9
Table 6. U.O.F. Incidents Reporting Subject Injuries, 2020-2024.....	10
Table 7. Officer-Perceived Subject Weapon(s), 2020-2024.....	12
Table 8. U.O.F. Incidents with Officer Injuries, 2020-2024.....	13
Table 9. U.O.F. Options Applied, 2020-2024.....	14
Table 10. Officer Assignment as Reported on U.F.R When Rifle U.O.F. Applied, 2024.....	15
Table 11. Type of Incident When Rifle U.O.F. Applied, 2024.....	15
Table 12. Annual C.E.W. Usage by Qualified Users, Deployments and Incidents, 2020-2024.....	16
Table 13. Types of C.E.W. Deployment by Year, 2020-2024.....	17
Table 14. Effectiveness of C.E.W. by Deployment Type, 2020-2024.....	17
Table 15. Perceived Subject Behaviour at Time of C.E.W. Deployment by Year, 2020-2024.....	18
Table 16. Type of C.E.W. Deployment and P.I.C., 2020-2024.....	19
Table 17. C.E.W. Deployments and Perceived Subject Condition, 2020-2024.....	19
Table 18. C.E.W. Deployment Effectiveness and P.I.C., 2020-2024.....	20

Appendix B – Supplementary Data

U.O.F. Summary Statistics Five-Year Comparison (2020-2024)							
Indicator	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	4 Yr Avg (2020-23)	% Chg 4-Yr Avg (2024)
City of Toronto Population	2,884,258	2,921,755	2,992,348	3,126,817	3,179,225	2,981,295	6.6%
T.P.S. Uniform Members	5,061	4,972	4,926	5,029	5,249	4,997	5.0%
Calls for Service Attended (C.F.S.A.)	412,332	398,144	385,609	407,589	411,607	400,919	2.7%
Violent C.F.S.A.	48,612	46,629	47,831	46,258	48,472	47,333	2.4%
Total C.C. Violation Occurrences	116,986	119,163	140,211	169,364	176,512	136,431	29.4%
P.I.C. C.F.S.A.	33,143	35,393	33,071	31,572	32,644	33,295	-2.0%
M.H.A. Apprehensions	12,409	14,273	13,589	12,760	13,845	13,258	4.4%
Arrests	21,032	21,739	25,249	29,090	33,805	24,278	39.2%
U.O.F. Reports	2,095	1,899	2,105	2,133	1,888	2,058	-8.3%
U.O.F. Incidents	1,368	1,248	1,387	1,322	1,152	1,331	-13.5%
U.O.F. Unique Officers	-	-	-	1,130	1,043	-	-
U.O.F. Options Employed	2,570	2,283	2,462	2,741	2,575	2,514	2.4%
U.O.F. Total Subjects	-	-	-	1,944	1,714	-	-
U.O.F. Perceived Subject Weapons	1,878	1,566	1,712	1,494	1,374	1,663	-17.4%
U.O.F. Reports per C.F.S.A. Rate	0.51%	0.48%	0.55%	0.52%	0.46%	0.51%	-10.7%
U.O.F. Unique Officers per T.P.S. Uniform Members	-	-	-	22.5%	19.9%	-	-
C.E.W. Qualified Users	2,322	2,460	2,888	3,480	3,428	2,788	23.0%
C.E.W. Deployments	604	603	688	642	421	634	-33.6%
C.E.W. Deployments per C.F.S.A. Rate	0.15%	0.15%	0.18%	0.16%	0.10%	0.16%	-35.5%
C.E.W. Deployments per Qualified Users Rate	26.0%	24.5%	23.8%	18.4%	12.3%	23.2%	-47.1%

Table 1. U.O.F. Summary Statistics, 2020-2024

Note: The Population and Uniform Members figures are extracted from the T.P.S. Analytics & Innovation (A.&I.) Annual Statistics Report (A.S.R.).

U.O.F. Incidents by Type of Incident (2020-2024)										
Type of Incident	2020		2021		2022		2023		2024	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Weapons Call	409	29.9	429	34.4	497	35.8	319	24.1	291	25.3
Search Warrant/Warrant Related	283	20.7	254	20.4	216	15.6	242	18.3	256	22.2
Violent Crime (Non-I.P.V.)	51	3.7	34	2.7	55	4.0	186	14.1	174	15.1
Stolen Vehicle	36	2.6	32	2.6	38	2.7	98	7.4	107	9.3
Person in Crisis / Wellness Check	77	5.6	84	6.7	104	7.5	140	10.6	80	6.9
Other	233	17.0	215	17.2	202	14.6	116	8.8	78	6.8
Disturbance	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	81	6.1	45	3.9
Intimate Partner Violence (I.P.V.)	34	2.5	35	2.8	45	3.2	45	3.4	38	3.3
Traffic	38	2.8	29	2.3	42	3.0	23	1.7	32	2.8
Investigation	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	29	2.2	17	1.5
Barricaded Subject	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	20	1.5	13	1.1
Police Custody Related	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	0.8	13	1.1
Animal Related	10	0.7	18	1.4	13	0.9	12	0.9	8	0.7
Arrest/Prisoner Related	16	1.2	10	0.8	5	0.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
Break and Enter	42	3.1	36	2.9	61	4.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
Drug Related	8	0.6	5	0.4	4	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
Pursuit	8	0.6	2	0.2	4	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
Robbery Call	43	3.1	23	1.8	41	3.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Suspicious Person Call	18	1.3	11	0.9	14	1.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Unknown Trouble Call	32	2.3	11	0.9	21	1.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
Wanted Person	30	2.2	20	1.6	25	1.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	1,368	100%	1,248	100%	1,387	100%	1,322	100%	1,152	100%

Table 2. U.O.F. Incidents by Type of Incident, 2020-2024

Note: The following incident types listed in the above table are groupings based on historical reporting practices: Animal Related = Animal Related, Human Destruction of Animal; Person in Crisis/Wellness Check = Person in Crisis, Wellness/Safety Check; Police Custody Related = Police Custody Related, Prisoner Related; Violent Crime (Non-I.P.V.) = Active Attacker, Violent Crime (non-IPV); Other = Alarm, Assist Other Police Service, Family/Neighbour/Other Dispute, Other, Other Fed/Prov Statutes, Person Stop, Property Crime, Public Order, Unintentional Discharge. The not mentioned incident types are not groupings and can be directly found in the U.F.R. as selection options.

Officer Assignment as Reported on U.F.R. (2020-2024)										
Officer Duties	2020		2021		2022		2023		2024	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Patrol	0	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1,434	67.9	1,258	66.6
Tactical	437	20.9	421	22.2	414	19.7	317	15.0	298	15.8
Investigation (C.I.B./Major Crime)	0	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	114	5.4	119	6.3
Special Operations	0	0	0	0.0	1	0.0	95	4.5	84	4.4
Traffic Patrol	28	1.3	8	0.4	16	0.8	15	0.7	35	1.9
Community Oriented/Directed	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	2.2	26	1.4
Other Type of Assignment	77	3.7	84	4.4	60	2.9	30	1.4	23	1.2
Paid Duty	11	0.5	12	0.6	13	0.6	18	0.9	15	0.8
Investigation - Drugs	19	0.9	13	0.7	4	0.2	9	0.4	11	0.6
Canine	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0.2	5	0.3
Police Dog/Mounted	5	0.2	5	0.3	9	0.4	1	0.0	3	0.2
Administrative	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0.1	2	0.1
Community Liaison School Res	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0.1	2	0.1
Mental Health/Mobile Crisis	0	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.1	2	0.1
Court Security	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.0	1	0.1
Hostage Rescue	0	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.1
Humane Destruction of Animal	0	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.1
Prisoner Transport/Care Control	0	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.1	1	0.1
Public Order	0	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	0.1	1	0.1
Crowd Control	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Directed Patrol	3	0.1	6	0.3	2	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
Foot Patrol	42	2.0	53	2.8	25	1.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
General Patrol	1,293	61.7	1,083	57.0	1,399	66.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
Investigation - Other	180	8.6	213	11.2	161	7.6	14	0.7	0	0.0
Off-Duty	0	0.0	1	0.1	1	0.0	2	0.1	0	0.0
Total Reports	2,095	100%	1,899	100%	2,105	100%	2,113	100%	1,888	100%

Table 3. Officer Assignment at Time of Incident as Reported on U.F.R., 2020-2024

U.O.F. Options Applied (2020-2024)										
U.O.F. Option Applied	2020		2021		2022		2023		2024	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Conducted Energy Weapons	633	24.6	584	25.6	668	27.1	622	22.7	413	16.0
See Table 5 for a C.E.W. Operational Deployment Type breakdown based on C.E.W. Use Report (T.P.S. Form 584) reporting										
Physical Control										
Hard	57	2.2	82	3.6	90	3.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
Soft	354	13.8	280	12.3	267	10.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
Both Hard and Soft	78	3.0	70	3.1	65	2.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
Escort Techniques	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	81	3.0	87	3.4
Grounding	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	232	8.5	254	9.9
Joint Locks	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	24	0.9	29	1.1
Pinning	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	119	4.3	128	5.0
Pressure Points	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	24	0.9	24	0.9
Strikes	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	71	2.6	68	2.6
Other Physical Control	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	21	0.8	4	0.2
Total	489	19.0	432	18.9	422	17.1	572	20.9	594	23.1
Firearms										
Firearm Discharge - Intentional	14	0.5	22	1.0	18	0.7	21	0.8	13	0.5
Firearm Pointed at Person	1016	39.5	852	37.3	948	38.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
Firearm Drawn (Not Pointed)	331	12.9	265	11.6	311	12.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
Handgun Pointed at Person	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	824	30.1	819	31.8
Handgun Drawn (Not Pointed)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	260	9.5	306	11.9
Rifle Pointed at Person	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	302	11.0	299	11.6
Shotgun (Lethal) Pointed at Person	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	48	1.8	43	1.7
Total	1,361	53.0	1,139	49.9	1,277	51.9	1,455	53.1	1,480	57.5
Other Type of Force										
Impact Weapons Used										
Impact Weapon Hard	11	0.4	21	0.9	12	0.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
Impact Weapon Soft	6	0.2	9	0.4	8	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
Impact Weapon Both Hard and Soft	2	0.1	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Baton - Hard	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	15	0.5	4	0.2
Baton - Soft	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	0.4	9	0.3
Shield	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	0.1	1	0.0
Other Impact Weapon	3	0.1	1	0.0	1	0.0	2	0.1	0	0.0
Less Lethal Shotgun										
Less Lethal Discharge	2	0.1	8	0.4	5	0.2	3	0.1	4	0.2
Less Lethal Point at Person	34	1.3	40	1.8	48	1.9	40	1.5	45	1.7
Oleoresin Capsicum Spray	18	0.7	39	1.7	12	0.5	12	0.4	10	0.4
Other Type of Force	3	0.1	3	0.1	6	0.2	3	0.1	10	0.4
Police Dog	8	0.3	6	0.3	3	0.1	2	0.1	5	0.2
Total	87	3.4	128	5.6	95	3.9	92	3.4	88	3.4
Grand Total	2,570	100%	2,283	100%	2,462	100%	2,741	100%	2,575	100%

Table 4. U.O.F. Options Applied by Category, 2020-2024

Note: Percentages show each force options share of all force options in a given year, and therefore, the grand total can exceed U.O.F. incidents and reports totals. Accidental/Unintentional U.O.F. have been excluded from the total.

Type of C.E.W. Deployment (2020-2024)							
Type of C.E.W. Deployment	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	4-Yr Avg (2020-23)	% Chg 4-Yr Avg (2024)
Demonstrated Force Presence	426	396	440	449	298	428	-30.3%
Full Deployment	132	130	177	142	98	145	-32.5%
Drive Stun	25	33	32	21	16	28	-42.3%
Full Deployment + Drive Stun	21	22	19	10	1	18	-94.4%
Total	604	581	668	622	413	619	-33.3%

Table 5. C.E.W. Operational Deployment Types by U.O.F. Incidents from C.E.W. Use Report (T.P.S. Form 584), 2020-2024

Note: Accidental and unintentional C.E.W. deployments are not included in this table: 2022 (20), 2023 (20) and 2024 (8).

U.O.F. Perceived Weapon(s) Carried by Subject(s) (2020-2024)										
Type of Weapon	2020		2021		2022		2023		2024	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Animal - No Weapon	4	0.2	3	0.2	8	0.4	5	0.3	2	0.1
Baseball Bat/Club	25	1.2	28	1.5	31	1.6	51	2.6	45	2.6
Bottle	3	0.1	8	0.4	5	0.3	2	0.1	1	0.1
Knife/Edged Weapon	329	15.9	285	15.6	399	20.5	365	18.7	316	18.2
Firearms										
Handgun (Semi-Auto/Pistol)	819	39.6	718	39.3	636	32.7	822	42.1	797	46.0
Long Gun (Rifle/Shotgun)	60	2.9	44	2.4	61	3.1	53	2.7	41	2.4
Other-Firearm	60	2.9	4	0.2	14	0.7	2	0.1	1	0.1
None	189	9.1	259	14.2	230	11.8	459	23.5	359	20.7
Other	101	4.9	100	5.5	109	5.6	86	4.4	69	4.0
Unknown	477	23.1	376	20.6	449	23.1	108	5.5	102	5.9
Grand Total	2,067	100%	1,825	100%	1,942	100%	1,953	100%	1,733	100%

Table 6. Perceived Weapon(s) Carried by Subject(s), 2020-2024

Note: A single U.O.F. incident may involve multiple subjects with multiple perceived weapons and involve multiple officers.

Percentages show each perceived subject weapons share of all perceived subject weapons in a given year, and therefore, the grand total can exceed U.O.F. incidents and reports totals. Accidental/Unintentional U.O.F. have been removed from the total.

Appendix C- Legislation and Governance

Use of Force Ontario Public-Police Interactions Training Aid (2023)

In May 2023, the Ministry of the Solicitor General replaced the Ontario Use of Force Model with the Ontario Public-Police Interactions Training Aid. This framework, built around the Assess–Plan–Act model, helps officers evaluate situations that may involve risk, with a focus on de-escalation and communication.

The Training Aid consists of a [framework document](#) and a [graphic](#). Together, they are intended to be used as a resource to help both police officers and the public understand how officers may respond during an interaction. The model emphasizes that while circumstances may require force, any response must be necessary, proportionate, and reasonable. Officers are expected to continually reassess situations and use the least amount of force required to ensure safety.

The Aid outlines subject behaviour ranging from cooperative to serious bodily harm or death, and guides officers in applying de-escalation and non-force options wherever possible. The overarching goal of any public-police interaction is a cooperative, respectful, and peaceful resolution, though outcomes depend on various situational factors.

Situational factors that may influence an officer's response include the environment, the number of individuals involved, the subject's perceived capabilities, prior knowledge of the subject, time and distance considerations, and potential indicators of an imminent threat. Subject behaviour, including abilities and state of mind, is important to an officer's assessment of risk, use of communication strategies and the possible effectiveness of the response options available to them. The training aid depicts subject behaviour as a grey ring which shading changes from light to dark grey illustrating that a subject's behaviour can transition from one to another (sometimes very quickly). Officers must evaluate the behaviour of the subject, while always assessing risk. Each category is described as follows:

- Cooperative – Subject complies with a lawful request
- Passive Resistant – Subject refuses to comply with officer's lawful direction, using little or no physical action. This may include verbal refusal or deliberate physical inactivity.
- Active Resistant – Subject uses non-assaultive physical actions to resist an officer's lawful direction. Examples include pulling away to prevent or escape control or blatant movements such as walking or running away.
- Assaultive – Subject attempts or applies force to another person, or threatens to do so through actions or gestures, creating a reasonable belief that they have the present ability to carry out the threat. This includes behaviours such as kicking, punching, or aggressive body language that signals the intent to assault.

- Serious Bodily Harm or Death – Subject exhibits actions that the officer reasonably believes are intended to, or are likely to, cause serious bodily harm or death to any person, including themselves. Examples include assaults with a weapon or suicide attempts.

Strategic factors may include the availability of equipment, presence of additional officers, use of cover, communication strategies, deployment of specialized units, geographic constraints, containment feasibility, and adherence to T.P.S. policies and procedures. An officer's perception is shaped by these factors along with personal attributes such as size, fitness, experience, stress, and training, all of which influence how a situation is interpreted and addressed.

These impact factors are critical in determining whether force is necessary and what level is appropriate. Officer safety is a fundamental component of public safety and is central to the assessment process outlined in the Ontario Public-Police Interactions Training Aid. Officers are responsible for using only the level of force required to bring an incident under control. Any U.O.F. must be reasonable, proportionate, necessary, and justified.

Verbal and non-verbal communication, along with non-force tactical options, form a key layer (green ring) in the Training Aid, positioned before any U.O.F. This emphasizes their role in conflict prevention and supports de-escalation, while reinforcing that communication remains essential even when force becomes necessary.

The outermost layers (yellow, orange, and red) depict a graduated range of options, physical control, intermediate weapons, and lethal force, illustrating the escalation path when non-force options are no longer practicable.




Figure C-1. The Ontario Public-Police Interactions Training Aid (2023)

Use of Force Governance Updates

In 2022, in response to Recommendation No. 49 of the Board's Recommendations on Policing Reform, Service Procedure 15-01, previously titled *Use of Force*, was revised. The updated procedure, renamed *Incident Response (Use of Force/De-Escalation)*, was developed to align with Board policy, Provincial Adequacy Standards, and input from T.P.S. U.O.F. experts.

The importance of de-escalation and communication is emphasized throughout the updated procedure, consistent with the Ontario Public-Police Interaction Training Aid (2023). Amendments to enhance supervision, accountability, and reporting include:

- Supervisors must review all available B.W.C. and I.C.C.S. footage of officers involved in the incident.
- Supervisors must notify the Unit Investigating Officer and/or Unit Complaint Coordinator (U.C.C.) upon receipt of a U.F.R.
- When a probationary constable is involved, supervisors must review the incident and footage with the officer to ensure alignment with training and fair, impartial policing principles.
- The Unit Investigating Supervisor/U.C.C. must:
 - Review the circumstances and appropriateness of the force used.
 - Review all available B.W.C. footage.
 - Take action if training issues or misconduct are identified.

Use of Force Governing Authorities

This section provides a list of governing authorities that regulate U.O.F. as it applies to T.P.S. members.

Federal Statutes

- Criminal Code of Canada (C.C.)

Provincial Statutes

- Anti-Racism Act, 2017
- Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019 (C.S.P.A.) and associated Ontario Regulations (O. Reg.)
 - O. Reg. 87/24 Training
 - O. Reg. 391/23 Use of Force and Weapons
 - O. Reg. 392/23 Adequate and Effective of Policing (General)
 - O. Reg. 407/23 Code of Conduct for Police Officers
- Police Services Act, 1990 (P.S.A.) and associated Ontario Regulations (O. Reg.)
 - O. Reg. 3/99 Adequacy and Effectiveness of Police Services
 - O. Reg. 268/10 General
 - O. Reg. 926/90 Equipment and Use of Force
- Special Investigations Unit Act, 2019.

Other Authorities

- Ontario Public-Police Interactions Training Aid (2023)
- Policing Standards Manual

Toronto Police Service Board Policies

- [Race-Based Data Collection, Analysis and Public Reporting](#)
- [Use of Force](#)

Toronto Police Service Procedures

- 04–02: Death Investigations
- 04–21: Gathering/Preserving Evidence
- 08–04: Members Involved in a Traumatic Critical Incident
- 10–06: Medical Emergencies
- 13–16: Special Investigations Unit
- 13–17: Notes and Reports
- 14–20: Auxiliary Members
- 15–01: Incident Response (Use of Force/De-Escalation)
- 15–02: Injury/Illness Reporting
- 15–03: Service Firearms
- 15–04: C-8 Rifle

- 15–05: Shotgun
- 15–06: Less Lethal Shotguns
- 15–08: MP5 Submachine Gun
- 15–09: Conducted Energy Weapon
- 15–10: Suspect Apprehension Pursuits
- 15–16: Uniform, Equipment and Appearance Standards
- 15–20: Body-Worn Camera
- 16–07: Collection, Analysis and Reporting of Race and Identity-Based Data
- 17–03: Requests Made for Information Under the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act

Service Forms

- T.P.S. 105: Injury/Illness Report
- T.P.S. 584: Conducted Energy Weapon Use Report
- T.P.S. 586: Firearm Discharged Report
- T.P.S. 649: Internal Correspondence
- Use of Force Report

Updates to Use of Force Reporting

In 2024, U.O.F. reporting requirements were outlined in both the P.S.A., which was in effect until March 31, 2024, and replaced by the C.S.P.A. which took effect April 1, 2024, as well as T.P.S. Procedure 15-01 Incident Response (Use of Force/De-Escalation). Under both Ontario Regulation 926/90 Equipment and Use of Force of the P.S.A. and the Ontario Regulation 391/23 Use of Force and Weapons under the C.S.P.A. a member of a police force shall submit a U.F.R. whenever the member:

- draws a handgun in the presence of a member of the public,
- points a firearm at a person,
- discharges a firearm,
- uses a weapon on another person,
- draws and displays a C.E.W. to a person with the intention of achieving compliance,
- points a C.E.W. at a person,
- discharges a C.E.W., or
- uses force on another person, including the use of a horse or a dog, that results in an injury requiring the services of a physician, nurse or paramedic and the member is aware that the injury required such services before the member goes off-duty.

A U.F.R. is not required to be submitted if any of the above, involving a firearm, C.E.W. or weapon occurs during training, practice, competition, demonstration, repair,

maintenance, testing, inspection, loading, unloading or is a dog or horse used as a weapon. A Team U.F.R. is only to be completed by members of the Emergency Task Force (E.T.F.) and or Public Safety Unit (P.S.U.). In all other cases where force is used, including demonstrated force presence of a C.E.W., each member involved must submit an individual U.F.R. All U.F.R.s are forwarded to the T.P.C., where they are reviewed by a Use of Force Analyst. The analyst evaluates the reports to identify potential equipment or training issues and to support ongoing development of the training program. The analyst then transmits U.F.R. data electronically to the Ministry of the Solicitor General. Once submitted, U.F.R. and C.E.W. reports are sent to Professionalism and Accountability – Risk Mitigation and Recognition where U.F.R. information is entered into the IAPro database system for statistical analysis and reporting by T.P.S.

2023 Modernized Use of Force Report

On January 1, 2023, the Ministry of the Solicitor General implemented the use of a new, modernized U.F.R. that all police services in the Province of Ontario were required to adopt. Members of the T.P.C. played a key role in this initiative, contributing significantly as part of a long-term working group led by the Ministry. This new report was developed in response to public consultations and community interest to better understand who is involved in U.O.F. incidents. It aims to support improved de-escalation strategies, particularly in interactions involving individuals from diverse socio-demographic backgrounds. The new U.F.R. included expanded data collection on officers' perceptions of a subject's race, age, and gender when force is used in the performance of their duties.

Links to the publicly available data are provided below:

- [Police Use of Force Race-Based Data – Ontario Data Catalogue](#)
- [Toronto Police Service Public Safety Data Portal – R.B.D.C. Open Data](#)

The new report captures significantly more data points than the previous form and reflects the T.P.S.'s ongoing commitment to transparency and accountability. This effort is part of the broader Race and Identity-Based Data Collection Strategy.

The modernized form offers several improvements over the previous version. It is intuitive, responsive, and logically structured. Feedback from members is overwhelmingly positive, many report that the new form is easier to complete and encourages clear articulation of the reasons for using force. While the new form enhances data quality and usability, the addition of numerous new fields presents challenges when comparing 2024 data with previous years, which were collected using the older, more limited form. The following pages will address some of the year-to-year variances observed in the accompanying tables.

Use of Force Options

Members are not required to complete a U.F.R. when physical control is the only type of force used and the subject does not sustain an injury because of the force, requiring the services of a physician, nurse or paramedic. As outlined by the Ministry of the Solicitor General, in the Use of Force Reporting Instruction Guide, 'injury requiring the services of a physician, nurse or paramedic' should be interpreted as referring to an injury that requires the provision of medical treatment, which would include an intervention, ongoing medical monitoring, or supervision by a physician, nurse, or paramedic in relation to the injury. 'Services' do not include an assessment by a physician, nurse or paramedic that does not involve treatment. Medical treatment, at the scene does not include a paramedic applying a band aid or antiseptic, which could be performed by someone other than a paramedic, nurse or doctor. A detailed breakdown of U.O.F. options applied in 2024 is provided in Appendix B - Supplementary Data of this report.

Conducted Energy Weapons

In May 2018, T.P.S. launched the expansion of the C.E.W. program. Prior to this expansion, C.E.W.s were only carried by uniform frontline supervisors, members of the E.T.F., and supervisors in high-risk units such as the Hold-Up Squad, Intelligence Services, and the Organized Crime Enforcement Unit. Since then, C.E.W. training has been delivered to over 3,500 frontline police constables. The expansion supports the T.P.S.'s commitment to prioritizing de-escalation and resolving interactions safely through non-lethal means, while continuing to protect both the public and officers.

All C.E.W. training is delivered by Ministry-certified U.O.F. instructors on the specific device approved for use by the T.P.S. Training for authorized officers consists of 20 hours - eight (8) hours more than the provincial standard - and includes theoretical instruction, practical scenarios, and a written examination. The training focuses on judgment training, decision-making, and de-escalation, in accordance with Ministry guidelines. Recertification is required at least once every 12 months, in line with Ministry guidelines outlined in Ontario Regulation 391/23 – Use of Force and Weapons and Ontario Regulation 87/24 – Training, both under the C.S.P.A.

T.P.S. training emphasizes that C.E.W.s should only be used when necessary, and that de-escalation should always be considered first, when safe and practical to do so. Other operational considerations include disengagement, maintaining distance, using time and cover effectively, and considering alternative U.O.F. options. When the frontline C.E.W. expansion began in 2018, the X2 model was the standard shared asset used by officers. In 2021, the T.P.S. began transitioning to the newer T7 model, which was individually issued rather than shared.

Conducted Energy Weapons Governance, Procedure & Reporting Changes

Since the launch of the frontline C.E.W. expansion in 2018, Service Procedure 15-09 has undergone numerous amendments and improvements. Currently, no other U.O.F. option, including firearms available to T.P.S. members requires such detailed reporting and multiple layers of oversight, as the C.E.W. When a C.E.W. is deployed, including for demonstrated force presence, the officer must notify both the Communications dispatcher and their supervisor. The officer in charge of the member's unit must also be informed. If the C.E.W. is deployed in full deployment or drive stun mode, the Communications supervisor must notify the officer in charge at the Toronto Police Operations Centre (T.P.O.C.).

- The T.P.S. is one of the only agencies in Ontario that requires its members to complete a C.E.W. Use Report in addition to a U.F.R. when the device is deployed. Until recently, the T.P.S.'s C.E.W. Use Report captured several data points (including de-escalation attempts) that were not available on the Ministry's U.F.R. On January 1, 2023, the Ministry introduced a new "Modernized Use of Force Report" which has since been in use by all Ontario police services. Almost all the information contained in the C.E.W. Use Report is now captured in the new U.F.R. However, the T.P.S. Form still captures data points that the Ministry's U.F.R. does not including: if the subject was perceived to be in crisis, under the influence of alcohol and or drugs or any combination of them and if the subject was apprehended under the M.H.A.

Reason(s) for Use of Force

The Ministry of the Solicitor General, U.F.R. allows officers to select multiple reasons for applying force. The available options listed in order in the report include effect arrest, prevent an offence, prevent escape, protect other officer(s), protect public (including victims), protect self, protect subject(s), unintentional, and other. Officers are instructed to select all applicable reasons that contributed to their decision to apply force during an incident. As a result, most reports indicate multiple reasons for applying force.

The IAPro database system, where U.F.R. data is entered for the T.P.S., is currently limited to one (1) entry per incident for why force was applied. This limitation prevents the generation of an accurate breakdown of why officers apply force because the first selected reason is all that is recorded. Consequently, any effort to extract and analyze this data does not reflect the full context of the officer's decision-making during the incident. Due to this limitation, a request was submitted to the IAPro vendor to update the database system, enabling the reporting of multiple reasons for applying force and accurate extraction of the data, for future Board reports. This issue has been addressed to allow for more accurate reporting in future years.

Use of Force and Subject Injuries

Officers are required to complete a U.F.R. if the subject sustains any injuries because of the force they applied. This includes any injury from the use of physical control, the use of a firearm or other weapon. If the officer used a dog, horse or physical force, a U.F.R. is required to report injuries that required the services of a physician, nurse or paramedic.

Per the Ministry of the Solicitor General, an 'injury requiring the services of a physician, nurse or paramedic' refers to an injury that requires the provision of medical treatment, which includes intervention, ongoing medical monitoring, or supervision by a physician, nurse, or paramedic in relation to the injury. Furthermore 'services' should not be interpreted simply as an assessment of the injury by a physician, nurse or paramedic that does not involve medical treatment, such as an intervention, monitoring, or supervision by a member of the medical profession.

Injuries that may have been sustained by the subject prior to officers' arrival at scene, their interaction with another individual or during the incident that did not result from the officer's U.O.F. are not to be recorded on the Ministry U.F.R. In addition, officers do not report the decontamination of a subject following an O.C. spray application where there was no other injury, or whether C.E.W. probes were removed by paramedic or physician without any other injury, unless the probes were removed from the head, throat or genitals. If an officer is not aware that the subject sustained an injury that required the services of a physician, nurse, or paramedic prior to going off-duty after the force event, officers are not required to complete a U.F.R.

Appendix D – Use of Force Training Highlights

Use of Force Training Requirements

On April 1, 2024, the Police Services Act, 1990 (P.S.A.) was replaced by the Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019 (C.S.P.A.). Until March 31, 2024, the P.S.A. outlined U.O.F. training requirements under Ontario Regulation 926/90 – Equipment and Use of Force stipulating that members of a police service are prohibited from using force on another person unless they have successfully completed the prescribed U.O.F. training course. Requalification is mandatory for any member who uses or may be required to use force or carry a weapon.

Fundamentally the same, C.S.P.A. Ontario Regulation 87/24 – Use of Force and Weapons stipulates the requirement for every police officer to successfully complete U.O.F. requalification delivered by a certified trainer every 12 months and where not reasonably possible the chief of police may provide an extension of up to 60 days. While C.S.P.A., Ontario Regulation 391/23 - Use of Force and Weapons further stipulates that a member of a police service shall not use force on another person, carry or use a firearm carry or use a weapon that is not a firearm unless the member has complied with the prescribed training requirements prescribed by the Ministry on the aforementioned.

Regardless of the Act, the requirement for T.P.S. officers to successfully complete requalification training every 12 months at the T.P.C., a program referred to as In-Service Training (I.S.T.) has remained unchanged.

In-Service Training for Members

Police U.O.F. training in the Province of Ontario is mandated and guided by the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services through the Policing Standards Manual as well as the C.S.P.A. Sworn T.P.S. members attend the T.P.C. annually to complete provincially mandated training and requalification in firearms, intermediate weapons, and physical control techniques. During I.S.T., officers are encouraged to approach incidents with a “de-escalation mindset” and to utilize behavioural influence strategies to gain voluntary compliance whenever possible. Members are trained to assess, plan, act, and continuously reassess and adjust their strategies and responses based on the evolving situation. Any level of force used must be:

- Reasonable
- Proportionate
- Necessary
- Justified

A key component of the I.S.T. program is a focus on mental health awareness, de-escalation, peer intervention, and crisis resolution. The development of this training has

been largely guided by the T.P.S.B.'s M.H.A.A.P. (formerly the Police Services Board Mental Health Sub-Committee).

Equipment and Use of Force

Members receive an annual overview of the Ontario Public-Police Interactions Training Aid, which replaced the Ontario Use of Force Model in May 2023, along with instruction on T.P.S. firearm procedures, managing imminence, subject control, less lethal U.O.F. options, excited delirium, positional asphyxia, and U.O.F. reporting. Members must successfully demonstrate proficiency in the use of their assigned firearm, as well as the use of various intermediate weapons, physical defense tactics, and control techniques. A significant portion of the training is dedicated to practical scenario-based exercises conducted in both indoor and outdoor environments.

Dynamic Scenario Judgement Training

This component of training places participants in a variety of realistic scenarios conducted within the T.P.C. indoor and outdoor training environments. By the end of these sessions, participants are expected to accurately assess situations and demonstrate appropriate U.O.F. responses. Participants must be able to clearly articulate the situational and tactical considerations, subject behaviours, available de-escalation techniques, alternative response strategies, and the justification for the level of force applied.

Dynamic Simulation Training – Video Training

Members participate in interactive video-based scenarios that range from routine, everyday engagements to high-risk encounters. This component of training is conducted within the video training environment at the T.P.C. and, like the indoor/outdoor training, emphasizes judgment-based decision-making. Members must be able to properly assess each scenario, demonstrate an appropriate U.O.F. response, and clearly articulate the situational and strategic considerations, subject behaviours, available de-escalation techniques, alternative response strategies, and the justification for the level of force used. In 2022, a new scenario was developed to reinforce the importance of situational peer intervention. This scenario was incorporated into the 2023 I.S.T. curriculum.

Wellness Supports

The T.P.S. offers a range of health and wellbeing supports for any critical incident, including those involving U.O.F. such as the Critical Incident Response Team (C.I.R.T.) and Peer Support Volunteers (P.S.V.) Program, follow-up care with a T.P.S. psychologist, and a gradual re-entry process into the workplace. This may include one-on-one training and exposure sessions with a U.O.F. instructor at the T.P.C.

The T.P.S. has also established an Early Intervention Program which utilizes U.O.F. reporting data entered in the IAPro database system to proactively identify opportunities to provide well-being support to members at pre-determined times and thresholds before it results in misconduct or degrades a member's health and wellness. The T.P.C. continues to review and enhance these supports to ensure they meet the evolving needs of members.



7. Request for Funds: 2025 Chief's Gala in Support of Victim Services Toronto



PUBLIC REPORT

October 9, 2025

To: Chair and Members
Toronto Police Service Board

From: Myron Demkiw
Chief of Police

**Subject: Request for Funds: 2025 Chief's Gala in Support of
Victim Services Toronto**

Purpose: ☐ Information Purposes Only ☒ Seeking Decision

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) approve an expenditure in the amount of \$10 thousand (K) from the Board's Special Fund to support the annual Chief's Gala in Support of Victim Services Toronto (V.S.T.).

Financial Implication:

The Board's Special Fund will be reduced by an additional \$10K if this request is approved.

Summary:

The Board Policy regarding the Special Fund provides delegated authority to the Chair and the Vice-Chair to approve expenditures from the Board's Special Fund for a total amount not to exceed \$10K.

The Chief's Gala is an annual signature fundraising event for V.S.T., a multi-service agency providing crisis response, trauma, and support services to victims of crime and sudden tragic circumstances 24 hours a day.

The purpose of this report is to recommend that the Board sponsor the Gala, both to support V.S.T.'s critical work in providing a lifeline to victims, and to demonstrate the

Board's commitment to community safety and well-being through supporting essential services that aid in healing and recovery from trauma.

Background

This request for funding from the Board's Special Fund has been reviewed to ensure that it meets the criteria set out in the Board's Special Fund Policy and is consistent with the Toronto Police Service's goals, which include embracing partnerships and creating safer communities.

History of Toronto Police Service Board Funding of Chief's Gala in Support of Victim Services Toronto post-pandemic: Requested, Received						
	Requested	Received	Requested	Received	Requested	Received
	2022	2022	2023	2023	2024	2024
VST Chief's Gala	4,000	4,000	4,000	2,000	7,000	7,000
Total		\$4,000		\$4,000		\$7,000

In 2024, V.S.T hosted the nineteenth in-person Chief's Gala event to an audience of over 1,600 attendees, with a blend of external guests and civilian and uniformed members of all ranks, at the Beanfield Centre, now called the Automotive Building at Exhibition Place. The Board has been supporting this event since its inception 19 years ago, including a \$7,000 sponsorship contribution made in 2024. Over the past 18 years, table and sponsorship packages have increased and this year's table costs will be \$10,000, with sponsorships starting at \$15,000.

The feedback from this event in 2024 was resoundingly positive, raising over \$1.5 million in profit in support of V.S.T.

The Chief's Gala is taking place on November 13, 2024 at the Automotive Building. The event is open to both external and internal guests.

Conclusion:

The Chief's Gala in support of V.S.T is a marquee event in the City of Toronto and the largest police fundraiser in the country. Guests will be in attendance to support victims of crime and sudden tragedies, as well as the extensive victim-centric programs that are provided to the community.

It is recommended that the Board approve this request.

Mr. Brian Moniz, Manager of Strategic Stakeholder Engagement will be in attendance to respond to any questions that the Board may have regarding this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Myron Demkiw, M.O.M.
Chief of Police



8. Facial Recognition System Follow-up- 2025



PUBLIC REPORT

November 6, 2025

To: Chair and Members
Toronto Police Service Board

From: Sandy Murray
Interim Executive Director

Subject: Facial Recognition System Follow-up- 2025

Purpose: ☒ Information Purposes Only ☐ Seeking Decision

Summary:

The purpose of this report is to provide the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) with the report *Facial Recognition System Follow-Up- 2025*, prepared by the Toronto Police Service's Audit & Quality Assurance Unit (A&QA).

On March 4, 2025, the Audit & Quality Assurance presented the report *Facial Recognition System Audit – 2023* to the Board. This report responds to the following motion approved by the Board:

As a result of the findings in this audit in which there were instances where occurrences involving an arrest did not have corroborating evidence documented to support the potential candidate match made using the Facial Recognition System (F.R.S.), and in light of commitment by Management to rectify this issue, that the Board direct the Chief of Police to ensure that:

- an audit is carried out with regards to the inclusion of documented corroborating evidence to support the potential candidate match made using the F.R.S., prior to arrest, and that the audit begin as soon as a sufficient sample of occurrences are available to adequately carry out such an audit; and*
- report back to the Board no later than November 2025 with findings from this audit.*

Discussion:

In accordance with the Board's *Adequacy Standards Compliance Policy*, the attached report is being submitted to the Board for information purposes only.

Conclusion:

It is recommended that the Board receive this report. Ms. Angela Schieda, Manager, A&QA will be in attendance to answer any questions that the Board may have regarding this report.

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Board receive this report for information.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications arising from the recommendation contained in this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandy Murray
Interim Executive Director

Attachment:

Facial Recognition System Follow-up -2025



Toronto Police Service

Facial Recognition System Follow-up- 2025

Audit & Quality Assurance

Approved by the Executive Assurance Committee on September 18, 2025

This report and the information contained herein is not to be further disseminated without the approval of the Chief of Police

Table of Contents

Facial Recognition System Follow-up - 2025	1
Background	1
Objectives	1
Scope	1
Conclusion	2
Objective 1	4
Compliance Issues	4
Issue #1 – Documented Corroborating Evidence	4
Issue #2 – Scanning and Attaching Notes	5
Recommendations	6
Recommendation #1 – Review of Service Governance	6
Recommendation #2 – Creation of a Text Template	7

Facial Recognition System Follow-up - 2025

Background

On March 4, 2025, the Audit & Quality Assurance report titled “Facial Recognition System Audit – 2023” was presented to the Toronto Police Service Board (Board).

After Board Members discussed this audit, the following board motion was approved:

“As a result of the findings in this audit in which there were instances where occurrences involving an arrest did not have corroborating evidence documented to support the potential candidate match made using the Facial Recognition System (F.R.S.), and in light of commitment by Management to rectify this issue,

That the Board direct the Chief of Police to ensure that:

- an audit is carried out with regards to the inclusion of documented corroborating evidence to support the potential candidate match made using the F.R.S., prior to arrest, and that the audit begin as soon as a sufficient sample of occurrences are available to adequately carry out such an audit; and
- report back to the Board no later than November 2025 with findings from this audit.”

Objectives

The objective of this project was to verify that occurrences with an arrest or active arrest warrant which involved a F.R.S. potential candidate match had the required corroborating evidence documented.

Scope

The scope of this project included, but was not limited to:

- interviews and/or correspondence with members of Forensic Identification Services (F.I.S.), Records Management Services and discussions with senior management from Detective Operations and Investigative Support;
- review of Service Procedure 04-04, F.R.S. and Service Procedure 13-17, Notes and Reports;
- review of related Board meeting minutes;
- review of information in Versadex (V.D.X.), including facial recognition analysts’

- bench notes¹, V.D.X. text templates, emails, and notes²; and
- review of information in PowerCase for qualifying major cases.

The audit included review of 28 general occurrences (G.O.s) identified in V.D.X. that:

- occurred between March 15, 2025 and May 15, 2025;
- contained a follow-up to a case manager identifying that at least one potential candidate match had been made using the F.R.S.; and
- a potential candidate identified was arrested or named in an active arrest warrant.

Two of the 28 G.O.'s each contained two arrests/active arrest warrants, for a total sample of 30 arrests/active arrest warrant cases reviewed.

In accordance with the *International Professional Practices Framework* of the Institute of Internal Auditors, the scope also included:

- considering the probability of significant errors, fraudulent entries, non-compliance, and the related risk management through effective internal controls; and
- identifying key information technology risks.

Conclusion

Overall, the findings in this report represent a medium risk to the Service. This report includes two non-compliance issues and two recommendations.

Areas of non-compliance included:

- one instance in which an arrest or active arrest warrant which involved a F.R.S. potential candidate match did not have the required corroborating evidence documented; and
- members not scanning and attaching notes into V.D.X. and/or PowerCase (if applicable), as required by Service Procedure 13-17, Notes and Reports.

¹ A document that provides information on the submitting officer, date of request, occurrence number, offense being investigated, the date of the F.R.S. search, the probe image(s), the mugshot(s), the F.I.S. analyst's comparison notes (if potential candidate match identified) and F.R.S. general information.

² Notes refers to any written or electronic record of information created or obtained by a member in the course of their duties made on any recording medium. This information can be recorded using a variety of different mediums. Recordings may be made by a member in the course of their duties. Recordings may be stored, created or documented in a variety of forms, including but not limited to, audio, visual, analog, digital, electronic or physical forms. Recording information itself will not establish the creation of notes. Notes are created by a member in the course of their duties with active input by a member. Notes are important because they act as an aid to memory and are the foundation of testimony in court.

Two recommendations have been included to assist members with the requirement to document, scan and attach all corroborating evidence to support the arrest of a potential candidate within the records management system.

The reader is cautioned on reliance on this conclusion due to limiting factors, such as, the economical use of a representative sample, professional judgement, and the evidence being persuasive rather than conclusive.

Angela Schieda, C.P.A., C.A., C.I.A.
Manager, Audit & Quality Assurance

September 18, 2025

Date

Objective 1

To verify that occurrences with an arrest or active arrest warrant which involved a F.R.S. potential candidate match had the required corroborating evidence documented.

Compliance Issues

Issue #1 – Documented Corroborating Evidence

Service Procedure 04-04, F.R.S., states: “Members requesting the use of this technology must be aware that the generated results of a potential candidate are only possible matches, and not an identification. As such, the results are only to be treated as an investigative aid, which still requires the corroboration of evidence and a thorough investigation.”

The email that members receive from Forensic Identification Services when a potential candidate is discovered by the F.R.S. states *“Please note that this is an investigative tool only and not an identification. All corroborating evidence must be clearly documented in your case. Versadex will be updated with these results.”*

In discussion with management, the following examples (among others) are considered acceptable as corroborating evidence and a thorough investigation:

- cell phone records confirming the individual was at/near the location of the occurrence at the same time;
- Automatic Licence Plate Recognition data that shows that the individual’s vehicle was at/near the location of the occurrence at the same time; and
- an identification by the investigator that the individual in the probe image and the individual in the mug shot is the same individual.

In 30 cases where the F.R.S. assisted in identifying a potential candidate that was arrested or cited in an active arrest warrant:

- 1/30 (3%) cases did not have documented corroborating evidence located in V.D.X. or the investigator’s notes.

It should be noted that 9/30 (30%) cases did not initially have documented corroborating evidence located in V.D.X. as directed in the email that members receive when a potential candidate is identified.

A.&Q.A. requested notes from the lead investigators of all nine cases; notes for eight of the nine cases were subsequently provided to A.&Q.A. and determined to contain sufficient corroborating evidence that had been documented prior to the arrest/active arrest warrant of the potential candidate.

For one of the nine cases, no notes existed, which accounts for the sole non-compliant case identified in the issue above.

Management Response from the Chief Superintendents, East & West Field Commands:

An Information Management Assessment was conducted by Investigative Support, in order to identify opportunities for improvement. The results have identified opportunities for us to standardize investigative documentation and support audit integrity and compliance with Service governance.

Both East and West Field Command are in alignment with the response from Investigative Support, which includes the following proposed amendments to Service Procedure 04-04, Facial Recognition System:

- Prior to an arrest or arrest warrant, the member shall make an entry in the memorandum book or case book documenting the corroborating evidence.
- When utilizing Facial Recognition, members shall scan and attach their notes to the occurrence.

In addition to the procedure amendments, members will require mandatory training on facial recognition before the submission of an F.R.S. request. When the training is complete, officers will be approved to submit a request. The training will highlight the need to document corroborating evidence, the procedural changes and requirements to complete a text template.

This work is underway and expected to be implemented by the end of Quarter 4 2025.

Issue #2 – Scanning and Attaching Notes

Service Procedure 13-17, Notes and Reports requires a member to scan and attach all notes into V.D.X when:

- investigating a major case as defined in the Ontario Major Case Management (O.M.C.M.) Manual;
- making an arrest;
- investigating a matter likely to be prosecuted; and
- deemed necessary.

Cases that meet the definition of a major case, as defined in the O.M.C.M. Manual may have notes scanned and attached into V.D.X. or PowerCase, depending on the nature of the case.

As explained in Issue #1, in 9/30 (30%) cases reviewed involving an arrest or active arrest warrant, notes were not scanned and attached into V.D.X.

Three of these nine cases met the definition of a major case, as per the O.M.C.M. Manual. With the assistance of PowerCase Coordinators from the Major Case Management section, A.&Q.A. confirmed that documented corroborating evidence could not be located within PowerCase for these three cases.

A.&Q.A. requested notes from the lead investigator of each of the nine cases and indicated that notes should be scanned and attached into V.D.X. or PowerCase as

applicable. Subsequently, A.&Q.A. verified that all³ nine cases now have the required notes scanned and attached into V.D.X.

Management Response from the Chief Superintendents, East & West Field Commands:

See response to Issue #1.

Management Response from the Chief Superintendent, Detective Operations:

Investigative Support will be working with Governance to update procedure.

Investigative Support will be working with Information Technology to create a text template to capture the required information. Detective Operations will communicate the above changes across the pillar.

Recommendations

Recommendation #1 – Review of Service Governance

To assist members with the requirement to document, scan and attach all corroborating evidence to support the arrest of a potential candidate within the records management system, management suggested amendments to Service Procedure 04-04, F.R.S and the creation of a text template within the records management system.

Risk Rating: **Medium**

Recommendation #1: That the Chief Superintendent, Investigative Support, in consultation with the Executive Advisor & Manager, Strategic Planning & Governance, amend Service Procedure 04-04, Facial Recognition System to require:

- a) all corroborating evidence to support the arrest of a potential candidate be documented within the records management system or member notes prior to seeking an arrest warrant for the potential candidate; and**
- b) if documentation of corroborating evidence is made in member notes, the notes must be scanned and attached to the general occurrence within the records management system.**

Management Response from the Chief Superintendent, Investigative Support:

The following amendments to Service Procedure 04-04, Facial Recognition System will be made by the end Quarter 4 2025:

- Prior to an arrest or arrest warrant the member shall make an entry in the memorandum book or case book documenting the corroborating evidence.
- When utilizing Facial Recognition, members shall scan and attach their notes to the occurrence.

In addition to the procedure amendments, members will require mandatory training on facial recognition before the submission of an F.R.S. request. When the training is

³ 1/9 cases missing notes was identified as non-compliant due to lack of documented corroborating evidence in Issue #1. The lead investigator for this case subsequently created notes that were scanned and attached into V.D.X. after discussion with A.&Q.A.

complete, officers will be approved to submit a request. The training will highlight the need to document corroborating evidence, the procedural changes and requirements to complete a text template. This work is underway and expected to be implemented by the end of Quarter 4 2025.

Recommendation #2 – Creation of a Text Template

Risk Rating: **Medium**

Recommendation #2: That the Chief Superintendent, Investigative Support, create a text template within the records management system to capture detailed documentation of the corroborating evidence obtained to support the arrest of a potential candidate prior to seeking an arrest warrant.

Management Response from the Chief Superintendent, Investigative Support:

The results of an Information Management Assessment currently underway will inform the creation of a mandatory Facial Recognition text template within our records management system to ensure all F.R.S. requests, regardless of match outcome, are documented with corroborating evidence. When the assessment is complete the text template will be implemented by the end of Quarter 4 2025.



9. Special Constable Appointments and Re-Appointments – November 2025



PUBLIC REPORT

September 16, 2025

To: Chair and Members
Toronto Police Service Board

From: Myron Demkiw
Chief of Police

**Subject: Special Constable Appointments and Re-Appointments –
November 2025**

Purpose: ☐ Information Purposes Only ☒ Seeking Decision

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) approve the agency-initiated appointment and re-appointment requests for the individuals listed in this report as special constables for the Toronto Community Housing Corporation (T.C.H.C.), the Toronto Transit Commission (T.T.C.) and the City of Toronto Traffic Agents (C.T.A.).

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications arising from the recommendation contained in this report.

Summary:

The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's approval for the agency requested appointments and re-appointments of special constables for the T.C.H.C., the T.T.C. and the C.T.A.

Discussion:

Background

Relevant Board Policies and Compliance

Under Section 92 of the *Community Safety and Policing Act 2019 (C.S.P.A)*, the Board is authorized to appoint special constables. Pursuant to this authority, the Board has agreements with the T.C.H.C., the T.T.C. and the C.T.A. governing the administration of special constables (Min. Nos.P2025-0114-10.0, P2024-1112-11.0 and P2025-0304-8.1).

All agencies have been issued an authorization to employ special constables by the Ministry of the Solicitor General.

The Toronto Police Service (Service) received requests from the T.C.H.C., the T.T.C. and the C.T.A. (see attachments) to appoint the following individuals as special constables:

Table 1. Name of Agency and Special Constable Applicant

Agency	Name	Status Requested
T.T.C.	Melissa CVETKOVIC	Re-Appointment
T.T.C.	Sultan Ali SAIF	Re-Appointment
T.T.C.	Petar MILENKOVIC	Re-Appointment
T.T.C.	Courtney GIBBS	Re-Appointment
T.T.C.	Yvette NATALIZIO	Re-Appointment
T.T.C.	Jessica HURLBUT	Re-Appointment
T.T.C.	Mohammed HASHAAM	Re-Appointment
T.T.C.	Matthew VIEIRA	Re-Appointment
T.C.H.C.	Ajithkumar ASHOKUMAR	New Appointment
C.T.A.	Sangeeth ABRAHAMLINGAM	New Appointment
C.T.A.	Sadik ADAN	New Appointment
C.T.A.	Davlat ATADJANOV	New Appointment
C.T.A.	Dean CASPI	Re-Appointment
C.T.A.	Harkaran Singh DANDIWAL	New Appointment
C.T.A.	Dwayne DAWKINS	New Appointment

Agency	Name	Status Requested
C.T.A.	Frank-Anthony GUARRASI	New Appointment
C.T.A.	Joshua HEWA BATUWITAGE	New Appointment
C.T.A.	Jagdeep SINGH	New Appointment
C.T.A.	Michael KE	New Appointment
C.T.A.	Christopher MACDONALD	New Appointment
C.T.A.	Rebekah MAKMALAN	New Appointment
C.T.A.	Yusuf MANJRA	Re-Appointment
C.T.A.	Jamaar MCLEGGON	New Appointment
C.T.A.	Navraj SINGH	New Appointment
C.T.A.	Shandeep PANNU	New Appointment
C.T.A.	Sohail PATEL	New Appointment
C.T.A.	Mickeala POWELL	New Appointment
C.T.A.	Shivanand RAMDASS	New Appointment
C.T.A.	Ashutosh SHARMA	New Appointment
C.T.A.	Pankaj SHARMA	New Appointment
C.T.A.	Syed Usama SHAHZEB	New Appointment
C.T.A.	Tristan SUALOG	New Appointment
C.T.A.	Sarkis TCHAKERIAN	New Appointment
C.T.A.	Ebin VARGHESE	New Appointment
C.T.A.	Gerald VENERACION	New Appointment
C.T.A.	Steve WILLIAMS	New Appointment

Special constables are appointed to enforce the *Criminal Code* and certain sections of the *Controlled Drugs and Substances Act*, the *Cannabis Act*, the *Trespass to Property Act*, the *Liquor Licence & Control Act*, the *Highway Traffic Act* and the *Mental Health Act* on their respective properties within the City of Toronto.

City Traffic Agents are appointed to conduct traffic direction under select sections of the *Highway Traffic Act* within the City of Toronto, but do not possess enforcement authorities.

The agreements between the Board and each agency require that background investigations be conducted on all individuals who are being recommended for appointment and re-appointment as special constables. The Service's Talent Acquisition Unit completed background investigations on these individuals, of which the agencies are satisfied with the results. Re-appointments have been employed by their agency for at least one 5-year term, and as such, they are satisfied that the members have satisfactorily carried out their duties and, from their perspective, there is nothing that precludes re-appointment.

The agencies have advised the Service that the above individuals satisfy all the appointment criteria as set out in the *C.S.P.A.*, all applicable Ontario Regulations and in their agreements with the Board. For all appointments and re-appointments, the applicants have completed the training prescribed by the Minister and the provincially mandated training titled "Thematic Training".

The term of appointment is for five years as of November 6, 2025.

The T.C.H.C., the T.T.C. and the C.T.A.'s respective approved and current complements are indicated below:

Table 2. Name of Agency, Approved Complement and Current Complement of Special Constables

Agency	Approved Complement	Current Complement
T.C.H.C.	300	163
T.T.C.	170	134
C.T.A.	200	66

Conclusion:

The Service continues to work together in partnership with the T.C.H.C., the T.T.C. and the C.T.A. to identify individuals to be appointed and re-appointed as special

constables, who will contribute positively to the safety and well-being of persons engaged in activities on their respective properties within the City of Toronto.

Deputy Chief Robert Johnson, Specialized Operations Command, will be in attendance to answer any questions that the Board may have with respect to this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Myron Demkiw, M.O.M.
Chief of Police

Attachments:

1. T.T.C. Re-Appointment Request Letter
2. T.C.H.C. New Appointment Request Letter
3. C.T.A. New & Re-Appointment Request Letter



Tuesday, September 2nd, 2025
Sergeant Q. Yang
Public Safety Operations Special Constable Liaison Office
40 College Street, Toronto, Ontario, MSG 2J3

Sergeant Yang,

On March 20th, 2025, the Toronto Transit Commission was approved as a Special Constable employer under the Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019. This approval was issued by Solicitor General Michael Kerzner.

In accordance with the terms and conditions set out in the Memorandum of Understanding between the Toronto Police Services Board and the Toronto Transit Commission, it is requested that the Board approve this submission and appoint the following individuals as Toronto Transit Commission Special Constables for a five-year term.

The following individuals are fully trained, meeting all Ministry requirements, they have shown they possess the required skills and abilities to perform at the level required to be a Special Constable.

New appointments and re-appointments have undergone a background check, conducted by the Toronto Police Service, and we are satisfied with the results of those checks. Re-appointments have been employed by the Toronto Transit Commission for at least one, five-year term, and as such, we are satisfied that the members have carried out their duties and, from our perspective, there is nothing that precludes re-appointment.

NAME	TYPE
Melissa CVETKOVIC	Re-Appointment
Sultan Ali SAIF	Re-Appointment
Petar MILENKOVIC	Re-Appointment
Courtney GIBBS	Re-Appointment
Yvette NATALIZIO	Re-Appointment
Jessica HURLBUT	Re-Appointment
Mohammed HASHAAM	Re-Appointment
Matthew VIEIRA	Re-Appointment

Regards,

James Bingham
Staff Sergeant 30069, Assistant Manager
Special Constable Service, Recruiting, Logistics and Community Engagement
Strategy and Customer Experience

Jamaal Myers, Chair
Joanne De Laurentiis, Vice-Chair
Greg Percy, Chief Executive Officer
Paul Ainslie, Commissioner

Alejandra Bravo, Commissioner
Fenton Jagdeo, Commissioner
Liane Kim, Commissioner

Ausma Malik, Commissioner
Josh Matlow, Commissioner
Julie Osborne, Commissioner
Dianne Saxe, Commissioner

Toronto Community
Housing Corporation
931 Yonge Street
Toronto, ON
M4W 2H2



August 25, 2025

Toronto Police Service
Special Constable Liaison Office
40 College Street
Toronto, Ontario
M5G 2J3

DELIVERED VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

**Re: Request for Toronto Police Service Board Approval for
New Appointment of Special Constables**

In accordance with the terms and conditions set out in the Memorandum of Understanding between the Toronto Police Service Board and Toronto Community Housing Corporation, the Board is authorized to appoint special constables.

The following individuals are fully trained; they have completed all provincially mandated and thematic training and have shown they possess the required skills and ability to perform at the level required to be a special constable. Both new appointments and re-appointments have undergone a background check, conducted by the Toronto Police Service, and we are satisfied with the results of those checks. All re-appointments have been employed by Toronto Community Housing Corporation for at least a 5-year term. The members have satisfactorily carried out their duties and from our perspective, there is nothing that precludes their appointment.

#	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Status
1	TCHC	Ashokumar	Ajithkumar	New Appointment

It is requested that the Board approve this submission.

Should you require any further information, please contact Jacqueline Doo, Specialist-Compliance, Training & Investigations at 437-925-1584.

Respectfully,



Allan Britton, Badge #31194

Acting Senior Director/Acting Chief Special Constable
Community Safety Unit

Toronto Community Housing

931 Yonge St, Toronto, ON M4W 2H2

T: 416 981-4116

Allan.britton@torontohousing.ca



Mike Barnett
Director

Transportation Services
Barbara Gray, General Manager

Reply to: Josh Thomas
Sr. Project Manager
Traffic Management
703 Don Mills Road 5th Floor
Toronto, Ontario, M3C 3N3
Tel: 437-219-5460
Email: josh.thomas@toronto.ca

DATE: September 12, 2025

Sgt. Qian Yang
Special Constable Liaison Office
40 College St.
Toronto, Ontario, M5G 2J3

Dear Sgt. Yang,

Re: Request for Toronto Police Service Board Approval for Re-Appointment and Appointment of Special Constables

In accordance with the terms and conditions set out in the Memorandum of Understanding between the Toronto Police Service Board and THE CITY OF TORONTO, the Board is authorized to appoint special constables. The following individuals are fully trained, meeting all Ministry requirements, and have shown they possess the required skills and abilities to perform at the level required to be a special constable.

Both new appointments and re-appointments have undergone a background check, conducted by the Toronto Police Service, and we are satisfied with the results of those checks. Reappointments have been employed by THE CITY OF TORONTO for at least one 5-year term, and as such, we are satisfied that the members have satisfactorily carried out their duties and, from our perspective, there is nothing that precludes re-appointment.


Name	Type	Current Term Expiry
Sangeeth ABRAHAMLINGAM	New Appointment	N/A
Sadik ADAN	New Appointment	N/A
Davlat ATADJANOV	New Appointment	N/A
Dean CASPI	Re- Appointment	N/A
Harkaran Singh DANDIWAL	New Appointment	N/A
Dwayne DAWKINS	New Appointment	N/A
Frank-Anthony GUARRASI	New Appointment	N/A
Joshua HEWA BATUWITAGE	New Appointment	N/A
Jagdeep Singh	New Appointment	N/A
Michael KE	New Appointment	N/A
Christopher MACDONALD	New Appointment	N/A
Rebekah MAKMALAN	New Appointment	N/A



Yusuf MANJRA	Re- Appointment	N/A
Jamaar MCLEGGON	New Appointment	N/A
Navraj Singh	New Appointment	N/A
<u>Shandeep PANNU</u>	New Appointment	N/A
Sohail PATEL	New Appointment	N/A
<u>Mickeala POWELL</u>	New Appointment	N/A
Shivanand RAMDASS	New Appointment	N/A
Ashutosh SHARMA	New Appointment	N/A
Pankaj SHARMA	New Appointment	N/A
Syed Usama Shahzeb	New Appointment	N/A
Tristan SUALOG	New Appointment	N/A
Sarkis TCHAKERIAN	New Appointment	N/A
Ebin VARGHESE	New Appointment	N/A
Gerald VENERACION	New Appointment	N/A
Steve WILLIAMS	New Appointment	N/A

It is requested that the Board approve this submission for appointments for a five-year term.

Yours truly,



Josh Thomas

Senior Project Manager, Traffic Agent Program



10. Receipt of Donation



PUBLIC REPORT

September 8, 2025

To: Chair and Members
Toronto Police Service Board

From: Myron Demkiw
Chief of Police

Subject: Receipt of Donation

Purpose: ☐ Information Purposes Only ☒ Seeking Decision

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) approve the acceptance of the donation being requested in this report.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications arising from the recommendation contained in this report.

As per the wishes of the donor, this financial donation is to be put toward the purchase of a new horse for the Toronto Police Service Mounted Unit (M.T.D.U.).

The ongoing veterinary care, training, and maintenance for the horse will be funded by the Toronto Police Service's (Service) operating budget. This funding has already been set aside as part of the current and future operating budget expenditures approved for the M.T.D.U.

Summary:

The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's approval of the donation to purchase a new horse for the M.T.D.U.

Discussion:

Background

There is one single donor who intends to make a \$13,500 donation to the Service's M.T.D.U to purchase a new horse.

This donation will allow the Service to replace retiring horses.

Actions have been taken to ensure that the reputation of the Service and the Board will not be negatively impacted by the acceptance of this donation.

Checks have been conducted on the donor from various police databases, including from Intelligence sources.

The donor has signed the required *Donor Declaration Form* indicating that he does not have any real or perceived conflicts of interest with the Toronto Police Service or the Board.

These checks and the Signed Declaration demonstrate that accepting this donation would not impugn the reputation of the Service or the Board.

This recommendation complies with the Service's policy '*18-08 Donations*' governing corporate community donations.

The Mounted Unit

The M.T.D.U. is a uniform support unit that is part of the Service's Emergency Management and Public Order Unit, operating under Public Safety Operations within Specialized Operations Command.

The M.T.D.U sets a herd target of 24 to 28 healthy horses. The current population is 26 horses, with one horse set to retire in 2025 and another the following year. The M.T.D.U has historically paid approximately \$10,000 (plus tax) per horse. The cost of each new horse suitable to the M.T.D.U has increased to the current pricing of \$12,000 (plus tax). A donation in this amount will greatly assist the M.T.D.U in various ways:

- It will enable the M.T.D.U to purchase a new horse without having to use its 2025 or 2026 operational budgets. This will also allow savings to be used for other needs within the M.T.D.U.
- It will improve the herd strength at a time where the demands on the M.T.D.U to meet its operational needs and the challenges within our city are extraordinarily high, given the current geopolitical climate.
- Service Mount 'Brock' is retiring this fall and a new horse will be purchased with this donation to replace him.

Donor:

The donor has not contributed to the Service financially in the past. This donor has indicated their motivation for this donation stems from a strong civic duty, as well as their desire to support the Service in its ability to provide policing services in specialized units. This donation is being made by the following individual:

1. Mr. David Sutton (Chairman and CEO of the Toronto Congress Centre)

Relevant Board Policies and Compliance

Donations from the community to the Service are a valuable form of public support. It is important that the acceptance of these donations be subject to a clear, transparent, and accountable process.

Conclusion:

As stated, the M.T.D.U is expecting at least one horse to retire within the near future. The M.T.D.U requires a specified number of healthy horses to meet operational demands.

This donation will ensure the continued viability of the unit, while also allowing for a donation that is purposeful and meaningful to both the Service and the donor.

By accepting this donation, the reputation of the Service will not be compromised.

This donation will enhance the Service's reputation by allowing it to fulfil its goal to *support safer communities*. That will be achieved, in part, through the maintenance of a strong complement of active working horses that will add to the response to public safety events across the City.

A copy of the donor declaration form is attached as an appendix.

Deputy Chief Robert Johnson, Specialized Operations Command, will be in attendance to answer any questions that the Board may have with respect to this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Myron Demkiw, M.O.M.
Chief of Police

Attachment:

1. Donor Declaration Form

Donor's Declaration Form

(To be signed at the time of donation)

I/We, David Sutton & Toronto Congress Centre, hereby solemnly declare that the donation and/or in-kind donation amount of and/or appraised amount of \$ 13,500, was donated to the City of Toronto (City) and Toronto Police Service (TPS) for community benefits which encompass projects, money, assets or activities that provide a public good.

The Donor acknowledges that all donations and/or in-kind donations, made to the City or the TPS meet the following criteria:

1. the donation must be given unconditionally and voluntarily without any expectation of benefit;
2. the donation cannot be used to influence the outcome of an outstanding approval, permit or license application or award of a procurement call; and
3. the City shall be notified in writing if they, their organization, or company are currently involved in a planning approval or procurement process with the City or one of its agencies.

The Donor acknowledges that the donation, information about the donation and this Donor's Declaration Form are subject to the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection Act and may be disclosed in accordance with the Act.

x David Sutton I/We or my/our organization have no outstanding approval, permit or licenses application or award of a procurement call with the City or the TPS.

OR

x David Sutton I/We or my/our organization do have one or more outstanding approval, permit or license application or award of a procurement call with the City or the TPS.

DATED at Toronto this 5th day of Sept., 2025. Signed: [Signature]

Print Name of Donor & Donating Organization:

David Sutton Toronto Congress Centre 650 Dixon Rd, Toronto, ON M9W 1J1
(Donor Name - Print) (Donating Organization) (Donor/Organization Address)

Are you a Registered Charity: ☐ Yes ☒ No (If Yes, Charity Registration Number: _____)

For Internal Use:

Member receiving donation: Morris, Peter	D/Sgt	99470
(Surname, G1 - Print)	(Title)	(Employee No.)
Signed: <u>[Signature]</u>	Date: <u>2025 09 05</u>	(yyyy/mm/dd)
Unit Commander: <u>[Signature]</u>	(Title)	(Employee No.)
(Surname, G1 - Print)	(Title)	(Employee No.)
Signed: _____	Date: _____	(yyyy/mm/dd)

TPS 668, 2022/05/19



11. Semi-Annual Report: Publication of Expenses – January 1 to June 30, 2025



PUBLIC REPORT

November 7, 2025

To: Chair and Members
Toronto Police Service Board

From: Myron Demkiw
Chief of Police

Subject: Semi-Annual Report: Publication of Expenses – January 1 to June 30, 2025

Purpose: ☒ Information Purposes Only ☐ Seeking Decision

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive this report.

Financial Implications:

Expenses reported in this report have been covered in the 2025 operating budgets and/or collectively bargained Senior Officer professional development fund.

Summary:

The purpose of this report is to advise the Board of the expenses incurred by Board and Toronto Police Service (Service) members during the period January 1 to June 30, 2025.

Discussion:

The Board's policy on Publication of Expense Details requires that expenses of the following individuals be reported to the Board on a semi-annual basis;

- Board Members
- Chief and Command Officers
- Excluded members at level of X40 and above
- Members in the rank of Chief Superintendent and Director

The expenses to be published are in three areas;

- business travel;
- conferences and training; and
- hospitality and protocol expenses

Attached to this report as Appendix A are the expenses, for the first half of 2025 for the applicable Service and Board members. The attachment shows the total for each member as well as a breakdown based on the three categories of expenses. The publication of this information will be available on the Board and Service's internet sites. The expenses of 29 members are included in this report, in alphabetical order, and total \$97,676.32.

Background

Relevant Board Policies and Compliance

This report is in compliance with the Board's Policy (Min No. P18/12 refers).

Conclusion:

This report contains details for the three categories of expenses incurred by Board and Service members, for the period of January 1 to June 30, 2025.

Interim Chief Administration Officer Mr. Colin Stairs will be in attendance to answer any questions the Board may have regarding this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Myron Demkiw, M.O.M.
Chief of Police

Attachments:

Appendix A – Toronto Police Service and Toronto Police Service Board Expense
Publication Summary – January 1 to June 30, 2025

Appendix A

Toronto Police Service and Toronto Police Services Board
Expense Publication Summary
Period: January 1, 2025 to June 30, 2025

Member	Expenses Reported
Barredo, Francisco	\$ 4,014.16
Baus, Jacqueline	\$ 3,353.57
Brillinger, Chris	\$ -
Carroll, Shelley	\$ -
Casselman, Nancy	\$ 1,146.68
Cheng, Lily	\$ -
Clancy, Natalie	\$ 2,814.09
Dawson, Shannon	\$ 4,767.06
Debnath, Falguni	\$ 1,511.13
Demkiw, Myron	\$ 7,371.71
Dhaliwal, Svina	\$ 4,881.11
Grant, Cindy	\$ -
Johnson, Robert	\$ 23,793.79
Kanengisser, Dubi	\$ 1,744.01
Kostakis, Evangelia	\$ 2,278.80
Mann, Mandeep	\$ 706.24
Matthews, Joseph	\$ 5,453.81
Migliore, Nicola	\$ -
Morgan, Ann	\$ 34.04
Morley, Amber	\$ -
Nicol, Brett	\$ 821.10
Pera, Enrico	\$ -
Pogue, Lauren	\$ 4,526.91
Skinner, Kelly	\$ 9,580.21
Sparkes, Allison	\$ -
Stairs, Colin	\$ 3,967.00
Stephenson, Katherine	\$ 8,758.86
White, Deidra	\$ 117.06
Williams, Ian	\$ 6,034.98
	<u>\$ 97,676.32</u>



Toronto Police Service
Senior Staff Expenses
For the period of January 1, 2025 to June 30, 2025

Unit: Public Safety Operations
Member: Barredo, Francisco
Job Title/Rank: Chief Superintendent

Business Travel

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
	No business travel expenses for this period.	\$0.00
		\$0.00

Conferences & Training

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
April 29-May 3	The Leadership in Counter Terrorism Alumni Association (L.i.n.C.T-A.A.) Conference in Dublin, Ireland	\$3,839.16
		\$3,839.16

Hospitality & Protocol

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
May 22	58th Annual Police Excellence Awards in Toronto, ON	\$175.00
		\$175.00

Member Total	\$4,014.16
---------------------	-------------------



**Toronto Police Service
Senior Staff Expenses
For the period of January 1, 2025 to June 30, 2025**

Unit: Strategy & Transformation
Member: Baus, Jacqueline
Job Title/Rank: Chief Superintendent

Business Travel

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
February 11	City Hall Budget Meeting in Toronto, ON	\$22.51
April 14	Business Meeting in Toronto, ON	\$22.51
April 24-27	International Association of Chiefs of Police (I.A.C.P.) Policy Council Mid-year Meeting in Grapevine, Texas	\$2,965.16
June 9	Confronting Anti-Black Racism Advisory Committee (C.A.B.R.A.C.) Meeting in Toronto, ON	\$22.51
		\$3,032.69

Conferences & Training

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
	No conferences and training expenses for this period.	\$0.00
		\$0.00

Hospitality & Protocol

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
April 16	Ontario Women in Law Enforcement (O.W.L.E.) Awards Gala in Brampton, ON	\$117.06
May 14	International Day Against Homophobia, Biphobia, Transphobia and the PRIDE-ISON Event in Toronto, ON	\$18.01
May 22	58th Annual Police Excellence Awards in Toronto, ON	\$175.00
June 4	The Native Women's Resource Centre of Toronto 40th Anniversary Celebration in Toronto, ON	\$10.81
		\$320.88

Member Total	\$3,353.57
---------------------	-------------------



**Toronto Police Service
Senior Staff Expenses
For the period of January 1, 2025 to June 30, 2025**

Unit: People and Culture
Member: Casselman, Nancy
Job Title/Rank: Director

Business Travel

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
June 16	3rd Annual Canadian Talent Management Summit in Toronto, ON	\$22.51
		\$22.51

Conferences & Training

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
February 25-26	Police Association of Ontario (P.A.O.) Police Employment Conference in Toronto, ON	\$814.08
		\$814.08

Hospitality & Protocol

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
May 1	2025 Ontario Women in Law Enforcement (O.W.L.E.) Awards Gala in Brampton, ON	\$135.09
May 22	58th Annual Police Excellence Awards in Toronto, ON	\$175.00
		\$310.09

Member Total	\$1,146.68
---------------------	-------------------



Toronto Police Service
Senior Staff Expenses
For the period of January 1, 2025 to June 30, 2025

Unit: Corporate Communications
Member: Clancy, Natalie
Job Title/Rank: Director

Business Travel

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
	No business travel expenses for this period.	\$0.00
		\$0.00

Conferences & Training

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
May 5-8	International Association of Chiefs of Police (I.A.C.P.) Public Information Officers Section Mid-Year Conference in Kansas City, Missouri	\$2,814.09
		\$2,814.09

Hospitality & Protocol

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
	No hospitality and protocol expenses for this period.	\$0.00
		\$0.00

Member Total	\$2,814.09
---------------------	-------------------



**Toronto Police Service
Senior Staff Expenses
For the period of January 1, 2025 to June 30, 2025**

Unit: Professionalism & Accountability
Member: Dawson, Shannon
Job Title/Rank: Chief Superintendent

Business Travel

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
April 24-27	International Association of Chiefs of Police (I.A.C.P.) Policy Council Mid-year Meeting in Grapevine, Texas	\$3,041.51
		\$3,041.51

Conferences & Training

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
February 2-5	Friends of Simon Weisenthal Center (F.S.W.C.) Tools for Tolerance Program in Los Angeles, California	\$1,550.55
		\$1,550.55

Hospitality & Protocol

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
May 22	58th Annual Police Excellence Awards in Toronto, ON	\$175.00
		\$175.00

Member Total	\$4,767.06
---------------------	-------------------



**Toronto Police Service
Senior Staff Expenses
For the period of**

Unit: Legal Services
Member: Debnath, Falguni
Job Title/Rank: General Counsel

Business Travel

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
	No business travel expenses for this period.	\$0.00
		\$0.00

Conferences & Training

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
April 22	York University Osgoode Professional Development, Prosecuting and Defending Professional Discipline Cases Webinar	\$707.23
April 25	Osgoode Professional Development, 15th National Symposium on Money Laundering and Financial Crimes in Toronto, ON	\$503.71
April 26	Osgoode Professional Development, Annual Provincial Offences Act (P.O.A.) Practitioner's Update Webinar - Online Event	\$300.19
		\$1,511.13

Hospitality & Protocol

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
	No hospitality and protocol expenses for this period.	\$0.00
		\$0.00

Member Total	\$1,511.13
---------------------	-------------------



Toronto Police Service
Senior Staff Expenses
For the period of January 1, 2025 to June 30, 2025

Unit: Chiefs Office
Member: Demkiw, Myron
Job Title/Rank: Chief of Police

Business Travel

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
March 5-7	Public Safety Canada National Forum on Combatting Anti-Semitism in Ottawa, ON	\$753.97
April 23-25	International Association of Chiefs of Police (I.A.C.P.) World Regional Chairs Meeting in Grapevine, Texas	\$1,817.14
June 10-11	Office of the Chief Government Meetings in Ottawa, ON	\$465.24
		\$3,036.35

Conferences & Training

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
February 2-3	Friends of Simon Weisenthal Center (F.S.W.C.) Tools for Tolerance Program in Los Angeles, California	\$1,040.10
April 26-May 3	Leadership in Counter Terrorism Alumni Association (L.i.n.C.T.-A.A.) Conference in Dublin, Ireland	\$1,704.72
June 21-25	Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police (O.A.C.P.) Annual Conference in Collingwood, ON	\$1,590.54
		\$4,335.36

Hospitality & Protocol

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
	No hospitality and protocol expenses for this period.	\$0.00
		\$0.00

Member Total	\$7,371.71
---------------------	-------------------



Toronto Police Service
Senior Staff Expenses
For the period of January 1, 2025 to June 30, 2025

Unit: Corporate Services Command
Member: Dhaliwal, Svina
Job Title/Rank: Chief Administrative Officer

Business Travel

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
January 13	Building Owners and Managers Association (B.M.O.A.) Meeting in Toronto, ON	\$30.62
February 27	Labour and Employment Law Meeting in Toronto, ON	\$28.82
April 6-7	Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) Senior Officer Bargaining Meeting in Toronto, ON	\$37.83
April 9	T.P.S. Senior Management Meeting in Toronto, ON	\$16.21
April 11	T.P.S. Senior Officer Bargaining Meeting in Toronto, ON	\$28.82
April 22	Young Presidents Organization (Y.P.O.) Gold and Toronto Police Collaborative Strategy Session in Toronto, ON	\$25.66
April 23-25	International Association of Chiefs of Police (I.A.C.P.) Global Policing Mid-year Meeting in Grapevine, Texas	\$2,234.15
June 2	T.P.S. Senior Officer Meeting at Royal Ontario Museum (R.O.M.) in Toronto, ON	\$16.21
June 4	Downtown Business Improvement Area (B.I.A.) Meeting in Toronto, ON	\$87.72
		\$2,506.04

Conferences & Training

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
March 2-4	Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police (C.A.C.P.) and British Columbia Association of Chiefs of Police (B.A.C.P.) Women in Policing Conference in Vancouver, BC.	\$1,514.31
May 29	Human Resources Outsourcing (H.R.O.) Today Canadian Talent Management Summit in Toronto, ON	\$13.51
June 2-4	Canadian Association for Research in Work and Health (C.A.R.W.H.) Conference in Ottawa, ON	\$661.44
		\$2,189.26



Toronto Police Service
Senior Staff Expenses
For the period of January 1, 2025 to June 30, 2025

Unit: Corporate Services Command
Member: Dhaliwal, Svina
Job Title/Rank: Chief Administrative Officer

Hospitality & Protocol

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
January 29	Royal Canadian Mounted Police (R.C.M.P.) Roundtable Evening Event Toronto, ON	\$10.81
May 22	58th Annual Police Excellence Awards in Toronto, ON	\$175.00
		\$185.81
Member Total		\$4,881.11



Toronto Police Service
Senior Staff Expenses
For the period of January 1, 2025 to June 30, 2025

Unit: Specialized Operations Command
Member: Johnson, Robert
Job Title/Rank: Deputy Chief

Business Travel

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
January 7	Young Presidents Organization (Y.P.O.) Meeting in Toronto, ON	\$11.70
January 29	Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) Chiefs of Police Roundtable Meeting in Toronto, ON	\$35.62
January 30	Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police (O.A.C.P.) Board of Directors Meeting in Burlington, ON	\$9.01
February 3	O.A.C.P. Board of Directors Meeting in Burlington, ON	\$9.01
February 19	Business Meeting in Toronto, ON	\$18.01
February 20	Business Roundtable Meeting in Toronto, ON	\$35.62
March 16-22	Major Cities Chiefs Association (M.C.C.A.) Police Executive Leadership Institute (P.E.L.I.) Mentoring Session in Virginia Beach, Virginia	\$3,354.41
May 15	Canadian Security Intelligence Service (C.S.I.S.) Meeting in Toronto, ON	\$19.81
June 24-28	54th Annual Canadian Integrated Response to Organized Crime (C.I.R.O.C.) Meeting in Fredericton, NB	\$1,982.45
		\$5,475.64

Conferences & Training

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
February 23-March 1	Major Cities Chiefs Association (M.C.C.A.) Police Executive Leadership Institution (P.E.L.I.) 11th Leadership Program Session in Grapevine, Texas	\$5,412.03
April 29-May 3	Leadership in Counter Terrorism Alumni Association (L.i.n.C.T.-A.A.) Conference in Dublin, Ireland	\$7,848.93
May 6-11	Counter Terrorism Preparedness Network (C.T.P.N.) Annual Conference in Stockholm, Sweden	\$4,201.74
		\$17,462.70



**Toronto Police Service
Senior Staff Expenses
For the period of January 1, 2025 to June 30, 2025**

Unit: Specialized Operations Command
Member: Johnson, Robert
Job Title/Rank: Deputy Chief

Hospitality & Protocol

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
January 29	Royal Canadian Mounted Police (R.C.M.P.) Roundtable Evening Event in Toronto, ON	\$9.01
February 13	National Flag Day Mayor's Event in Toronto, ON	\$9.90
May 22	58th Annual Police Excellence Awards in Toronto, ON	\$175.00
March 26-27	King Charles III Coronation Medal Ceremony in Ottawa, ON	\$661.54
		\$855.45
Member Total		\$23,793.79



**Toronto Police Service
Senior Staff Expenses
For the period of January 1, 2025 to June 30, 2025**

Unit: Toronto Police Service Board
Member: Kanengisser, Dubi
Job Title/Rank: Executive Director

Business Travel

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
January 5-7	Canadian Association of Police Governance (C.A.P.G) Meeting in Ottawa, ON	\$1,744.01
		\$1,744.01

Conferences & Training

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
	No conferences and training expenses for this period.	\$0.00
		\$0.00

Hospitality & Protocol

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
	No hospitality and protocol expenses for this period.	\$0.00
		\$0.00

Member Total	\$1,744.01
---------------------	-------------------



**Toronto Police Service
Senior Staff Expenses
For the period of January 1, 2025 to June 30, 2025**

Unit: Toronto Police Service Board
Member: Kostakis, Evangelia
Job Title/Rank: Board Member

Business Travel

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
	No business travel expenses for this period.	\$0.00
		\$0.00

Conferences & Training

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
January 5-7	Canadian Association of Police Governance (C.A.P.G.) Strategic Leadership Summit in Ottawa, ON	\$1,257.84
June 3-5	Ontario Association of Police Services Board (O.A.P.S.B.) Spring Conference and Annual General Meeting (A.G.M.) in London, ON	\$1,020.96
		\$2,278.80

Hospitality & Protocol

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
	No hospitality and protocol expenses for this period.	\$0.00
		\$0.00

Member Total	\$2,278.80
---------------------	-------------------



Toronto Police Service
Senior Staff Expenses
For the period of January 1, 2025 to June 30, 2025

Unit: Field Services
Member: Mann, Mandeep
Job Title/Rank: Chief Superintendent

Business Travel

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
April 22	Young Presidents Organization (Y.P.O.) Gold and Toronto Police Collaborative Strategy Session in Toronto, ON	\$28.37
		\$28.37

Conferences & Training

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
May 20-June 17	University of Toronto Clear and Confident Public Speaking Course in Toronto, ON	\$613.03
June 13	Furthering Our Community by Uniting Services (F.O.C.U.S.) Toronto Annual Conference in Toronto, ON	\$12.61
		\$625.64

Hospitality & Protocol

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
June 06	Youth Association for Academics, Athletics, and Character Education (Y.A.A.C.E.) National Day Against Gun Violence Event in Toronto, ON	\$18.01
June 14	Toronto Chinese Business Association 37th Toronto International Dragon Boat Race Festival in Toronto, ON	\$27.02
June 18	Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) Chief and Toronto Police Service Board (T.P.S.B) Pride Reception in Toronto, ON	\$7.20
		\$52.23

Member Total	\$706.24
---------------------	-----------------



Toronto Police Service
Senior Staff Expenses
For the period of January 1, 2025 to June 30, 2025

Unit: Detective Operations
Member: Matthews, Joseph
Job Title/Rank: Chief Superintendent

Business Travel

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
February 4	Minister of the Attorney General (M.A.G.) Meeting in Toronto, ON	\$39.17
February 27-28	Regional Forum of Port Security Partners in Montreal, QC	\$1,335.79
March 4-8	53rd Canadian Integrated Response to Organized Crime (C.I.R.O.C.) Federal Policing Program in Vancouver, BC	\$2,907.89
June 24-28	54th Annual C.I.R.O.C. Meeting in Fredericton, NB	\$995.96
		\$5,278.81

Conferences & Training

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
	No conferences and training expenses for this period.	\$0.00
		\$0.00

Hospitality & Protocol

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
May 22	58th Annual Police Excellence Awards in Toronto, ON	\$175.00
		\$175.00

Member Total	\$5,453.81
---------------------	-------------------



Toronto Police Service
Senior Staff Expenses
For the period of January 1, 2025 to June 30, 2025

Unit: Toronto Police Service Board
Member: Morgan, Ann
Job Title/Rank: Board Member

Business Travel

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
January 24	Mental Health and Addictions Advisory Panel (M.H.A.A.P.) Committee Meeting in Toronto, ON	\$34.04
		\$34.04

Conferences & Training

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
	No conferences and training expenses for this period.	\$0.00
		\$0.00

Hospitality & Protocol

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
	No hospitality and protocol expenses for this period.	\$0.00
		\$0.00

Member Total	\$34.04
---------------------	----------------



Toronto Police Service
Senior Staff Expenses
For the period of January 1, 2025 to June 30, 2025

Unit: West Field Command
Member: Nicol, Brett
Job Title/Rank: Chief Superintendent

Business Travel

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
February 2-8	International Association of Chiefs of Police (I.A.C.P.) United Arab Emirates (U.A.E.) Ministry of Interior (M.O.I.) Police Academy Exchange Graduation Ceremony in Abu Dhabi, UAE	\$646.10
		\$646.10

Conferences & Training

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
	No conferences and training expenses for this period.	\$0.00
		\$0.00

Hospitality & Protocol

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
May 22	58th Annual Police Excellence Awards in Toronto, ON	\$175.00
		\$175.00

Member Total	\$821.10
---------------------	-----------------



**Toronto Police Service
Senior Staff Expenses
For the period of January 1, 2025 to June 30, 2025**

Unit: Community Safety Command
Member: Pogue, Lauren
Job Title/Rank: Deputy Chief

Business Travel

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
January 13	Building Owners and Managers Association (B.O.M.A.) Meeting in Toronto, ON	\$30.62
January 28	The Downtown Community Outreach & Engagement (C.O.R.E.) Team Meeting in Toronto, ON	\$30.62
February 5-7	Major City Chief's Association (M.C.C.A.) Meeting in Washington, USA	\$1,713.63
February 20	Business Roundtable Meeting in Toronto, ON	\$35.62
April 6-8	Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police (O.A.C.P.) Board of Directors and Strategic Planning Meeting in Waterloo, ON	\$202.61
		\$2,013.10

Conferences & Training

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
February 2-5	Friends of Simon Weisenthal Center (F.S.W.C.) Tools for Tolerance Program in Los Angeles, California	\$1,560.28
June 21-23	O.A.C.P. Annual Conference in Collingwood, ON	\$531.51
		\$2,091.79

Hospitality & Protocol

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
March 1	Toronto Garrison Officers' Ball in Toronto, ON	\$16.21
May 22	58th Annual Police Excellence Awards in Toronto, ON	\$175.00
June 3	Native Women's Resource Centre of Toronto 40th Anniversary Celebration in Toronto, ON	\$230.81
		\$422.02

Member Total	\$4,526.91
---------------------	-------------------



Toronto Police Service
Senior Staff Expenses
For the period of January 1, 2025 to June 30, 2025

Unit: East Field Command
Member: Skinner, Kelly
Job Title/Rank: Chief Superintendent

Business Travel

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
January 28	The Downtown Community Outreach & Engagement (C.O.R.E.) Team Meeting in Toronto, ON	\$30.62
February 20	Big Brothers Big Sisters of Toronto Meeting in Toronto, ON	\$10.81
February 25	University of Guelph-Humber Women of Distinction Alumni Award Meeting in Toronto, ON	\$3.60
April 24-27	International Association of Chiefs of Police (I.A.C.P.) World Regional Chairs Meeting in Grapevine, Texas	\$3,079.58
May 8	Big Brothers Big Sisters of Toronto Meeting in Toronto, ON	\$13.50
		\$3,138.11

Conferences & Training

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
February 4-14	Global Policing Exchange Leadership Programme (G.P.L.X.) in London, UK	\$6,267.10
		\$6,267.10

Hospitality & Protocol

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
May 22	58th Annual Police Excellence Awards in Toronto, ON	\$175.00
		\$175.00

Member Total	\$9,580.21
---------------------	-------------------



**Toronto Police Service
Senior Staff Expenses
For the period of January 1, 2025 to June 30, 2025**

Unit: Technology and Transformation Command
Member: Stairs, Colin
Job Title/Rank: Chief Transformation Officer

Business Travel

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
January 10	Business Meeting in Toronto, ON	\$10.81
January 29	Chief of Police (C.O.P.) Roundtable Meeting in Toronto, ON	\$54.76
February 20	International Association of Chiefs of Police (I.A.C.P.) Leadership Meeting in Toronto, ON	\$16.21
February 20	Business Roundtable Meeting in Toronto, ON	\$19.72
		\$101.50

Conferences & Training

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
May 8-13	Pearls in Policing Conference in Dubai, UAE	\$2,855.61
May 14-16	World Policing Conference in Dubai, UAE	\$997.08
June 24	Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police (O.A.C.P.) Conference in Blue Mountain, ON	\$13.51
		\$3,866.20

Hospitality & Protocol

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
	No hospitality and protocol expenses for this period.	\$0.00
		\$0.00

Member Total	\$3,967.70
---------------------	-------------------



**Toronto Police Service
Senior Staff Expenses
For the period of January 1, 2025 to June 30, 2025**

Unit: Investigative Support
Member: Stephenson, Katherine
Job Title/Rank: Chief Superintendent

Business Travel

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
January 13-17	Royal Canadian Mounted Police (R.C.M.P.) Meeting in Colorado Springs, Colorado	\$3,437.88
February 23	R.C.M.P. Planning Meeting in Ottawa, ON	\$619.88
March 5-7	National Forum on Combatting Antisemitism in Ottawa, ON	\$849.06
March 23-27	Leadership in Counter Terrorism Alumni Association (L.i.n.C.T.-A.A.) Meeting in Ottawa, ON	\$1,011.76
		\$5,918.58

Conferences & Training

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
February 2-6	Friends of Simon Weisenthal Center (F.S.W.C.) Tools for Tolerance for Law Enforcement Training Program in Los Angeles, California	\$1,555.85
April 30-May 2	Leadership in Counter Terrorism Alumni Association (L.i.n.C.T.-A.A.) Conference in Dublin, Ireland	\$640.55
May 20-30	L.i.n.C.T.-A.A. Global 1 Training Session in Ottawa, ON	\$643.88
		\$2,840.28

Hospitality & Protocol

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
	No hospitality and protocol expenses for this period.	\$0.00
		\$0.00

Member Total	\$8,758.86
---------------------	-------------------



Toronto Police Service
Senior Staff Expenses
For the period of January 1, 2025 to June 30, 2025

Unit: Information Technology Services
Member: White, Deidra
Job Title/Rank: Director

Business Travel

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
	No business travel expenses for this period.	\$0.00
		\$0.00

Conferences & Training

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
	No conferences and training expenses for this period.	\$0.00
		\$0.00

Hospitality & Protocol

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
May 1	Award Nominee for 2025 Ontario Women in Law Enforcement (O.W.L.E.) Awards Gala in Brampton, ON	\$117.06
		\$117.06
Member Total		\$117.06



**Toronto Police Service
Senior Staff Expenses
For the period of January 1, 2025 to June 30, 2025**

Unit: Information Management
Member: Williams, Ian
Job Title/Rank: Director

Business Travel

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
April 14-17	Police Information and Statistics (P.O.L.I.S) Spring Meeting in Saskatoon, SK.	\$2,242.77
		\$2,242.77

Conferences & Training

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
April 26-May 1	Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police (C.A.C.P.) National Police Leadership Conference in Winnipeg, MB	\$2,847.93
		\$2,847.93

Hospitality & Protocol

Dates	Purpose, Description & Location	Total Expenses (Net of HST Rebate)
March 25-27	King Charles III Coronation Medal Ceremony in Ottawa, ON	\$944.28
		\$944.28

Member Total	\$6,034.98
---------------------	-------------------



12. Chief's Administrative Investigation Reports



12.1. Chief Administrative Investigation of the Custody Death of Complainant 2024.26



PUBLIC REPORT

August 1, 2025

To: Chair and Members
Toronto Police Service Board

From: Myron Demkiw
Chief of Police

Subject: Chief's Administrative Investigation into the Custody
Death of Complainant 2024.26

Purpose: ☒ Information Purposes Only ☐ Seeking Decision

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive this report for information.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications arising from the recommendation contained in this report.

Summary:

The Professional Standards – Special Investigations Unit Liaison (P.R. S. – S.I.U. Liaison) investigation determined the conduct of the designated officials was in compliance with applicable provincial legislation regarding the Standards of Conduct and the applicable Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) procedures.

Discussion:

Background

Whenever the Special Investigations Unit (S.I.U.) investigates an incident involving death, serious injury, the discharge of a firearm at a person or the allegation of a sexual

assault, provincial legislation requires the chief of police, of the relevant police service, to conduct an administrative investigation.

This is the Chief's report in respect of this incident.

Relevant Board Policies and Compliance

- Community Safety and Policing Act (C.S.P.A.) 2019
- Special Investigations Unit Act (S.I.U.A.), 2019
- Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) Procedures

S.I.U. Terminology

Complainant – Refers to the Affected Person

SO – Subject Official(s)

WO – Witness Official(s)

PRP – Peel Regional Police

SEW – Service Employee Witness

S.I.U. Investigative Conclusion

In a letter to the Chief of Police dated April 17, 2025, Director Joseph Martino of the S.I.U. advised, *"I write to advise you that the investigation by this Unit into the Custody Death of [Complainant 2024.26], also involving Peel Regional Police, that occurred on May 1, 2024, has been completed. The file has been closed and no further action is contemplated. In my view, there were no reasonable grounds in the evidence to proceed with criminal charges against the subject official."*

The following *S.I.U. Incident Narrative and Analysis and Director's Decision* has been reprinted from the S.I.U. Director's report, number 24-OCD-190, which can be found via the following link:

[Special Investigations Unit -- Director's Report Details, Case Number: 24-OCD-190](#)

S.I.U. Incident Narrative

"The evidence collected by the SIU, including an interview with the SO and video footage that largely captured the incident, gives rise to the following scenario.

In the morning of April 25, 2024, the SO, followed shortly by another PRP officer, WO #4. arrived at the Circle K / Esso gas station at 7970 Mavis Road, Brampton. A 911 call had been received reporting that a male – the Complainant – was harassing customers and appeared intoxicated by drugs or alcohol. The officers questioned the Complainant inside the store. He was cooperative and provided his name. Asked if he wanted medical attention, the Complainant refused. He denied the use of drugs or alcohol.

Having checked his name and learned that there was a warrant in effect for his arrest by the TPS, the officers took the Complainant into custody without incident.

WO #4 drove the Complainant to TPS 31 Division and paraded him before WO #1 for booking at about 9:30 a.m. The Complainant was unsteady on his feet, spoke in a low voice, and spoke and breathed rapidly. He told WO #1 that he suffered from psychosis and took medication for the condition. He denied having consumed alcohol or drugs, and indicated he was not physically injured. WO #1 was having difficulty discerning the Complainant's replies to his questions and asked him to write them out with pen and paper. The Complainant returned the paper with writing that made no sense. The Complainant was searched, fingerprinted, and lodged in a cell. Concerned with the Complainant's wellbeing, WO #1 directed that the special constable assigned to monitor him - the SEW - keep him in close check. The time was about 10:04 a.m.

At about 10:18 a.m., WO #1 approached the cell in the company of the SEW, who had expressed concern with the Complainant's health. The Complainant was laying on the cell bench still whispering and breathing rapidly, but he was no longer responsive to the officers' questions. WO #1 arranged to have two officers – WO #2 and WO #3 – transport the Complainant to hospital.

The transporting officers and the Complainant arrived at hospital at about 10:45 a.m.

While in the care of hospital later that day, the Complainant collapsed and went unconscious. He was placed on life support and pronounced brain dead in the morning of May 1, 2024. In the afternoon of that day, with the removal of life support, the Complainant passed away. The time was 2:18 p.m.

Cause of Death

The pathologist at autopsy concluded that the cause of the Complainant's death was "unascertained". She did opine that "[c]omplications of taking a toxicologically significant substance is likely what led to this man's demise."

Analysis and Director's Decision

"The Complainant died in hospital while in the custody of the TPS on May 1, 2024. He had been arrested by PRP on April 25, 2024, and transferred to the TPS, on the strength of an arrest warrant taken out by the TPS. The SIU was notified of the incident and initiated an investigation naming one of the PRP arresting officers – the SO – the subject official. The investigation is now concluded. On my assessment of the evidence, there are no reasonable grounds to believe that the SO committed a criminal offence in connection with the Complainant's arrest and death.

The offences that arise for consideration are failure to provide the necessities of life and criminal negligence causing death contrary to sections 215 and 220 of the Criminal Code, respectively. Both require something more than a simple want of care to give rise to liability. The former is predicated, in part, on conduct that amounts to a marked

departure from the level of care that a reasonable person would have exercised in the circumstances. The latter is premised on even more egregious conduct that demonstrates a wanton or reckless disregard for the lives or safety of other persons. It is not made out unless the neglect constitutes a marked and substantial departure from a reasonable standard of care. In the instant case, the question is whether there was any want of care on the part of the Complainant's police custodians, including the SO, sufficiently serious to attract criminal sanction, that endangered the Complainant's life or caused his death. In my view, there was not.

The Complainant was lawfully in police custody from the moment of his arrest by the SO and WO #4 of the PRP. Given the warrant in effect, the officers were within their rights in apprehending the Complainant and transporting him to TPS 31 Division.

With respect to the care afforded the Complainant through his period in custody, the evidence indicates that none of the officers who dealt with him fell short of the requirements of the criminal law. The Complainant certainly appeared off – breathing rapidly, whispering, unsteady and, at times, incoherent – but there was nothing to suggest he needed immediate medical attention. He was able to articulate that he suffered from mental illness, for which he took medication, but denied being injured or having consumed alcohol or drugs. To his credit, because of the Complainant's behaviour, WO #1 directed that he be monitored closely. Within minutes of that instruction, asked to the cells by the special constable watching the Complainant, WO #1 arranged to have him sent to hospital.

For the foregoing reasons, there is no basis for proceeding with criminal charges in this case. The file is closed."

Summary of the Toronto Police Service's Investigation

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison conducted an administrative investigation as is required by provincial legislation.

This investigation was reviewed by Specialized Criminal Investigations – Homicide and Missing Persons in accordance with T.P.S. Procedure 13-16 (Special Investigations Unit).

This investigation examined the circumstances of the custody death in relation to the applicable legislation, policing services provided, procedures, and the conduct of the involved officers.

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation reviewed the following T.P.S. Procedures:

- Procedure 01-01 (Arrest);
- Procedure 01-02 (Search of Persons);
- Procedure 01-03 (Persons in Custody);
- Procedure 04-16 (Death in Police Custody);

- Procedure 10-06 (Medical Emergencies);
- Procedure 13-16 (Special Investigations Unit);
- Procedure 13-17 (Notes and Reports);
- Procedure 15-01 (Incident Response (Use of Force/De-Escalation));
- Procedure 15-02 (Injury/Illness Reporting);
- Procedure 15-17 (In-Car Camera System); and
- Procedure 15-20 (Body-Worn Camera).

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison also reviewed the following legislation:

- Special Investigations Unit Act, (S.I.U.A.) 2019.

Conclusion:

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation determined that the T.P.S. policies and procedures associated with this custody death were lawful, in keeping with current legislation, and written in a manner which provided adequate and appropriate guidance to the members. None of the examined policies and procedures required modification.

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation determined the conduct of the involved officers was in compliance with applicable provincial legislation regarding the Standards of Conduct, the applicable T.P.S. Procedures and the officers' training.

The existence of the Body-Worn Camera footage of the interaction, the booking hall video and the cell video were essential pieces of evidence that assisted both the S.I.U.'s investigation and this administrative investigation.

Chief Superintendent Shannon Dawson, Professionalism and Accountability, will be in attendance to answer any questions that the Board may have regarding this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Myron Demkiw, M.O.M.
Chief of Police



12.2. Chief's Administrative Investigation into the Firearms Death of a Person – Complainant 2024.37



PUBLIC REPORT

August 1, 2025

To: Chair and Members
Toronto Police Service Board

From: Myron Demkiw
Chief of Police

Subject: Chief's Administrative Investigation into the Firearms
Death of a Person – Complainant 2024.37

Purpose: ☒ Information Purposes Only ☐ Seeking Decision

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive this report for information, as per O. Reg. 391/23 s. 9(2)(b).

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications arising from the recommendation contained in this report.

Summary:

The Professional Standards – Special Investigations Unit (P.R.S. – S.I.U.) Liaison investigation determined the conduct of the designated officials was in compliance with applicable provincial legislation regarding the Standards of Conduct and the applicable Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) Procedures.

Discussion:

Background

Whenever the Special Investigations Unit (S.I.U.) investigates an incident involving death, serious injury, the discharge of a firearm at a person or the allegation of a sexual

assault, provincial legislation requires the chief of police, of the relevant police service, to conduct an administrative investigation.

This is the Chief's report in respect of this incident.

Relevant Board Policies and Compliance

- Community Safety and Policing Act (C.S.P.A.) 2019
- Special Investigations Unit Act (S.I.U.A.), 2019
- Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) Procedures

S.I.U. Terminology

Complainant – Refers to the Affected Person

SO – Subject Official(s)

WO – Witness Official(s)

CEW – Conducted Energy Weapon

S.I.U. Investigative Conclusion

In a letter to the Chief of Police dated March 6, 2025, Director Joseph Martino of the S.I.U. advised, *"The file has been closed and no further action is contemplated. In my view, there were no reasonable grounds in the evidence to proceed with criminal charges against the subject official."*

The following *S.I.U. Incident Narrative and Analysis and Director's Decision* has been reprinted from the S.I.U. Director's report, number 24-TFD-233, which can be found via the following link:

[Special Investigations Unit -- Director's Report Details, Case Number: 24-TFD-233](#)

S.I.U. Incident Narrative

"The evidence collected by the SIU, including interviews with police and non-police eyewitnesses, and video footage that captured the incident, gives rise to the following scenario. As was her legal right, the SO did not agree an interview with the SIU or the release of her notes.

The Complainant was of unsound mind in the afternoon of June 3, 2024. While on foot in the area of Warden Avenue and Ellesmere Road, he was disrupting traffic, had torn the windshield wipers off one or more vehicles, and had attempted to carjack a vehicle waiting to turn onto Ellesmere Road from Crocus Drive (west of Warden Avenue). The Complainant had also entered the Home Depot on Ellesmere Road, east of Warden

Avenue, and stolen a hammer and metal file. Citizens affected by this behaviour called 911.

The SO was partnered with WO #1 when they heard of the 911 calls over the radio. They were in the vicinity and decided to attend the area to locate the Complainant. With WO #1 driving, the officers made their way onto Ellesmere Road and travelled east, east of Warden Avenue. They were flagged by Home Depot employees, who were pointing in the direction of the Complainant. The Complainant had turned left into the driveway of the parking lot east of the building at 520 Ellesmere Road. He was holding a hammer in his right hand, and a metal file in his left. WO #1 turned left, bringing the cruiser to a stop facing north a short distance into the driveway.

WO #1 exited the cruiser and was confronted by the Complainant west of his location. The Complainant walked towards the officer, the hammer held high in his right hand, the file in his left. WO #1 drew his CEW, pointed it at the Complainant and backed up to a position behind the cruiser. The SO had exited the cruiser and had her firearm out. She tracked the Complainant as he advanced on WO #1, repeatedly telling him to “get back”. The Complainant continued to approach WO #1 and was within about three metres of the officer when he fired his CEW twice. The second of the discharges caused the Complainant to fall to the ground.

The Complainant rose to his feet within two to three seconds of falling, turned towards the SO, several metres to his north, and started to run at her, the hammer held high. The SO ran backwards along the passenger side of the cruiser. The parties had just cleared the front end of the cruiser when the SO fired a single shot. The Complainant was no more than a metre or two from the officer at the time. He was struck in the torso and immediately felled by the shot

WO #1 and the SO approached the Complainant and handcuffed him. Additional officers arrived on scene and first-aid was administered.

The Complainant was transported to hospital in ambulance and subsequently pronounced deceased.

Cause of Death

The pathologist at autopsy was of the preliminary view that the Complainant’s death was attributable to a penetrating gunshot wound to the abdomen.”

S.I.U. Analysis and Director’s Decision

“The Complainant passed away on June 3, 2024, the result of a gunshot fired by a TPS officer. The SIU was notified of the incident and initiated an investigation, naming the SO the subject official. The investigation is now concluded. On my assessment of the evidence, there are no reasonable grounds to believe that the SO committed a criminal offence in connection with the Complainant’s death.

Section 34 of the Criminal Code provides that conduct that would otherwise constitute an offence is legally justified if it was intended to deter a reasonably apprehended assault, actual or threatened, and was itself reasonable. The reasonableness of the conduct is to be assessed in light of all the relevant circumstances, including with respect to such considerations as the nature of the force or threat; the extent to which the use of force was imminent and whether there were other means available to respond to the potential use of force; whether any party to the incident used or threatened to use a weapon; and, the nature and proportionality of the person's response to the use or threat of force.

WO #1 and the SO were engaged in the lawful execution of their duties through the series of events that culminated in the shooting. Aware of his erratic and violent behaviour, the officers were within their rights in attending at the scene to do what they could to take the Complainant into custody and ensure public safety.

There is no doubt that the SO fired her weapon believing it was necessary to protect herself from a reasonably apprehended attack by the Complainant. The officer did not provide that evidence firsthand to the SIU, as was her legal right, but the circumstances surrounding the events in question lead inexorably to that inference. The Complainant had just threatened her partner, advancing on him with purpose while brandishing a hammer and file, and he was now running towards her with the same weapons. There could be little doubt that the SO was at imminent risk of attack and that defensive action was necessary to preserve herself.

There is also no doubt that the SO's choice of defensive force, namely, a single gunshot, was reasonable. Knowing what she knew of the Complainant's behaviour prior to police arrival, and knowing that her partner's CEW discharges had not proven effective in deterring the Complainant, it would have been apparent to the officer that her life hung in the balance if action was not taken to stop the Complainant's advance. The hammer in the Complainant's hands was clearly capable of inflicting grievous bodily harm or death, and nothing short of the immediate stopping power of a firearm would do in the circumstances. It should be noted that the SO did attempt to create distance from the Complainant, but he was closing the gap and was within striking range at the time of the shot. On this record, I am unable to reasonably conclude that the SO acted unreasonably when she met a threat of lethal force with a resort to lethal force of her own.

For the foregoing reasons, there is no basis for proceeding with criminal charges in this case."

Summary of the Toronto Police Service's Investigation

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison conducted an administrative investigation as is required by provincial legislation and T.P.S. Procedure 13-16 (Special Investigations Unit).

This investigation examined the circumstances of the firearm death in relation to the applicable legislation, policing services provided, procedures and the conduct of the involved officers.

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation reviewed the following T.P.S. Procedures:

- Procedure 08-04 (Members Involved in a Traumatic Critical Incident);
- Procedure 13-16 (Special Investigations Unit);
- Procedure 13-17 (Notes and Reports);
- Procedure 15-01 (Incident Response (Use of Force/De-Escalation));
- Procedure 15-03 (Service Firearms);
- Procedure 15-09 (Conducted Energy Weapons);
- Procedure 15-17 (In-Car Camera System); and,
- Procedure 15-20 (Body-Worn Camera).

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation also reviewed the following legislation:

- Ontario Regulation 391/23
- Special Investigations Unit Act (S.I.U.A.) 2019

Conclusion:

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation determined that the T.P.S.'s policies and procedures associated with this firearms death were lawful, in keeping with current legislation, and written in a manner which provided adequate and appropriate guidance to the members. None of the examined policies and procedures required modification.

This investigation determined the conduct of the involved officers was in compliance with applicable provincial legislation regarding the Standards of Conduct, the applicable T.P.S. Procedure and the officers' training

The In-Car Camera System and the Body-Worn Camera footage were essential pieces of evidence that assisted both the S.I.U.'s investigation and this administrative investigation.

Chief Superintendent Shannon Dawson, Professionalism and Accountability, will be in attendance to answer any questions that the Board may have regarding this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Myron Demkiw, M.O.M.
Chief of Police



12.3. Chief Administrative Investigation of the Custody Injury of Complainant 2024.89



PUBLIC REPORT

August 1, 2025

To: Chair and Members
Toronto Police Service Board

From: Myron Demkiw
Chief of Police

Subject: Chief's Administrative Investigation into the Custody
Injury of Complainant 2024.89

Purpose: ☒ Information Purposes Only ☐ Seeking Decision

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive this report for information.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications arising from the recommendation contained in this report.

Summary:

The Professional Standards – Special Investigations Unit (P.R.S. – S.I.U.) Liaison investigation determined the conduct of the designated official was in compliance with applicable provincial legislation regarding the Standards of Conduct and the applicable Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) Procedures.

Discussion:

Background

Whenever the Special Investigations Unit (S.I.U.) investigates an incident involving death, serious injury, the discharge of a firearm at a person or the allegation of a sexual

assault, provincial legislation requires the chief of police of the relevant police service, to conduct an administrative investigation.

This is the Chief's report in respect of this incident.

Relevant Board Policies and Compliance

- Community Safety and Policing Act (C.S.P.A.) 2019
- Special Investigations Unit Act (S.I.U.A.) 2019
- T.P.S. Procedures

S.I.U. Terminology

Complainant – Refers to the Affected Person

SO – Subject Official(s)

WO – Witness Official(s)

CW – Civilian Witness

S.I.U. Investigative Conclusion

In a letter to the Chief of Police dated April 14, 2025, Director Joseph Martino of the S.I.U. advised, *"The file has been closed, and no further action is contemplated. In my view, there were no reasonable grounds in the evidence to proceed with criminal charges against the subject official."*

The following *S.I.U. Incident Narrative and Analysis and Director's Decision* has been reprinted from the S.I.U. Director's report, number 24-TCI-546, which can be found via the following link:

[Special Investigations Unit -- Director's Report Details, Case Number: 24-TCI-546](#)

S.I.U. Incident Narrative

"The evidence collected by the SIU, including interviews with the Complainant and the SO, and video footage that captured the incident, gives rise to the following scenario.

In the late evening of December 20, 2024, TPS officers were dispatched to the area of Finch Avenue West and Pearldale Avenue, Toronto. A Mercedes was stopped, its engine running, in the eastbound curb lane of Finch Avenue West, west of Pearldale Avenue. Its driver was reportedly asleep in the driver's seat.

WO #2 was the first to arrive on scene, stopping his cruiser behind the Mercedes. The SO and his partner – WO #1 – arrived in their cruiser shortly after, stopping the vehicle

nose-to-nose with the Mercedes. The officers were able to rouse the driver – the Complainant – and have him exit the vehicle. He was handcuffed without incident behind the back and placed in the rear seat of SO and WO #1's cruiser.

When the Complainant complained of pain because of the handcuffs, the officers agreed to adjust them. He was removed from the cruiser and placed front first against the driver-side. After his right cuff was removed, the Complainant began to resist the SO and WO #1. The officers attempted to keep him pinned against the cruiser, but he was able to break free. The SO took hold of the Complainant and forced him to the ground. The struggle continued as the Complainant refused to surrender his right arm to be re-handcuffed. The SO struck him multiple times in the head area. Additional officers arrived on scene, and the Complainant was secured in handcuffs and leg restraints.

Following his arrest, the Complainant was taken to hospital and diagnosed with a fracture of the right orbital bone.”

S.I.U. Analysis and Director's Decision

“The Complainant was seriously injured in the course of his arrest by TPS officers on December 20, 2024. The SIU was notified of the incident and initiated an investigation naming the SO the subject official. The investigation is now concluded. On my assessment of the evidence, there are no reasonable grounds to believe that the SO committed a criminal offence in connection with the Complainant's arrest and injury

Pursuant to section 25(1) of the Criminal Code, police officers are immune from criminal liability for force used in the course of their duties provided such force was reasonably necessary in the execution of an act that they were required or authorized to do by law.

The SO and his colleagues were within their rights in moving to take the Complainant into custody for drunk driving given the signs of impairment he displayed – he had stopped with his engine running in a live lane of traffic, had fallen asleep at the wheel of the vehicle, and smelled of alcohol

With respect to the force used by the SO, namely, a takedown and multiple hand strikes to the head, I am unable to reasonably conclude it was unjustified. The Complainant presented as a formidable challenge. He managed to break free of the grasp of three officers and, over the course of two or three minutes on the ground, was able to keep his right arm from being controlled by the SO. At some point, the evidence indicates he bit the SO on the right forearm. The takedown made sense in the circumstances as it would position the officers to better deal with any additional resistance on the part of the Complainant. When the Complainant continued to struggle and took hold of a carabiner on the SO's vest, pulling the officer towards him, the SO was entitled to resort to a measure of force to break the Complainant's hold. The force used was significant – about a half-dozen left hand punches to the head (some of which did not land) followed by two rights – but did not exceed what was warranted in the circumstances. The number of punches seemed excessive to one of the paramedics on site, but it is

important to note that the paramedic was not aware that the SO was being held by the Complainant at the time. In arriving at this conclusion, I am mindful that an officer embroiled in a physical struggle is not expected to measure his responsive force to a nicety; what the law requires is force that is reasonable in the circumstances, not necessarily exacting: R v Nasogaluak, [2010] 1 SCR 206; R v Baxter (1975), 27 CCC (2d) 96 (Ont. CA)

In the result, while I accept that the Complainant's fracture was incurred in the altercation that marked his arrest, more than likely the result of one or more of the SO's punches, there are no reasonable grounds to believe the injury is attributable to any unlawful conduct on the part of the officer. As such, there is no basis for proceeding with criminal charges in this case. The file is closed."

Summary of the Toronto Police Service's Investigation

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison conducted an administrative investigation as is required by provincial legislation.

This investigation examined the circumstances of the custody injury in relation to the applicable legislation, policing services provided, procedures, and the conduct of the involved officers.

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation reviewed the following T.P.S. Procedures:

- Procedure 01-01 (Arrest);
- Procedure 01-02 (Search of Persons);
- Procedure 01-03 (Persons in Custody);
- Procedure 07-06 (Ability Impaired/80mg and Over Investigation);
- Procedure 07-09 (Breath Interview);
- Procedure 08-03 (Injured on Duty Reporting);
- Procedure 10-06 (Medical Emergencies);
- Procedure 13-16 (Special Investigations Unit);
- Procedure 13-17 (Notes and Reports);
- Procedure 15-01 (Incident Response (Use of Force/De-Escalation));
- Procedure 15-02 (Injury/Illness Reporting);
- Procedure 15-17 (In-Car Camera System); and
- Procedure 15-20 (Body-Worn Camera)

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation also reviewed the following legislation:

- Special Investigations Unit Act (S.I.U.A.), 2019

Conclusion:

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation determined that the T.P.S.'s policies and procedures associated with this custody injury were lawful, in keeping with current legislation, and written in a manner which provided adequate and appropriate guidance to the members. None of the examined policies and procedures required modification.

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation determined the conduct of the involved officers was in compliance with applicable provincial legislation regarding the Standards of Conduct and the applicable T.P.S. Procedures.

The existence of the Body-worn Camera and In-Car Camera System. footage of the interaction were essential pieces of evidence that assisted both the S.I.U.'s investigation and this administrative investigation.

Chief Superintendent Shannon Dawson, Professionalism and Accountability, will be in attendance to answer any questions that the Board may have regarding this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Myron Demkiw, M.O.M.
Chief of Police



12.4. Chief Administrative Investigation of the Custody Injury of Complainant 2025.01



PUBLIC REPORT

August 1, 2025

To: Chair and Members
Toronto Police Service Board

From: Myron Demkiw
Chief of Police

Subject: Chief's Administrative Investigation into the Custody
Injury of Complainant 2025.01

Purpose: ☒ Information Purposes Only ☐ Seeking Decision

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive this report for information.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications arising from the recommendation contained in this report.

Summary:

The Professional Standards – Special Investigations Unit (P.R.S. – S.I.U.) Liaison investigation determined the conduct of the involved officers was in compliance with applicable provincial legislation regarding the Standards of Conduct and the applicable Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) Procedures.

Discussion:

Background

Whenever the Special Investigations Unit (S.I.U.) investigates an incident involving death, serious injury, the discharge of a firearm at a person or the allegation of a sexual

assault, provincial legislation requires the chief of police of the relevant police service, to conduct an administrative investigation.

This is the Chief's report in respect of this incident.

Relevant Board Policies and Compliance

- Community Safety and Policing Act (C.S.P.A.) 2019
- Special Investigations Unit Act (S.I.U.A.) 2019
- T.P.S. Procedures

S.I.U. Terminology

Complainant – Refers to the Affected Person

SO – Subject Official(s)

WO – Witness Official(s)

CW – Civilian Witness(es)

S.I.U. Investigative Conclusion

In a letter to the Chief of Police dated May 2, 2025, Director Joseph Martino of the S.I.U. advised, *"The file has been closed, and no further action is contemplated. In my view, there were no reasonable grounds in the evidence to proceed with criminal charges against the subject official."*

The following *S.I.U. Incident Narrative and Analysis and Director's Decision* has been reprinted from the S.I.U. Director's report, number 24-TCI-006, which can be found via the following link:

[Special Investigations Unit -- Director's Report Details, Case Number: 25-TCI-006](#)

S.I.U. Incident Narrative

"The evidence collected by the SIU, including an interview with the Complainant, and police and non-police witnesses, gives rise to the following scenario. As was his legal right, the SO chose not to interview with the SIU or authorize the release of his notes.

In the afternoon of January 3, 2025, TPS officers were dispatched to an apartment in the area of Wellesley Street East and Jarvis Street, Toronto. A woman – the CW – had called 911 to ask that someone check on the wellbeing of her family member – the Complainant – who resided at the address. She had not heard from him in a couple of days and was refusing to answer his door when she personally attended at his home.

Paramedics were the first to arrive on scene, in the hallway outside the Complainant's apartment. They were followed by WO #1 and his partner, and a short time later, a TPS MCIT consisting of the SO and a mental health nurse. The officers attempted to communicate with the Complainant through the closed and locked door, impressing on him that they were to help and could not leave until they had checked on him.

The Complainant, of unsound mind at the time, was not receptive to the officers' overtures. Afraid that the police officers would beat him, he refused to answer the door.

The officers became increasingly concerned for the Complainant's safety, particularly when they thought they smelled plastic burning from within the apartment. They decided the Complainant's was subject to apprehension under the Mental Health Act and that there were exigent circumstances justifying entry into the apartment to take him into custody.

Shortly before 2:00 p.m., the SO unlocked the door using a key provided by the building's management. Followed by WO #1, the officer walked through a corridor towards the apartment balcony. As he opened the balcony door, the Complainant, lying flat on the top of the balcony railing, rolled off and fell down its exterior side.

The Complainant dropped onto the roof in front of a fifth-floor apartment balcony, suffering a fractured left elbow, and a possibly broken left shoulder blade, in the process.

Officers arrived on the roof and arrested the Complainant. He was transported to hospital."

S.I.U. Analysis and Director's Decision

"The Complainant was seriously injured in a fall from height on January 3, 2025. As TPS officers had been attempting to speak to him moments before the fall, the SIU was notified of the incident and initiated an investigation. The SO was identified as the subject official. The investigation is now concluded. On my assessment of the evidence, there are no reasonable grounds to believe that the SO committed a criminal offence in connection with the Complainant's injury.

The offence that arises for consideration is criminal negligence causing bodily harm contrary to section 221 of the Criminal Code. The offence is reserved for serious cases of neglect that demonstrate a wanton or reckless disregard for the lives or safety of other persons. It is predicated, in part, on conduct that amounts to a marked and substantial departure from the level of care that a reasonable person would have exercised in the circumstances. In the instant case, the question is whether there was a want of care on the part of the SO, sufficiently egregious to attract criminal sanction, that caused or contributed to the Complainant's injuries. In my view, there was not.

I am satisfied that the officers, including the SO, were within their rights in seeking to apprehend the Complainant under the section 17 of the Mental Health Act. Given what they knew of the Complainant's mental condition from his family member, and what they personally ascertained of his state of mind in their efforts to communicate with him through the closed door, the officers had cause to be concerned that the Complainant was a danger to himself because of mental disorder. I am also satisfied that the officers' entry into the apartment, after detecting the smell of plastic burning from inside, was justified on the basis of exigent circumstances.

In and out of the apartment, the evidence further indicates that the SO comported himself with due care and regard for the Complainant's safety. The officer, trained in dealing with persons in mental health crisis, did what he could from outside the apartment to secure the Complainant's trust and have him open the door. His decision to enter the apartment when he did is entitled to deference even if it played a part in provoking the Complainant's rash decision to jump from the balcony. Officers in these situations are in a very difficult position, constantly weighing the risks of a more proactive posture against the risks associated with waiting. On the record in this case, there is nothing to indicate that the SO made any serious error in judgement. Just the contrary, in fact, given the smell of burning plastic and the significant dangers to the Complainant and others of a possible fire in the apartment.

For the foregoing reasons, there is no basis for proceeding with criminal charges in this case. The file is closed."

Summary of the Toronto Police Service's Investigation

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison conducted an administrative investigation as is required by provincial legislation.

This investigation examined the circumstances of the custody injury in relation to the applicable legislation, policing services provided, procedures, and the conduct of the involved officers.

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation reviewed the following T.P.S. Procedures:

- Procedure 01-01 (Arrest);
- Procedure 01-02 (Search of Persons);
- Procedure 01-03 (Persons in Custody);
- Procedure 06-04 (Persons In Crisis);
- Procedure 06-13 (Mobile Crisis Intervention Team (MCIT));
- Procedure 10-06 (Medical Emergencies);
- Procedure 13-16 (Special Investigations Unit);
- Procedure 13-17 (Notes and Reports);
- Procedure 15-01 (Incident Response (Use of Force/De-Escalation));
- Procedure 15-02 (Injury/Illness Reporting); and

- Procedure 15-20 (Body-Worn Camera)

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation also reviewed the following legislation:

- Special Investigations Unit Act (S.I.U.A.), 2019
- Mental Health Act, 1990

Conclusion:

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation determined that the T.P.S.'s policies and procedures associated with this custody injury were lawful, in keeping with current legislation, and written in a manner which provided adequate and appropriate guidance to the members. None of the examined policies and procedures required modification.

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation determined the conduct of the involved officers was in compliance with applicable provincial legislation regarding the Standards of Conduct and the applicable T.P.S. procedures.

The use of the Body-worn Camera by attending officers and the footage of this event and its disclosure to the S.I.U. assisted both the S.I.U.'s investigation and this administrative investigation.

Chief Superintendent Shannon Dawson, Professionalism and Accountability, will be in attendance to answer any questions that the Board may have regarding this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Myron Demkiw, M.O.M.
Chief of Police



12.5. Chief's Administrative Investigation into the Custody Death of Complainant 2025.02



PUBLIC REPORT

September 2, 2025

To: Chair and Members
Toronto Police Service Board

From: Myron Demkiw
Chief of Police

Subject: Chief's Administrative Investigation into the Custody
Death of Complainant 2025.02

Purpose: ☒ Information Purposes Only ☐ Seeking Decision

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive this report for information.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications arising from the recommendation contained in this report.

Summary:

The Professional Standards – Special Investigations Unit Liaison (P.R. S. – S.I.U. Liaison) investigation determined the conduct of the designated officials was in compliance with applicable provincial legislation regarding the Standards of Conduct and the applicable Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) procedures.

Discussion:

Background

Whenever the Special Investigations Unit (S.I.U.) investigates an incident involving death, serious injury, the discharge of a firearm at a person or the allegation of a sexual

assault, provincial legislation requires the chief of police, of the relevant police service, to conduct an administrative investigation.

This is the Chief's report in respect of this incident.

Relevant Board Policies and Compliance

- Community Safety and Policing Act (C.S.P.A.), 2019
- Special Investigations Unit Act (S.I.U.A.), 2019
- Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) Procedures

S.I.U. Terminology

Complainant – Refers to the Affected Person

SO – Subject Official(s)

WO – Witness Official(s)

S.I.U. Investigative Conclusion

In a letter to the Chief of Police dated May 13, 2025, Director Joseph Martino of the S.I.U. advised, *"I write to advise you that the investigation by this Unit into the Custody Death of [Complainant 2025.02], that occurred on January 13, 2025, has been completed. The file has been closed, and no further action is contemplated. In my view, there were no reasonable grounds in the evidence to proceed with criminal charges against the subject official."*

The following *S.I.U. Incident Narrative and Analysis and Director's Decision* has been reprinted from the S.I.U. Director's report, number 25-TCD-013, which can be found via the following link:

[Special Investigations Unit -- Director's Report Details, Case Number: 25-TCD-013](#)

S.I.U. Incident Narrative

"The evidence collected by the SIU, including interviews with police eyewitness and video footage that captured the incident in part, gives rise to the following scenario. As was his legal right, the SO did not agree an interview with the SIU. He did authorize the release of his notes.

In the early morning of January 13, 2025, the SO, in the company of WO #1, WO #2 and WO #3, arrived in the hallway outside Apartment #2 on High Park Avenue. They were there to arrest the Complainant, for whom there were warrants in effect for multiple breaks and enters. Present with the officers were CW #1, CW #2 and CW #3.

The Complainant answered the knock at the door. Informed by WO #3 that there were warrants for her arrest, she closed the door shut. From inside the apartment, the Complainant told the officers she would not be going with them before she entered onto the balcony, made her way onto the adjacent balcony of Apartment #1, and entered that unit.

The officers decided to arrange for a Feeney warrant⁴ while they waited outside the front door. Aware that CW #4 was the apartment tenant, and that he too had warrants for arrest, the SO spoke to him through the door, warning that he would also be arrested if the officers had to wait for a Feeney warrant to enter. CW #4 opened the door for the officers and allowed them to enter. He told the officers that the Complainant was now in Apartment #1. The time was about 1:50 a.m.

The SO and WO #1 went onto the balcony of Apartment #2. The Complainant, inside Apartment #1 at the time, knew that there were still officers in the hallway aware of her presence in that unit. She returned to the balcony and was confronted by the SO, looking over from the balcony of Apartment #2. The officer attempted to persuade the Complainant to turn herself in. She asked if she could surrender at a later date and was told that the matter had to be dealt with now. With that, the Complainant said she would just jump. She quickly climbed over the railing and fell to the ground below. The time was about 1:56 a.m.

Officers rushed to the Complainant's side to provide aid. Paramedics attended and transported her to hospital. She was pronounced deceased at 2:37 a.m.

Cause of Death

The pathologist at autopsy was of the preliminary view that the Complainant's death was attributable to multiple blunt impact trauma."

Analysis and Director's Decision

"The Complainant died in a fall from height in Toronto on January 13, 2025. As TPS officers were on scene communicating with her at the time, the SIU was notified of the incident and initiated an investigation. The SO was identified as the subject official. The investigation is now concluded. On my assessment of the evidence, there are no reasonable grounds to believe that the SO committed a criminal offence in connection with the Complainant's death.

The offences that arise for consideration is criminal negligence causing death contrary to section 220 of the Criminal Code. The offence is reserved for serious cases of neglect that demonstrate a wanton or reckless disregard for the lives or safety of other persons. It is predicated, in part, on conduct that amounts to a marked and substantial departure from the level of care that a reasonable person would have exercised in the circumstances. In the instant case, the question is whether there was a want of care on the part of the SO, sufficiently egregious to attract criminal sanction, that caused or contributed to the Complainant's death. In my view, there was not.

The SO and the other officers in attendance were engaged in the execution of their duties through the series of events culminating in the Complainant's fall. They were within their rights in seeking to execute warrants for the Complainant's arrest for multiple incidents of break and enter. They had also received consent from CW #4 to enter the apartment and were lawfully placed in and around Apartment #1 and Apartment #2 at all material times.

I am also satisfied that the SO comported himself with due care and regard for the Complainant's safety throughout their dealings. The officer clearly articulated their intention to arrest the Complainant and requested that she surrender. When she asked to be allowed to turn herself in at a subsequent time, the SO calmly explained that that was not an option. He had no reason to suspect that the Complainant was in mental health distress or suicidal, and no reason to believe that she would take the drastic action she did. The SO also had no opportunity to intervene to prevent the Complainant's fall. Not more than several seconds elapsed from the moment the Complainant indicated she would jump until she was up and over the balcony railing.

For the foregoing reasons, there is no basis for proceeding with criminal charges in this case. The file is closed."

Summary of the Toronto Police Service's Investigation

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison conducted an administrative investigation as is required by provincial legislation.

This investigation was reviewed by the Specialized Criminal Investigations – Homicide and Missing Persons Unit in accordance with T.P.S. Procedure 13-16 (Special Investigations Unit).

This investigation examined the circumstances of the custody death in relation to the applicable legislation, policing services provided, procedures, and the conduct of the involved officers.

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation reviewed the following T.P.S. Procedures:

- Procedure 01-01 (Arrest);
- Procedure 02-01 (Arrest Warrants);
- Procedure 04-16 (Death in Police Custody);
- Procedure 10-06 (Medical Emergencies);
- Procedure 13-16 (Special Investigations Unit);
- Procedure 13-17 (Notes and Reports);
- Procedure 15-01 (Incident Response (Use of Force/De-Escalation));
- Procedure 15-02 (Injury/Illness Reporting);
- Procedure 15-17 (In-Car Camera System); and
- Procedure 15-20 (Body-Worn Camera).

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison also reviewed the following legislation:

- Special Investigations Unit Act, (S.I.U.A.), 2019.

Conclusion:

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation determined that the T.P.S. policies and procedures associated with this custody death were lawful, in keeping with current legislation, and written in a manner which provided adequate and appropriate guidance to the members. None of the examined policies and procedures required modification.

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation determined the conduct of the involved officers was in compliance with applicable provincial legislation regarding the Standards of Conduct, the applicable T.P.S. Procedures and the officers' training.

Body Worn Camera (B.W.C.) and In-Car Camera System footage that revealed details of the events from responding members after the fall were disclosed to the S.I.U. for the purposes of their investigation. The officers who had contact with the affected person leading up to the fall were not equipped with B.W.C.

Chief Superintendent Shannon Dawson, Professionalism and Accountability, will be in attendance to answer any questions that the Board may have regarding this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Myron Demkiw, M.O.M.
Chief of Police



12.6. Chief's Administrative Investigation into the Custody Injury of Complainant 2025.07



PUBLIC REPORT

August 1, 2025

To: Chair and Members
Toronto Police Service Board

From: Myron Demkiw
Chief of Police

Subject: Chief's Administrative Investigation into the Custody
Injury of Complainant 2025.07

Purpose: ☒ Information Purposes Only ☐ Seeking Decision

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive this report for information.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications arising from the recommendation contained in this report.

Summary:

The Professional Standards – Special Investigations Unit (P.R.S. – S.I.U.) Liaison investigation determined the conduct of the designated officials was in compliance with applicable provincial legislation regarding the Standards of Conduct and the applicable Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) Procedures.

Discussion:

Background

Whenever the Special Investigations Unit (S.I.U.) investigates an incident involving death, serious injury, the discharge of a firearm at a person or the allegation of a sexual

assault, provincial legislation requires the chief of police of the relevant police service, to conduct an administrative investigation.

This is the Chief's report in respect of this incident.

Relevant Board Policies and Compliance

- Community Safety and Policing Act (C.S.P.A.) 2019
- Special Investigations Unit Act (S.I.U.A.) 2019
- T.P.S. Procedures

S.I.U. Terminology

Complainant – Refers to the Affected Person

SO – Subject Official(s)

WO – Witness Official(s)

S.I.U. Investigative Conclusion

In a letter to the Chief of Police dated May 14, 2025, Director Joseph Martino of the S.I.U. advised, *"The file has been closed, and no further action is contemplated. In my view, there were no reasonable grounds in the evidence to proceed with criminal charges against the subject official."*

The following *S.I.U. Incident Narrative and Analysis and Director's Decision* has been reprinted from the S.I.U. Director's report, number 25-TCI-027, which can be found via the following link:

[Special Investigations Unit -- Director's Report Details, Case Number: 25-TCI-027](#)

S.I.U. Incident Narrative

"The evidence collected by the SIU, including interviews with the Complainant and police witnesses, and video footage that captured the incident, gives rise to the following scenario. As was his legal right, the SO did not agree an interview with the SIU. He did authorize the release of his notes.

In the early morning of January 24, 2025, TPS officers, including the SO attended at a residence in the area of St. Clair Avenue West and Old Weston Road. A female resident at the address had earlier called police to report that her boyfriend – the Complainant – had kicked down her door and assaulted her. The Complainant was located on the roof of the two-storey building.

From behind the building, the SO climbed an external stairway and found the Complainant standing on an elevated ledge at the edge of the rooftop. He told the Complainant to step off the ledge to safety. The Complainant refused to do so. Rather, within minutes of the officer's arrival, the Complainant attempted to climb to an adjacent rooftop that was a storey higher. As the Complainant tried to pull himself up, the SO rushed towards him, grabbed him by the legs, and took him down.

The Complainant landed on his feet, fracturing his right inner ankle in the process.

The SO, with the assistance of WO #1, handcuffed the Complainant and took him into custody. He was taken to hospital following his arrest and treated for his injury."

S.I.U. Analysis and Director's Decision

"The Complainant was seriously injured in the course of his arrest by TPS officers on January 24, 2025. The SIU was notified of the incident and initiated an investigation, naming the SO the subject official. The investigation is now concluded. On my assessment of the evidence, there are no reasonable grounds to believe that the SO committed a criminal offence in connection with the Complainant's arrest and injury.

Pursuant to section 25(1) of the Criminal Code, police officers are immune from criminal liability for force used in the course of their duties provided such force was reasonably necessary in the execution of an act that they were required or authorized to do by law.

Given what they knew of the 911 call from the Complainant's girlfriend, the Complainant was subject to arrest for assault.

With respect to the force used by the SO against the Complainant, I am satisfied it was no more than was reasonably necessary to effect the arrest. The SO was alive to the precarious position the Complainant found himself, perched on the exterior ledge of the second-floor of a two-storey building. When he did not respond to the officer's initial direction that he surrender safely to arrest, and made comments about jumping, the SO wisely backed up so as not to provoke the Complainant. He maintained that posture until the Complainant attempted to climb up to the third-floor roof of an adjacent building. The officer seized that opportunity to physically engage the Complainant in the only way available at the time, namely, by pulling him down. The officer could have chosen a more passive tack, allowing the Complainant to reach the third-floor from where negotiations could conceivably have continued. That said, the SO would have been rightly concerned that the Complainant might escape apprehension or suffer an even more serious injury were he to fall from three stories instead of two. Faced with these competing considerations, I am unable to reasonably conclude that the SO acted unreasonably.

For the foregoing reasons, there is no basis for proceeding with criminal charges in this case. The file is closed."

Summary of the Toronto Police Service's Investigation

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison conducted an administrative investigation as is required by provincial legislation.

This investigation examined the circumstances of the custody injury in relation to the applicable legislation, policing services provided, procedures, and the conduct of the involved officers.

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation reviewed the following T.P.S. Procedures:

- Procedure 01-01 (Arrest);
- Procedure 01-02 (Search of Persons);
- Procedure 01-03 (Persons in Custody);
- Procedure 05-03 (Break and Enter);
- Procedure 05-04 (Intimate Partner Violence);
- Procedure 10-06 (Medical Emergencies);
- Procedure 13-16 (Special Investigations Unit);
- Procedure 13-17 (Notes and Reports);
- Procedure 15-01 (Incident Response (Use of Force/De-Escalation));
- Procedure 15-17 (In-Car Camera System); and
- Procedure 15-20 (Body-Worn Camera)

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation also reviewed the following legislation:

- Special Investigations Unit Act (S.I.U.A.), 2019

Conclusion:

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation determined that the T.P.S.'s policies and procedures associated with this custody injury were lawful, in keeping with current legislation, and written in a manner which provided adequate and appropriate guidance to the members. None of the examined policies and procedures required modification.

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation determined the conduct of the subject official was in compliance with applicable provincial legislation regarding the Standards of Conduct and the applicable T.P.S. procedures and the officer's training.

The existence of the Body-worn Camera and In-car Camera System footage of the interaction were essential pieces of evidence that assisted both the S.I.U.'s investigation and this administrative investigation.

Chief Superintendent Shannon Dawson, Professionalism and Accountability, will be in attendance to answer any questions that the Board may have regarding this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Myron Demkiw, M.O.M.
Chief of Police



12.7. Chief's Administrative Investigation into the Custody Injury of Complainant 2025.08



PUBLIC REPORT

September 2, 2025

To: Chair and Members
Toronto Police Service Board

From: Myron Demkiw
Chief of Police

Subject: Chief's Administrative Investigation into the Custody
Injury of Complainant 2025.08

Purpose: ☒ Information Purposes Only ☐ Seeking Decision

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive this report for information.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications arising from the recommendation contained in this report.

Summary:

The Professional Standards – Special Investigations Unit (P.R.S. – S.I.U.) Liaison investigation determined the conduct of all the designated officials was in compliance with applicable provincial legislation regarding the Standards of Conduct and the applicable Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) Procedures.

Discussion:

Background

Whenever the Special Investigations Unit (S.I.U.) investigates an incident involving death, serious injury, the discharge of a firearm at a person or the allegation of a sexual

assault, provincial legislation requires the chief of police of the relevant police service, to conduct an administrative investigation.

This is the Chief's report in respect of this incident.

Relevant Board Policies and Compliance

- Community Safety and Policing Act (C.S.P.A.), 2019
- Special Investigations Unit Act (S.I.U.A.), 2019
- T.P.S. Procedures

S.I.U. Terminology

Complainant – Refers to the Affected Person

SO – Subject Official

WO – Witness Official(s)

CW – Civilian Witness

S.I.U. Investigative Conclusion

In a letter to the Chief of Police dated May 22, 2025, Director Joseph Martino of the S.I.U. advised, *"The file has been closed, and no further action is contemplated. In my view, there were no reasonable grounds in the evidence to proceed with criminal charges against the subject official."*

The following *S.I.U. Incident Narrative and Analysis and Director's Decision* has been reprinted from the S.I.U. Director's report, number 25-TCI-039, which can be found via the following link:

[Special Investigations Unit -- Director's Report Details, Case Number: 25-TCI-039](#)

S.I.U. Incident Narrative

"The evidence collected by the SIU, including interviews with the Complainant and police eyewitnesses, and video footage that captured the incident, gives rise to the following scenario. As was his legal right, the SO did not agree an interview with the SIU or the release of his notes.

In the evening of January 29, 2025, the Complainant was arrested at his residence with respect to an allegation of domestic assault. He was taken into custody, brought to 22 Division, and lodged in a cell to await a bail hearing.

Early the next morning, the Complainant was removed from his cell unhandcuffed and taken to a room to have his photograph and fingerprints taken. When the Complainant refused to cooperate for the photograph, his head was held in position by several police officers, including the SO. The Complainant was then walked to the fingerprint scanner where he continued to resist the officers' efforts. With two officers on his right side, and two on his left, his arms were held in an effort to facilitate the process. After a while, while an officer was still trying to take his right hand prints, the Complainant suddenly yanked his left arm loose from the hold of the SO and WO #4. The officers grappled to control the Complainant and forced him to the floor, where he landed front first. The SO lowered himself by the left side of the Complainant's head and attempted to free his left arm from under him before delivering two knee strikes to the shoulder and head area. Following the strikes, the Complainant's arms were positioned behind his back and handcuffed.

The Complainant was subsequently seen at hospital and diagnosed with left-sided facial fractures."

S.I.U. Analysis and Director's Decision

"The Complainant was seriously injured while in the custody of the TPS on January 30, 2025. The SIU was notified of the incident and initiated an investigation, naming the SO the subject official. The investigation is now concluded. On my assessment of the evidence, there are no reasonable grounds to believe that the SO committed a criminal offence in connection with the Complainant's injuries.

Pursuant to section 25(1) of the Criminal Code, police officers are immune from criminal liability for force used in the course of their duties provided such force was reasonably necessary in the execution of an act that they were required or authorized to do by law.

Given what they knew of the 911 call about an assault allegedly perpetrated by the Complainant on his partner, and confirmation received by officers from the reported victim at the scene to the effect that the Complainant had pushed her in the face, I am satisfied that the Complainant was subject to arrest for assault. Once in lawful custody, the police were entitled to exercise reasonable control over the Complainant's movements to ensure he was safely processed according to law.

I am further satisfied that the force brought to bear against the Complainant in the fingerprint room was justified. The Complainant's agitation had been rising and boiled over when he violently freed his left arm from the grips of the SO and WO #4. The officers were within their rights in reasserting control over the Complainant at that point. A takedown made sense as it would immediately position the officers to better manage the Complainant's resistance. It would also appear that the two knee strikes were reasonable in the circumstances, occurring as they did after the SO had tried and failed to wrestle control of the Complainant's left arm. No further strikes were delivered once the Complainant was handcuffed behind the back.

In the result, while I accept that the Complainant's fractures were incurred in the altercation in the fingerprint room, there are no reasonable grounds to believe that they are attributable to unlawful force on the part of the SO or the other officers present at the time. As such, there is no basis for proceeding with criminal charges in this case. The file is closed."

Summary of the Toronto Police Service's Investigation

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison conducted an administrative investigation as is required by provincial legislation.

This investigation examined the circumstances of the custody injury in relation to the applicable legislation, policing services provided, procedures, and the conduct of the involved officers.

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation reviewed the following T.P.S. Procedures:

- Procedure 01-01 (Arrest);
- Procedure 01-02 (Search of Persons);
- Procedure 01-03 (Persons in Custody);
- Procedure 01-03 Appendix D (Booking Hall/Detention Area Monitoring);
- Procedure 05-04 (Intimate Partner Violence);
- Procedure 10-06 (Medical Emergencies);
- Procedure 13-16 (Special Investigations Unit);
- Procedure 13-17 (Notes and Reports);
- Procedure 15-01 (Incident Response (Use of Force/De-Escalation));
- Procedure 15-02 (Injury/Illness Reporting); and
- Procedure 15-20 (Body-Worn Camera).

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation also reviewed the following legislation:

- Special Investigations Unit Act (S.I.U.A.), 2019

Conclusion:

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation determined that the T.P.S. policies and procedures associated with this custody injury were lawful, in keeping with current legislation, and written in a manner which provided adequate and appropriate guidance to the members. None of the examined policies and procedures required modification.

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation determined the conduct of the involved officers was in compliance with applicable provincial legislation regarding the Standards of Conduct and the applicable T.P.S. Procedures.

The events surrounding 2025.08's arrest and subsequent actions in the Print Room at 22 Division were recorded on the involved officers Body-worn Camera (B.W.C.). The Print Room at 22 Division is equipped with the Digital Video Asset Management System (D.V.A.M.S.) and recorded the entire sequence of events. These assets were disclosed to the S.I.U. for its investigation.

The existence of the B.W.C. and the D.V.A.M.S. recordings of the interactions were essential pieces of evidence that assisted both the S.I.U.'s investigation and this administrative investigation.

Chief Superintendent Shannon Dawson, Professionalism and Accountability, will be in attendance to answer any questions that the Board may have regarding this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Myron Demkiw, M.O.M.
Chief of Police



12.8. Chief's Administrative Investigation into the Custody Injury of Complainant 2025.09



PUBLIC REPORT

September 2, 2025

To: Chair and Members
Toronto Police Service Board

From: Myron Demkiw
Chief of Police

Subject: Chief's Administrative Investigation into the Custody
Injury of Complainant 2025.09

Purpose: ☒ Information Purposes Only ☐ Seeking Decision

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive this report for information.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications arising from the recommendation contained in this report.

Summary:

The Professional Standards – Special Investigations Unit (P.R.S. – S.I.U.) Liaison investigation determined the conduct of all the designated officials was in compliance with applicable provincial legislation regarding the Standards of Conduct and the applicable Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) Procedures.

Discussion:

Background

Whenever the Special Investigations Unit (S.I.U.) investigates an incident involving death, serious injury, the discharge of a firearm at a person or the allegation of a sexual

assault, provincial legislation requires the chief of police of the relevant police service, to conduct an administrative investigation.

This is the Chief's report in respect of this incident.

Relevant Board Policies and Compliance

- Community Safety and Policing Act (C.S.P.A.), 2019
- Special Investigations Unit Act (S.I.U.A.), 2019
- T.P.S. Procedures

S.I.U. Terminology

Complainant – Refers to the Affected Person

SO – Subject Official(s)

WO – Witness Official(s)

SEW – Service Employee Witness(es)

S.I.U. Investigative Conclusion

In a letter to the Chief of Police dated May 28, 2025, Director Joseph Martino of the S.I.U. advised, *"The file has been closed, and no further action is contemplated. In my view, there were no reasonable grounds in the evidence to proceed with criminal charges against the two subject officials."*

The following *S.I.U. Incident Narrative and Analysis and Director's Decision* has been reprinted from the S.I.U. Director's report, number 25-TCI-057, which can be found via the following link:

[Special Investigations Unit -- Director's Report Details, Case Number: 25-TCI-057](#)

S.I.U. Incident Narrative

"The evidence collected by the SIU, including interviews with police and non-police witnesses, and video footage that captured the incident in part, gives rise to the following scenario. As was their legal right, neither subject official agreed an interview with the SIU or the release of their notes.

The Complainant was arrested in the afternoon of February 11, 2025, for being in violation of a term of a release order, namely, that he not attend a shopping mall in Toronto. He had arrived at a bank branch at that location in an agitated state, believing that his money was being improperly accessed. WO #1 and WO #2 took the Complainant into custody. As the Complainant was bleeding from the face, an

ambulance was called. Paramedics dressed his wound and left; the Complainant having declined their offer of a trip to hospital.

The Complainant was transported to 31 Division where he was booked and subjected to a search of his person and clothing, which turned up nothing. When asked by the booking officer – SO #1, he denied having consumed drugs or alcohol. He also told SO #1 he was not in possession of any drugs. The Complainant asked to go to hospital and SO #1 acquiesced to the request.

WO #1 and WO #2 transported the Complainant to hospital. After his visit with a physician, the officers took the Complainant to 32 Division where he was paraded before SO #2 before being lodged in a cell.

The Complainant was placed in a cell at about 7:30 p.m. Shortly after, he appeared to ingest a substance after manipulating his shoes. At about 11:30 p.m., SEW #1 and SEW #2 entered the Complainant's cell and found him unresponsive – breathing but unconscious.

Paramedics arrived at the cell and transported the Complainant to hospital where he spent time in the ICU. The Complainant signed himself out of hospital on February 17, 2025."

S.I.U. Analysis and Director's Decision

"The Complainant lapsed into acute medical distress while in the custody of the TPS on February 11, 2025. The SIU was notified of the incident and initiated an investigation, naming SO #1 and SO #2 subject officials. The investigation is now concluded. On my assessment of the evidence, there are no reasonable grounds to believe that either subject official committed a criminal offence in connection with the Complainant's medical incident.

The offences that arise for consideration are failure to provide the necessities of life and criminal negligence causing bodily harm contrary to sections 215 and 221 of the Criminal Code, respectively. Both require something more than a simple want of care to give rise to liability. The former is predicated, in part, on conduct that amounts to a marked departure from the level of care that a reasonable person would have exercised in the circumstances. The latter is premised on even more egregious conduct that demonstrates a wanton or reckless disregard for the lives or safety of other persons. It is not made out unless the neglect constitutes a marked and substantial departure from a reasonable standard of care. In the instant case, the question is whether there was any want of care on the part of either subject official, sufficiently serious to attract criminal sanction, that endangered the Complainant's life or contributed to his health crisis. In my view, there was not.

I am satisfied that the Complainant was lawfully in police custody through the series of events culminating in his medical event. In contravention of a release order, he had attended at the shopping mall upset about his banking situation.

I am further satisfied that the police personnel who cared for him comported themselves with due regard for his well-being through his time in custody. The Complainant was subjected to what appeared to be a thorough search of his person and clothing on arrival at 31 Division, which had turned up nothing of concern. There is also evidence that the Complainant was regularly monitored while in the cell at 32 Division by the special constables tasked with that responsibility. While it might be that the Complainant's apparent ingestion of an illicit substance could have been detected sooner or, conceivably, even prevented had he been subjected to more frequent checks, the Complainant did not present as a high risk detainee who would warrant a heightened level of supervision - he appeared of sound mind and had denied being in possession of drugs. Of some concern is the fact that the Complainant was not searched again at 32 Division on his return from hospital. The Complainant's custodians did not seem to think that another search was warranted as he had already been checked and was in continuous police custody between his arrivals at 31 and 32 Division. That line of logic, however, fails to account for periods in which the Complainant was left alone to some extent at hospital, whether when using the bathroom or being seen by a physician. Be that as it may, it would be speculation to conclude that the Complainant was able to take possession of illicit substances during these times. Far likelier, in my view, is that the substances were concealed on his person or in his clothing from the moment of his arrest, and that the officers who searched him at 31 Division simply failed to locate them, despite what appears to have been a competently conducted search.

For the foregoing reasons, there is no basis for proceeding with criminal charges in this case.

This matter involved what appears to have been a late notification of the incident by the police service to the SIU in possible contravention of section 16 of the Special Investigations Unit Act, 2019. An unconscious Complainant was seen by paramedics at 32 Division at about 2345 hours, February 11, 2025, but the matter was not reported to the SIU until about 0740 hours of the following day. I will be raising this matter in my reporting letter to the chief of police. Further to section 35.1 of the Special Investigations Unit, 2019, I will also be referring this matter to the Law Enforcement Complaints Agency for their consideration."

Summary of the Toronto Police Service's Investigation

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison conducted an administrative investigation as is required by provincial legislation.

This investigation examined the circumstances of the custody injury in relation to the applicable legislation, policing services provided, procedures, and the conduct of the involved officers.

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation reviewed the following T.P.S. Procedures:

- Procedure 01-01 (Arrest);
- Procedure 01-02 (Search of Persons);
- Procedure 01-03 (Persons in Custody);
- Procedure 03-06 (Guarding Persons in Hospital);
- Procedure 10-06 (Medical Emergencies);
- Procedure 13-16 (Special Investigations Unit);
- Procedure 13-17 (Notes and Reports);
- Procedure 15-17 (In-Car Camera System); and
- Procedure 15-20 (Body-Worn Camera).

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation also reviewed the following legislation:

- Special Investigations Unit Act (S.I.U.A.), 2019

Conclusion:

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation determined that the T.P.S.'s policies and procedures associated with this custody injury were lawful, in keeping with current legislation, and written in a manner which provided adequate and appropriate guidance to the members. None of the examined policies and procedures required modification.

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation determined the conduct of the subject officials was in compliance with applicable provincial legislation regarding the Standards of Conduct, the applicable T.P.S. Procedures and the officers' training.

The Director of the S.I.U. raised a concern of *“what appears to have been a late notification of the incident by the police service to the S.I.U. in possible contravention of section 16 of the Special Investigations Unit Act (S.I.U.A.), 2019”*.

This potential misconduct was referred to the Law Enforcement Complaints Agency (L.E.C.A.) by the S.I.U. On June 25, 2025, L.E.C.A. advised the T.P.S. they would not be investigating this complaint as *“it is not in the public interest for LECA to initiate an investigation into this matter in the absence of a public complaint”*.

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison reviewed this potential breach of the S.I.U.A. and Procedure 13-16 (Special Investigations Unit) as part of the Chief's Administrative Investigation.

The investigation found that the Complainant was removed by Toronto Paramedic Services from his cell for an unknown medical issue and transported to hospital on February 11, 2025.

The Complainant was examined by a Physician and six hours later on February 12, 2025, he was admitted to hospital for observation and treatment of a self-induced drug overdose. Once the Complainant was admitted to hospital the T.P.S. notified the S.I.U. of the potential threshold injury.

The S.I.U.'s mandate and the requirement of the Service to notify the S.I.U. was not triggered when the Complainant was transported to hospital from police custody.

When the T.P.S. was made aware that the Complainant's condition was grave and that he would be admitted to hospital for observation and treatment of a self-induced drug overdose the S.I.U. was notified.

The Complainant regained consciousness later in the day on February 12, 2025, and left the hospital against medical advice.

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation concluded that the T.P.S. was in compliance with Procedure 13-16 (Special Investigations Unit) and the S.I.U.A., 2019 and no officers conduct contributed to the Complainant's overdose and admission to hospital.

The In-Car Camera System and the Body-Worn Camera footage were essential pieces of evidence that assisted both the S.I.U.'s investigation and this administrative investigation.

Chief Superintendent Shannon Dawson, Professionalism and Accountability, will be in attendance to answer any questions that the Board may have regarding this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Myron Demkiw, M.O.M.
Chief of Police



12.9. Chief's Administrative Investigation into the Custody Injury of Complainant 2025.11



PUBLIC REPORT

September 2, 2025

To: Chair and Members
Toronto Police Service Board

From: Myron Demkiw
Chief of Police

Subject: Chief's Administrative Investigation into the Custody
Injury of Complainant 2025.11

Purpose: ☒ Information Purposes Only ☐ Seeking Decision

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive this report for information.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications arising from the recommendation contained in this report.

Summary:

The Professional Standards – Special Investigations Unit (P.R.S. – S.I.U.) Liaison investigation determined the conduct of the involved officers was in compliance with applicable provincial legislation regarding the Standards of Conduct and the applicable Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) Procedures.

Discussion:

Background

Whenever the Special Investigations Unit (S.I.U.) investigates an incident involving death, serious injury, the discharge of a firearm at a person or the allegation of a sexual

assault, provincial legislation requires the chief of police of the relevant police service, to conduct an administrative investigation.

This is the Chief's report in respect of this incident.

Relevant Board Policies and Compliance

- Community Safety and Policing Act (C.S.P.A.), 2019
- Special Investigations Unit Act (S.I.U.A.), 2019
- T.P.S. Procedures

S.I.U. Terminology

Complainant – Refers to the Affected Person

SO – Subject Official(s)

WO – Witness Official(s)

CW – Civilian Witness(es)

S.I.U. Investigative Conclusion

In a letter to the Chief of Police dated June 17, 2025, Director Joseph Martino of the S.I.U. advised, *"The file has been closed, and no further action is contemplated. In my view, there were no reasonable grounds in the evidence to proceed with criminal charges against the subject official."*

The following *S.I.U. Incident Narrative and Analysis and Director's Decision* has been reprinted from the S.I.U. Director's report, number 25-TCI-074, which can be found via the following link:

[Special Investigations Unit -- Director's Report Details, Case Number: 25-TCI-074](#)

S.I.U. Incident Narrative

"The evidence collected by the SIU, including interviews with the Complainant, the SO and other police and non-police witnesses, and video footage that captured the incident in part, gives rise to the following scenario.

In the early morning of February 22, 2025, the SO, together with WO #1 and WO #2, was dispatched to a home in North York. The CW had called police to report a domestic disturbance involving the Complainant. The Complainant had earlier damaged property inside the house and was now outside banging on the front door seeking to be let in.

The officers arrived on scene shortly before 2:00 a.m. to find the Complainant on the front driveway of the address. They were aware of a bench warrant for the Complainant. The Complainant warned the officers to remain at the foot of the driveway and not to enter onto the property.

After several minutes of attempting to speak to him, the officers moved forward and took hold of the Complainant. The Complainant resisted the officers' efforts to secure him in handcuffs and was forced to the ground. Following a further period of struggle, the officers wrestled control of the Complainant, handcuffing him behind the back and placing him in leg restraints.

The Complainant was carried a short distance to one of the cruisers and placed in the rear for transport to the police station.

At the police station, the Complainant indicated that his right ring finger was injured. He was taken to hospital and diagnosed with a fracture of the finger."

S.I.U. Analysis and Director's Decision

"The Complainant was seriously injured in the course of his arrest by TPS officers on February 22, 2025. The SIU was notified of the incident and initiated an investigation, naming the SO the subject official. The investigation is now concluded. On my assessment of the evidence, there are no reasonable grounds to believe that the SO committed a criminal offence in connection with the Complainant's arrest and injury.

Pursuant to section 25(1) of the Criminal Code, police officers are immune from criminal liability for force used in the course of their duties provided such force was reasonably necessary in the execution of an act that they were required or authorized to do by law.

The officers, including the SO, were acting lawfully in moving to take the Complainant into custody on the basis of the bench warrant in effect.

I am also satisfied the officers, including the SO, used no more force than was necessary to effect the Complainant's arrest. When the Complainant reacted by vigorously resisting arrest, the officers were entitled to respond with a measure of force. A takedown made sense in the circumstances as it would position the officers to better manage any additional resistance by the Complainant. In fact, the Complainant continued to struggle against the officers on the ground, even lashing out with his feet and legs. Given their positional advantage and greater numbers, however, the officers were able to subdue the Complainant without the use of strikes of any kind. On this record, the evidence does not make out an unwarranted application of force by any of the officers.

In the result, while I accept that the Complainant's fractured right finger was incurred in the altercation that marked his arrest, there are no reasonable grounds to conclude the

injury was attributable to unlawful conduct on the part of the police. As such, there is no basis for proceeding with criminal charges in this case. The file is closed.”

Summary of the Toronto Police Service’s Investigation

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison conducted an administrative investigation as is required by provincial legislation.

This investigation examined the circumstances of the custody injury in relation to the applicable legislation, policing services provided, procedures, and the conduct of the involved officers.

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation reviewed the following T.P.S. Procedures:

- Procedure 01-01 (Arrest);
- Procedure 01-02 (Search of Persons);
- Procedure 01-03 (Persons in Custody);
- Procedure 10-06 (Medical Emergencies);
- Procedure 13-16 (Special Investigations Unit);
- Procedure 13-17 (Notes and Reports);
- Procedure 15-01 (Incident Response (Use of Force/De-Escalation));
- Procedure 15-02 (Injury/Illness Reporting); and
- Procedure 15-20 (Body-Worn Camera).

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation also reviewed the following legislation:

- Special Investigations Unit Act (S.I.U.A.), 2019

Conclusion:

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation determined that the T.P.S.’s policies and procedures associated with this custody injury were lawful, in keeping with current legislation, and written in a manner which provided adequate and appropriate guidance to the members. None of the examined policies and procedures required modification.

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation determined the conduct of the involved officers was in compliance with applicable provincial legislation regarding the Standards of Conduct and the applicable T.P.S. procedures.

All of the officers involved in this event were equipped with Body Worn Cameras (B.W.C.). The B.W.C. were activated and recorded the entire event. These assets were disclosed to the S.I.U.

Chief Superintendent Shannon Dawson, Professionalism and Accountability, will be in attendance to answer any questions that the Board may have regarding this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Myron Demkiw, M.O.M.
Chief of Police



12.10. Chief's Administrative Investigation into the Custody Death of Complainant 2025.12



PUBLIC REPORT

September 2, 2025

To: Chair and Members
Toronto Police Service Board

From: Myron Demkiw
Chief of Police

Subject: Chief's Administrative Investigation into the Custody
Death of Complainant 2025.12

Purpose: ☒ Information Purposes Only ☐ Seeking Decision

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive this report for information.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications arising from the recommendation contained in this report.

Summary:

The Professional Standards – Special Investigations Unit (P.R. S. – S.I.U.) Liaison investigation determined the conduct of the designated officials was in compliance with applicable provincial legislation regarding the Standards of Conduct and the applicable Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) Procedures.

Discussion:

Background

Whenever the Special Investigations Unit (S.I.U.) investigates an incident involving death, serious injury, the discharge of a firearm at a person or the allegation of a sexual

assault, provincial legislation requires the chief of police, of the relevant police service, to conduct an administrative investigation.

This is the Chief's report in respect of this incident.

Relevant Board Policies and Compliance

- Community Safety and Policing Act (C.S.P.A.), 2019
- Special Investigations Unit Act (S.I.U.A.), 2019
- T.P.S. Procedures

S.I.U. Terminology

Complainant – Refers to the Affected Person

SO – Subject Official

WO – Witness Official(s)

CW – Civilian Witness(es)

S.I.U. Investigative Conclusion

In a letter to the Chief of Police dated June 23, 2025, Director Joseph Martino of the S.I.U. advised, *"The file has been closed, and no further action is contemplated. In my view, there were no reasonable grounds in the evidence to proceed with criminal charges against the subject official."*

The following *S.I.U. Incident Narrative and Analysis and Director's Decision* has been reprinted from the S.I.U. Director's report, number 25-TCD-082, which can be found via the following link:

[Special Investigations Unit -- Director's Report Details, Case Number: 25-TCD-082](#)

S.I.U. Incident Narrative

"The evidence collected by the SIU, including interviews with police witnesses and audio and video recording that captured the incident in part, gives rise to the following scenario. As was his legal right, the SO did not agree an interview with the SIU. He did authorize the release of his notes.

Shortly after 11:30 p.m., February 28, 2025, TPS uniformed officers were dispatched to Residence #2 in the area of Ellesmere Road and Bellamy Road North. 911 calls had been received reporting a domestic disturbance at the home in which the Complainant had assaulted his wife - Civilian #2 - and pointed a firearm at her, threatening to kill the both of them. Civilian #2 had managed to flee the residence, and she and her daughter - Civilian #1 - were together at another address on the street. The Complainant was said to be alone at the residence. He had told Civilian #2 that he was not going back to

jail and was prepared to shoot responding officers. The uniformed officers contained the residence pending the arrival of ETF officers.

A team of ETF officers arrived on scene, established a command centre not far from the residence, and took over containment of the home. Under the supervision of WO #1, the SO – a trained negotiator – was tasked with contacting the Complainant. After a number of failed attempts, the officer was able to connect with the Complainant by phone at about 1:07 a.m. Over the course of several hours, the SO attempted to persuade the Complainant to surrender peacefully to police. The Complainant indicated he had no intention of hurting anyone, but was adamant that he did not want to go to jail. He talked about his difficult upbringing, grievances with previous dealings with the police, and troubles at home with his wife and child. He told the SO that he would prefer to turn himself in at a later time, but the officer indicated that would not be possible. As the negotiations continued to unfold, the ETF consulted and received advice from a forensic psychiatrist. He suggested an audio-recorded message be taken from Civilian #1 and played to the Complainant over the phone. In the recording, Civilian #1 encouraged her father to surrender peacefully and said that no one wanted to see him hurt. The Complainant seemed moved by the message but stayed put.

At about 5:20 a.m., the ETF decided that a more proactive posture might prove more effective in bringing the standoff to a safe resolution, namely, the use of gas in the residence to force the Complainant to surrender and exit the residence. The SO advised the Complainant that gas might be inserted into the residence, but still the Complainant refused to give up. At about 5:43 a.m., the Complainant's breathing could still be heard over the phone, but he was no longer speaking. As the breath became slower and fainter, the ETF decided to break a window in order to deploy a drone. The drone entered the home at about 6:20 a.m. and located the Complainant on the floor of a bedroom. He was surrounded by blood. ETF officers entered the home and found the Complainant vital signs absent. There was a revolver in his right hand, and a bullet wound to the right side of his head.

The Complainant was transported to hospital and pronounced deceased at about 6:34 a.m.

Cause of Death

The pathologist at autopsy was of the preliminary view that the Complainant's death was attributable to a gunshot wound to the head."

Analysis and Director's Decision

"The Complainant died of a self-inflicted gunshot wound in the morning of March 1, 2025. As he was in his home with TPS officers surrounding the residence at the time, the SIU was notified of the incident and initiated an investigation. The SO was identified as the subject official. The investigation is now concluded. On my assessment of the evidence, there are no reasonable grounds to believe that the SO committed a criminal offence in connection with the Complainant's death.

The offences that arise for consideration is criminal negligence causing death contrary to section 220 of the Criminal Code. The offence is reserved for serious cases of neglect that demonstrate a wanton or reckless disregard for the lives or safety of other persons. It is predicated, in part, on conduct that amounts to a marked and substantial departure from the level of care that a reasonable person would have exercised in the circumstances. In the instant case, the question is whether there was a want of care on the part of the SO, sufficiently egregious to attract criminal sanction, that caused or contributed to the Complainant's death. In my view, there was not.

The officers who responded to the scene of the standoff were lawfully placed and in the execution of their duties through the events culminating in the Complainant's death. The Complainant was subject to arrest for the assault on Civilian #2. In light of the information about a gun in the Complainant's possession, it was also imperative in the interests of public safety that he be taken into custody as soon as circumstances would allow.

I am also satisfied that the ETF operation outside the home, including the SO's place in it as the chief negotiator, was conducted with due care and regard for public safety, including the Complainant's health and wellbeing. Negotiations were given a fair chance to work and there were points, given the rapport the SO had built with the Complainant, where it might have seemed that a peaceful resolution was within reach. The plan to introduce gas into the home represented an escalation in police tactics, but one which was proportionate to the exigencies of the situation. Though the Complainant could not be persuaded to surrender via negotiations alone, he was otherwise coherent in his communications with the SO and there was some prospect that a threat of gas would convince him to exit. Lastly, as soon as it appeared that the Complainant's condition had taken a turn for the worse, the ETF acted quickly to enter the home and render whatever assistance they could. On this record, it would be unreasonable to conclude that the SO or any involved officer transgressed the limits of care prescribed by the criminal law in relation to the Complainant's death.

For the foregoing reasons, there is no basis for proceeding with criminal charges in this case. The file is closed."

Summary of the Toronto Police Service's Investigation

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison conducted an administrative investigation as is required by provincial legislation.

This investigation examined the circumstances of the firearm injury in relation to the applicable legislation, policing services provided, procedures, and the conduct of the involved officers.

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation reviewed the following T.P.S. Procedures:

- Procedure 01-01 (Arrest);

- Procedure 05-04 (Intimate Partner Violence);
- Procedure 05-21 (Firearms);
- Procedure 05-34 (Serious Assaults);
- Procedure 08-04 (Members involved in a Traumatic Critical Incident);
- Procedure 10-05 (Incidents Requiring the Emergency Task Force);
- Procedure 10-06 (Medical Emergencies);
- Procedure 10-15 (Use of Remote Piloted Aircraft System – RPAS);
- Procedure 13-16 (Special Investigations Unit);
- Procedure 13-17 (Notes and Reports);
- Procedure 15-01 (Incident Response (Use of Force/De-Escalation));
- Procedure 15-02 (Injury/Illness Reporting);
- Procedure 15-17 (In-Car Camera System); and
- Procedure 15-20 (Body-Worn Camera).

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison also reviewed the following legislation:

- Special Investigations Unit Act (S.I.U.A.), 2019.

Conclusion:

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation determined that the T.P.S. policies and procedures associated with this custody death were lawful, in keeping with current legislation, and written in a manner which provided adequate and appropriate guidance to the members. None of the examined policies and procedures required modification.

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation determined the conduct of all designated officials was in compliance with applicable provincial legislation regarding the Standards of Conduct, the applicable T.P.S. Procedures and the officers' training.

The existence of Body-Worn Camera footage was an essential piece of evidence that assisted both the S.I.U.'s investigation and this administrative investigation.

Chief Superintendent Shannon Dawson, Professionalism and Accountability, will be in attendance to answer any questions that the Board may have regarding this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Myron Demkiw, M.O.M.
Chief of Police



12.11. Chief's Administrative Investigation into the Vehicle Injuries to Complainant 2025.13



PUBLIC REPORT

September 2, 2025

To: Chair and Members
Toronto Police Service Board

From: Myron Demkiw
Chief of Police

Subject: Chief's Administrative Investigation of the Vehicle
Injuries to Complainant 2025.13

Purpose: ☒ Information Purposes Only ☐ Seeking Decision

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive this report for information.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications arising from the recommendation contained in this report.

Summary:

The Professional Standards - Special Investigations Unit (P.R.S. – S.I.U.) Liaison investigation determined the conduct of the designated official was in compliance with applicable provincial legislation regarding the Standards of Conduct and Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) Procedures.

Discussion:

Background

Whenever the Special Investigations Unit (S.I.U.) investigates an incident involving death, serious injury, the discharge of a firearm at a person or the allegation of a sexual

assault, provincial legislation requires the chief of police, of the relevant police service, to conduct an administrative investigation.

This is the Chief's report in respect of this incident.

Relevant Board Policies and Compliance

- Community Safety and Policing Act (C.S.P.A.), 2019
- Ontario Highway Traffic Act (H.T.A), 1990
- Special Investigations Unit Act (S.I.U.A.), 2019
- T.P.S. Procedures

S.I.U. Terminology

Complainants – Refers to the Affected Persons

SO – Subject Official

WO – Witness Official

CW – Civilian Witness

S.I.U. Investigative Conclusion

In a letter to the Chief of Police dated June 26, 2025, Director Joseph Martino of the S.I.U. advised, *"The file has been closed and no further action is contemplated. In my view, there were no reasonable grounds in the evidence to proceed with criminal charges against the subject official."*

The following *S.I.U. Incident Narrative and Analysis and Director's Decision* has been reprinted from the S.I.U. Director's report, number 25-TVI-092, which can be found via the following link:

[Special Investigations Unit -- Director's Report Details, Case Number: 25-TVI-092](#)

S.I.U. Incident Narrative

"The evidence collected by the SIU, including interviews with the Complainant and a civilian witness, and video footage that largely captured the incident, gives rise to the following scenario. As was his legal right, the SO did not agree an interview with the SIU. He did authorize the release of his notes.

In the morning of March 8, 2025, the Complainant was the front seat passenger in a Lincoln Aviator operated by the CW. The vehicle was travelling southbound on Oak Park Avenue to make a left-turn on Danforth Avenue. Westbound vehicular traffic on Danforth Avenue was backed up but one of the vehicles had reversed a distance

creating an opening at the Oak Park intersection. The CW maneuvered onto the northbound lane to overtake a southbound vehicle ahead of him and entered into the opening without first stopping at a stop sign. He continued southwards and was turning left onto the eastbound lane of Danforth Avenue when the Aviator was struck by an eastbound vehicle.

The vehicle was a cruiser with the SO behind the wheel. The officer was travelling upwards of 70 km/h, his emergency equipment activated, responding to the scene of a reported assault.

The Complainant was transported to hospital following the incident and diagnosed with a broken nose.”

S.I.U. Analysis and Director’s Decision

“The Complainant was seriously injured in a motor vehicle collision with a TPS cruiser on March 8, 2025. The SIU was notified of the incident and initiated an investigation, naming the SO the subject official. The investigation is now concluded. On my assessment of the evidence, there are no reasonable grounds to believe that the SO committed a criminal offence in connection with the collision.

The offence that arises for consideration is dangerous driving causing bodily harm contrary to section 320.13(2) of the Criminal Code. As an offence of penal negligence, a simple want of care will not suffice to give rise to liability. Rather, the offence is predicated, in part, on conduct that amounts to a marked departure from the level of care that a reasonable person would have observed in the circumstances. In the instant case, the issue is whether there was a want of care in the manner in which the SO operated his vehicle, sufficiently egregious to attract criminal sanction, that caused or contributed to the collision. In my view, there was not.

The SO was in the lawful execution of his duties responding to a serious call for service involving a recent assault. As such, he was entitled to speed pursuant to section 128(13)(b) as long as he did not unduly danger the safety of the public around him. The SO was, in fact, in excess of the 40 km/h speed limit as he approached the scene of the collision, but not, I am satisfied, in contravention of the latitude afforded officers. For starters, the SO had his lights and siren operating, giving advance notice to motorists and pedestrians in the vicinity of his cruiser’s presence. He was also travelling in a lane that was relatively clear of traffic at the time. Lastly, at speeds of slightly more than 70 km/h, the officer had not lost the ability to safely control his vehicle (as was evidenced by the SO’s driving from the moment he was dispatched). It is true that the SO might have been able to react to avoid the collision had he been travelling at a slower speed. That said, the evidence indicates that the collision had more to do with the CW’s failure to make a left-turn in safety than any speed on the part of the officer. On this record, I am unable to reasonably conclude that the manner in which the SO operated the cruiser transgressed the limits of care prescribed by the criminal law.

For the foregoing reasons, there is no basis for proceeding with criminal charges in this case. The file is closed.”

Summary of the Toronto Police Service’s Investigation

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison conducted an administrative investigation as is required by provincial legislation.

This investigation was reviewed by Traffic Services (T.S.V.) as is required by Procedure 13-16 (Special Investigations Unit).

This investigation examined the circumstances of this collision in relation to the applicable legislation, policing services provided, procedures, and the conduct of the involved officers.

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation reviewed the following T.P.S. procedures.

- Procedure 07-03 (Life Threatening/Fatal Collisions);
- Procedure 07-05 (Service Vehicle Collisions);
- Procedure 10-06 (Medical Emergencies);
- Procedure 13-16 (Special Investigations Unit);
- Procedure 13-17 (Notes and Reports);
- Procedure 15-11 (Use of Service Vehicles);
- Procedure 15-17 (In-Car Camera System); and
- Procedure 15-20 (Body-Worn Camera).

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation also reviewed the following legislation.

- Special Investigations Unit Act (S.I.U.A.), 2019
- Ontario Highway Traffic Act (H.T.A.), 1990

Conclusion:

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison, in consultation with investigators from T.S.V., determined that the T.P.S. policies and procedures associated with this vehicle injury were lawful, in keeping with current legislation, and written in a manner which provided adequate and appropriate guidance to the members. None of the examined policies and procedures required modification.

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison, in consultation with T.S.V., found the conduct of the subject official was in compliance with applicable provincial legislation regarding the Standards of Conduct, the applicable T.P.S. procedure and the officers’ training.

Chief Superintendent Shannon Dawson, Professionalism and Accountability, will be in attendance to answer any questions that the Board may have regarding this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Myron Demkiw, M.O.M.
Chief of Police



12.12. Chief's Administrative Investigation into the Custody Injury of Complainant 2025.15



PUBLIC REPORT

September 2, 2025

To: Chair and Members
Toronto Police Service Board

From: Myron Demkiw
Chief of Police

Subject: Chief's Administrative Investigation into the Custody
Injury of Complainant 2025.15

Purpose: ☒ Information Purposes Only ☐ Seeking Decision

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive this report for information.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications arising from the recommendation contained in this report.

Summary:

The Professional Standards – Special Investigations Unit (P.R.S. – S.I.U.) Liaison investigation determined the conduct of the involved officers was in compliance with applicable provincial legislation regarding the Standards of Conduct and the applicable Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) Procedures.

Discussion:

Background

Whenever the Special Investigations Unit (S.I.U.) investigates an incident involving death, serious injury, the discharge of a firearm at a person or the allegation of a sexual

assault, provincial legislation requires the chief of police of the relevant police service, to conduct an administrative investigation.

This is the Chief's report in respect of this incident.

Relevant Board Policies and Compliance

- Community Safety and Policing Act (C.S.P.A.), 2019
- Special Investigations Unit Act (S.I.U.A.), 2019
- T.P.S. Procedures

S.I.U. Terminology

Complainant – Refers to the Affected Person

SO – Subject Official

WO – Witness Official(s)

CW – Civilian Witness(es)

S.I.U. Investigative Conclusion

In a letter to the Chief of Police dated June 30, 2025, Director Joseph Martino of the S.I.U. advised, *"The file has been closed, and no further action is contemplated. In my view, there were no reasonable grounds in the evidence to proceed with criminal charges against the subject official."*

The following *S.I.U. Incident Narrative and Analysis and Director's Decision* has been reprinted from the S.I.U. Director's report, number 25-TCI-095, which can be found via the following link:

[Special Investigations Unit -- Director's Report Details, Case Number: 25-TCI-095](#)

S.I.U. Incident Narrative

"The material events in question, clear on the evidence collected by the SIU, may briefly be summarized.

In the morning of March 11, 2025, TPS officers were dispatched to an apartment building in the area of Jane Street and Lawrence Avenue West. 911 calls had been received about a woman hanging from one of the apartment balconies. The SO, joined by WO #1 and WO #2, arrived at the address and immediately made their way to the scene – the balcony of Apartment #1. The woman – the Complainant – was on the outside of the balcony railing. Her head was just below the balcony floor, her body weight supported by the railing of the balcony directly beneath her and anti-bird netting.

The Complainant was of unsound mind at the time. Shortly after arriving as a guest at the apartment in the company of Witness #1, the Complainant ventured out onto the balcony intending to harm herself by jumping. Witness #1 had tried to return her to safety without success. He was present on the balcony when the officers arrived.

The SO bent down, reached through the balcony railing support bars, and grabbed a hold of the Complainant's right hand with his right hand. He pleaded with her to return to safety. Within seconds, the Complainant wriggled free of the SO's grip, fell through the netting, and dropped a couple of stories onto the balcony of Apartment #2 directly below her.

Paramedics responded to the scene and transported the Complainant to hospital. She was diagnosed with multiple injuries, including a fractured pelvis and sacrum (tailbone)."

S.I.U. Analysis and Director's Decision

"The Complainant was seriously injured in a fall from an apartment balcony in Toronto on March 11, 2025. As TPS officers were on scene attempting to prevent her fall at the time, the SIU was notified of the incident and initiated an investigation. The SO was identified as the subject official. The investigation is now concluded. On my assessment of the evidence, there are no reasonable grounds to believe that the SO committed a criminal offence in connection with the Complainant's fall and injuries.

The offence that arises for consideration is criminal negligence causing bodily harm contrary to section 221 of the Criminal Code. The offence is reserved for serious cases of neglect that demonstrate a wanton or reckless disregard for the lives or safety of other persons. It is predicated, in part, on conduct that amounts to a marked and substantial departure from the level of care that a reasonable person would have exercised in the circumstances. In the instant case, the question is whether there was a want of care on the part of the SO, sufficiently egregious to attract criminal sanction, that caused or contributed to the Complainant's fall. In my view, there was not.

A police officer's foremost duty is the protection and preservation of life. The SO was in the execution of that duty when he attended at the balcony of Apartment #1 intending to prevent harm coming to the Complainant.

During his brief time on the balcony, there is no indication that the SO failed to acquit himself with due care and regard for the Complainant's wellbeing. Having arrived on scene to find the Complainant in an extremely precarious position and on the verge of falling, the officer acted reasonably by taking hold of her hand. He held on as long as he could but eventually lost his grip, through no fault of his own. Thereafter, he and the other officers acted quickly to render aid to the Complainant pending the arrival of paramedics.

For the foregoing reasons, there is no basis for proceeding with criminal charges in this case. The file is closed.”

Summary of the Toronto Police Service’s Investigation

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison conducted an administrative investigation as is required by provincial legislation.

This investigation examined the circumstances of the custody injury in relation to the applicable legislation, policing services provided, procedures, and the conduct of the involved officers.

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation reviewed the following T.P.S. Procedures:

- Procedure 01-01 (Arrest);
- Procedure 01-02 (Search of Persons);
- Procedure 01-03 (Persons in Custody);
- Procedure 06-04 (Persons In Crisis);
- Procedure 06-13 (Mobile Crisis Intervention Team (MCIT));
- Procedure 08-03 (Injured on Duty Reporting);
- Procedure 08-04 (Members Involved in a Traumatic Critical Incident);
- Procedure 10-06 (Medical Emergencies);
- Procedure 13-16 (Special Investigations Unit);
- Procedure 13-17 (Notes and Reports);
- Procedure 15-01 (Incident Response (Use of Force/De-Escalation));
- Procedure 15-02 (Injury/Illness Reporting);
- Procedure 15-17 (In-Car Camera System); and
- Procedure 15-20 (Body-Worn Camera).

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation also reviewed the following legislation:

- Special Investigations Unit Act (S.I.U.A.), 2019
- Mental Health Act (M.H.A), 1990

Conclusion:

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation determined that the T.P.S.’s policies and procedures associated with this custody injury were lawful, in keeping with current legislation, and written in a manner which provided adequate and appropriate guidance to the members. None of the examined policies and procedures required modification.

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation determined the conduct of the involved officers was in compliance with applicable provincial legislation regarding the Standards of Conduct and the applicable T.P.S. Procedures.

All the officers involved in this event were equipped with Body-Worn Camera (B.W.C.). The B.W.C.s were activated and recorded the entire event. Other officers arriving later activated their In-Car Camera Systems (I.C.C.S.). These assets were disclosed to the S.I.U.

The use of the B.W.C. and the I.C.C.S. by attending officers and the footage of this event and its disclosure to the S.I.U. assisted both the S.I.U.'s investigation and this administrative investigation.

Chief Superintendent Shannon Dawson, Professionalism and Accountability, will be in attendance to answer any questions that the Board may have regarding this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Myron Demkiw, M.O.M.
Chief of Police



12.13. Chief's Administrative Investigation into the Custody Injury of Complainant 2025.16



PUBLIC REPORT

September 2, 2025

To: Chair and Members
Toronto Police Service Board

From: Myron Demkiw
Chief of Police

Subject: Chief's Administrative Investigation into the Custody
Injury of Complainant 2025.16

Purpose: ☒ Information Purposes Only ☐ Seeking Decision

Recommendation:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board) receive this report for information.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications arising from the recommendation contained in this report.

Summary:

The Professional Standards – Special Investigations Unit (P.R.S. – S.I.U.) Liaison investigation determined the conduct of the involved officers was in compliance with applicable provincial legislation regarding the Standards of Conduct and the applicable Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) Procedures.

Discussion:

Background

Whenever the Special Investigations Unit (S.I.U.) investigates an incident involving death, serious injury, the discharge of a firearm at a person or the allegation of a sexual

assault, provincial legislation requires the chief of police of the relevant police service, to conduct an administrative investigation.

This is the Chief's report in respect of this incident.

Relevant Board Policies and Compliance

- Community Safety and Policing Act (C.S.P.A.), 2019
- Special Investigations Unit Act (S.I.U.A.), 2019
- T.P.S. Procedures

S.I.U. Terminology

Complainant – Refers to the Affected Person

SO – Subject Official

CW – Civilian Witness(es)

CEW – Conducted Energy Weapon

S.I.U. Investigative Conclusion

In a letter to the Chief of Police dated July 7, 2025, Director Joseph Martino of the S.I.U. advised, *"The file has been closed, and no further action is contemplated. In my view, there were no reasonable grounds in the evidence to proceed with criminal charges against the subject official."*

The following *S.I.U. Incident Narrative and Analysis and Director's Decision* has been reprinted from the S.I.U. Director's report, number 25-TCI-096, which can be found via the following link:

[Special Investigations Unit -- Director's Report Details, Case Number: 25-TCI-096](#)

S.I.U. Incident Narrative

"The evidence collected by the SIU, including interviews with the Complainant and civilian eyewitnesses, and video footage that captured the incident in part, gives rise to the following scenario. As was his legal right, the SO did not agree an interview with the SIU or the release of his notes.

In the evening of March 11, 2025, the SO was working a paid-duty providing security at Marshalls - a store located at the Dufferin Mall, 900 Dufferin Street, Toronto - when he was alerted to a theft in progress. The store's non-police security officers – CW #1 and CW #2 – had detected a customer leaving the store with unpaid merchandise.

The customer was the Complainant. Confronted by CW #2 upon exiting the store, the two became engaged in a physical struggle. CW #1 and the SO intervened in the struggle but the Complainant was able to pull himself free. He attempted to escape northwards outside the store but had not gone very far before he was struck in the back by the probes of a CEW discharged by the SO. The Complainant immediately locked-up and fell face first onto the pavement, breaking his nose in the process.

The Complainant was arrested and sent to hospital where he was treated for his injury.”

S.I.U. Analysis and Director’s Decision

“The Complainant was seriously injured in the course of his arrest by a TPS officer on March 11, 2025. The SIU was notified of the incident and initiated an investigation naming the officer – the SO – the subject official. The investigation is now concluded. On my assessment of the evidence, there are no reasonable grounds to believe that the SO committed a criminal offence in connection with the Complainant’s arrest and injury.

Pursuant to section 25(1) of the Criminal Code, police officers are immune from criminal liability for force used in the course of their duties provided such force was reasonably necessary in the execution of an act that they were required or authorized to do by law.

I am satisfied that there were lawful grounds to arrest the Complainant for theft given the video evidence of his activities in the store.

I am also satisfied that the force used by the SO in aid of the Complainant’s arrest was reasonably necessary. When the Complainant physically resisted the officer’s efforts to take him into custody, the SO was entitled to resort to a measure of force. He did so using like, and therefore proportionate, force, namely, engaging in a wrestling contest to overcome the Complainant’s resistance. Thereafter, when the Complainant broke free of the officer’s and security officers’ hold, the SO was within his rights in turning to the use of his CEW. The weapon represented a reasonable escalation of force at the time as it carried a legitimate prospect of bringing an end to the Complainant’s flight without the infliction of serious injury.

For the foregoing reasons, there is no basis for proceeding with criminal charges in this case. The file is closed.”

Summary of the Toronto Police Service’s Investigation

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison conducted an administrative investigation as is required by provincial legislation.

This investigation examined the circumstances of the custody injury in relation to the applicable legislation, policing services provided, procedures, and the conduct of the involved officers.

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation reviewed the following T.P.S. Procedures:

- Procedure 01-01 (Arrest);
- Procedure 01-02 (Search of Persons);
- Procedure 01-03 (Persons in Custody);
- Procedure 10-06 (Medical Emergencies);
- Procedure 13-16 (Special Investigations Unit);
- Procedure 13-17 (Notes and Reports);
- Procedure 15-01 (Incident Response (Use of Force/De-Escalation));
- Procedure 15-02 (Injury/Illness Reporting);
- Procedure 15-09 (Conducted Energy Weapons);
- Procedure 15-17 (In-Car Camera System); and
- Procedure 15-20 (Body-Worn Camera).

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation also reviewed the following legislation:

- Special Investigations Unit Act (S.I.U.A.), 2019

Conclusion:

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation determined that the T.P.S.'s policies and procedures associated with this custody injury were lawful, in keeping with current legislation, and written in a manner which provided adequate and appropriate guidance to the members. None of the examined policies and procedures required modification.

The P.R.S. – S.I.U. Liaison investigation determined the conduct of the involved officers was in compliance with applicable provincial legislation regarding the Standards of Conduct and the applicable T.P.S. procedures.

The officer involved in this event was equipped with Body-Worn Camera (B.W.C.). The B.W.C. was activated and recorded the entire event. Other officers arriving later activated their In-Car Camera Systems (I.C.C.S.) and their B.W.C.s. These assets were disclosed to the S.I.U.

The use of the B.W.C. and I.C.C.S. by attending officers and its disclosure to the S.I.U. assisted both the S.I.U.'s investigation and this administrative investigation.

Chief Superintendent Shannon Dawson, Professionalism and Accountability, will be in attendance to answer any questions that the Board may have regarding this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Myron Demkiw, M.O.M.
Chief of Police



13. Request for Review of a Service Complaint Investigation: – Professional Standards Case Number – PRS-093892



PUBLIC REPORT

June 2, 2025

To: Chair and Members
Toronto Police Service Board

From: Myron Demkiw
Chief of Police

**Subject: Request for Review of a Service Complaint Investigation:
– Professional Standards Case Number – PRS-093892**

Purpose: ☐ Information Purposes Only ☒ Seeking Decision

Recommendations:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board):

- 1) determine whether to concur with the decision that no further action was required with respect to the complaint, and;
- 2) advise the complainant, the Office of the Independent Police Review Director (O.I.P.R.D.) and the Chief of Police of the disposition of the complaint, in writing, with reasons.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications arising from the recommendations contained in this report.

Discussion:

Background

The Board has received a request to review the disposition of a complaint about the services provided by the Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.).

Relevant Board Policies and Compliance

As of April 1, 2024, the O.I.P.R.D. transitioned to the Law Enforcement Complaints Agency (L.E.C.A.) under the Community Safety and Policing Act (C.S.P.A.).

Accordingly, the Independent Police Review Director will now be referred to as the Complaints Director. As the incident that is the subject of the complaint took place prior to April 1, 2024, the complaint will continue to be dealt with in accordance with the provision of the Police Services Act (P.S.A.), R.S.O. 1990, c.P.15.

Section 63 of the P.S.A. directs the Chief of Police to review every complaint about the policies or services provided by a municipal police force that is referred to him or her by the O.I.P.R.D.

The Chief of Police shall, within 60 days of the referral of the complaint to him or her, notify the complainant in writing of his or her disposition of the complaint, with reasons, and of the complainant's right to request that the Board review the complaint if the complainant is not satisfied with the disposition.

A complainant may, within 30 days after receiving the notice, request that the Board review the complaint by serving a written request to that effect on the Board.

Board Review:

Section 63 of P.S.A. directs that upon receiving a written request for a review of a complaint previously dealt with by the Chief of Police, the Board shall:

- a) advise the Chief of Police of the request,
- b) subject to subsection (7), review the complaint and take any action, or no action, in response to the complaint, as it considers appropriate; and
- c) notify the complainant, the Chief of Police, and the O.I.P.R.D. in writing of its disposition of the complaint, with reasons.

Summary of the Complaint and Investigation

Complaint Number: PRS-093892
Complaint Type: Service
Disposition: No Action Required

On November 20, 2023, the O.I.P.R.D. received a complaint from the complainant who alleged that the T.P.S. failed to investigate threats she has received from her neighbour.

The O.I.P.R.D. classified this complaint as a complaint about the service provided by the T.P.S. and on December 4, 2023, assigned it to the T.P.S. for investigation.

On December 5, 2023, Detective Jeffrey Gough (10316), of 51 Division was assigned the file for investigation.

The following steps were taken to investigate this complaint:

- Communicated and met with the Complainant.
- Spoke with Witness – Toronto Community Housing (T.C.H.).
- Reviewed relevant T.C.H. policies and procedures.
- Reviewed Intergraph Computer Aided Dispatch (I.C.A.D.) Radio Call Event Details Report: Event # 23-1661522.
- Reviewed the relevant complaint file, 230015997.
- Reviewed relevant Service policies and procedures.

The information gathered supports the fact that the Complainant is a vulnerable person who believed that she was suffering from a force that permeates her apartment's walls. She regularly contacts T.C.H. Special Constables for help, but the Complainant has not reported any incidents to the police that were able to be resolved through criminal code or provincial statute authorities.

There are no reasonable grounds to believe a criminal or provincial offence has been committed. The T.C.H. special constables should continue to respond to her calls to the Community Safety Unit line, and they should continue to address her complaints about noise and the interference she alleges is being committed by her neighbour.

The Complainant's allegations lack the air of objective reality. Based on the totality of the information, lack of evidence, and the nature of the utterances made, one can reasonably conclude the Complainant has the subjective perception that she is being victimized by her neighbour. However, this is not based on facts or evidence.

The service provided by the T.P.S. was in compliance with Service procedures and governing authorities, and a deficiency in the quality or level of service was not identified.

Conclusion:

The investigation revealed that all appropriate actions and measures have been undertaken by members of the Service in accordance with Service procedures and governing authorities.

Therefore, no further action is required.

Chief Superintendent Shannon Dawson, Professionalism and Accountability, will be in attendance to answer any questions that the Board may have regarding this report.

Reason for Confidential Information

This report includes a confidential attachment containing a letter from the O.I.P.R.D., directing the T.P.S. to deal with a complaint relating to a service issue, pursuant to section 63 of the P.S.A. It also contains details of a Report of Investigation.

Respectfully submitted,

Myron Demkiw, M.O.M.
Chief of Police

Attachments:

A letter from the Office of the Independent Police Review Director (O.I.P.R.D.) – Complaint Number 230015997, and Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) Report of Investigation – File Number: PRS-093892/2003.EXT-0892



14. Request for Review of a Service
Complaint Investigation: – Professional
Standards (P.R.S.) Case Number – PRS-
102706 Inspectorate of Policing (I.O.P.)
Complaint Number: 24-3851/INV-25-50



PUBLIC REPORT

November 6, 2025

To: Chair and Members
Toronto Police Service Board

From: Myron Demkiw
Chief of Police

Subject: Request for Review of a Service Complaint Investigation: –
Professional Standards (P.R.S.) Case Number – PRS-102706
Inspectorate of Policing (I.O.P.) Complaint Number: 24-3851/INV-
25-50

Purpose: ☐ Information Purposes Only ☒ Seeking Decision

Recommendations:

This report recommends that the Toronto Police Service Board (Board):

- 1) determine whether to concur with the decision that action be taken with respect to this complaint, and;
- 2) advise the complainant, the Inspector General (I.G.), and the Solicitor General of any steps taken in response to this complaint.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications arising from the recommendations contained in this report.

Discussion:

Background

The Board has received direction from the I.G. to report on a complaint regarding the policies of a police service board pursuant to s.107(1)(c) of the Community Safety and

Policing Act, 2019 (C.S.P.A.), and the procedures established by the Chief of Police, Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) pursuant to s.107(1)(d) of the C.S.P.A.

Relevant Board Policies and Compliance

- Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019 (C.S.P.A.).

Board Review:

Pursuant to Section 107(7) of the C.S.P.A. directs that the Board shall:

- a) review the complaint as it relates to its policies and/or procedures;
- b) report back to the I.G. within the time specified by the I.G. about any steps taken in response to the complaint, if any; and
- c) report to the Solicitor General about any steps taken in response to this complaint.

Summary of the Complaint and Investigation

Complaint Number: PRS-102706
Complaint Type: Service
Disposition: Actions Taken

On October 29, 2024, the I.G. received a complaint via the Law Enforcement Complaints Agency (L.E.C.A.).

The Complainant stated there is a significant increase in the use of city sidewalks by e-bike operators and cyclists. The Complainant indicated he has been struck by one such user and has had a negative interaction with another, leading to his assertion that pedestrians are not afforded appropriate care and consideration.

The Complainant alleges the T.P.S. does not conduct traffic enforcement actions related to infractions committed by e-bike operators and cyclists.

The I.O.P. classified this complaint as a complaint about the policies or procedures provided by the T.P.S. and on June 2, 2025, referred it to the Board for review.

On July 22, 2025, Detective Nicholas Lawson (10005), of Traffic Services (T.S.V.) was assigned the file for investigation.

The following steps were taken to investigate this complaint:

- Reviewed Provincial Legislation.
- Reviewed T.P.S. Procedures.

- Reviewed the Board Adequacy Policy.
- Reviewed Micromobility Enforcement Statistics.
- Reviewed T.P.S. News Release 61302 (2024). “Safe Rides, Safe Streets”, Micromobility Vehicle Campaign.
- Reviewed T.P.S. News Release 63832 (2025). “T.P.S. increasing enforcement of micromobility vehicles”.
- Reviewed T.P.S. “Safe Rides, Safe Streets”, Micromobility Operational Plan 2024.
- Reviewed T.P.S. Service Micromobility Back to School Campaign Operational Plan 2025.
- Reviewed T.P.S. Website: Bicycle Safety.
- Reviewed T.P.S. T.S.V. Website: Mission Statement.

Analysis:

Within Ontario Regulation 392/23 “Adequate and Effective Policing (General)” under the C.S.P.A., the generally applicable standard to adequate and effective policing is set forth, and includes, but is not limited to, functions provided to an extent and in a reasonable manner that adheres to the policing needs of the community.

The Regulation also mandates that police services adopt procedures to address traffic direction and enforcement, including traffic patrol.

The Board addresses the requirements of the C.S.P.A. (captured under the previous Police Services Act (P.S.A.)), within the Adequacy Standards Compliance Policy, section XLIV LE-017 – Traffic Management, Traffic Law Enforcement and Road Safety.

It is the policy of the Board that the Chief of Police will establish procedures on traffic management, traffic law enforcement and road safety.

This mandate is fulfilled within T.P.S. Procedure Chapter 7: Vehicle Investigations and Traffic Enforcement; Appendix “A” Traffic Direction and Traffic Enforcement.

Within Appendix “A”, the T.P.S. outlines the requirement for efficient traffic and congestion management, deployment of police officers, and traffic enforcement, in a combined effort to uphold public safety and order on Toronto roads.

T.P.S. Procedure mandates holding individuals accountable for poor driving behaviour to promote a safe driving environment for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists.

On October 21, 2024, the T.P.S. published News Release 61302 “Safe Rides, Safe Streets”, Micromobility Vehicle Campaign, through which the public was notified of focused enforcement toward micromobility devices between November 4 and November 17, 2024.

The enforcement campaign was extensively detailed within an Operational Plan and aimed to enhance public awareness of safety issues including illegal sidewalk riding, regulations related to e-vehicles, and enforcement of non-compliant micromobility devices within the City of Toronto.

A statistical analysis revealed the T.P.S. issued a combined 696 offence notices, Summons, and warnings related to these devices throughout 2024.

On August 25, 2025, the T.P.S. published News Release 63832 “Toronto Police Service increasing enforcement of micromobility vehicles”, through which the public was notified of a three-week safety and enforcement campaign slated to conclude on September 13, 2025.

Similar to 2024, the 2025 safety campaign as developed and detailed within an Operational Plan that included a defined mission, objective, and execution strategy.

A statistical analysis revealed the T.P.S. issued a combined 1,013 offence notices, Summonses, and warnings related to micromobility enforcement actions between January and September 14, 2025, an increase of 45% from 2024 figures, with projected enforcement values to increase by end of the year.

In addition to safety campaigns and enforcement action, the T.P.S. provides public education and direction relating to micromobility laws, widely available on the T.P.S.’s website.

Conclusion:

Traffic management, traffic law enforcement and road safety have been a priority of the T.P.S. for decades, as reflected in the Board policy predating the C.S.P.A.

Notwithstanding historical enforcement activities, the T.P.S. continues to adapt and pivot to fulfil the needs of the community and effectively manage emerging trends and technology.

The 2024 and 2025 micromobility safety campaigns that succeeded the Complainant’s September 7, 2024, submission, are demonstrative of the T.P.S.’s commitment to community response and effective delivery of police services.

Statistical analysis corroborates the T.P.S.'s dedication to enforcement action toward micromobility users that act in contravention of applicable laws.

Furthermore, the T.P.S. affirms that the safety and well-being of Toronto's citizens continues to be its foremost priority.

Chief Superintendent Shannon Dawson, Professionalism and Accountability, will be in attendance to answer any questions that the Board may have regarding this report.

Reason for Confidential Information

This report includes a confidential attachment containing a letter from the I.O.P., directing the Board to review and respond to a complaint relating to a policy or procedure issue, pursuant to s.107(6) of the C.S.P.A. and a letter from L.E.C.A. to the I.O.P. pursuant to s. 108(1) of the C.S.P.A. It also contains details of an Investigative Report.

Respectfully submitted,

Myron Demkiw, M.O.M.
Chief of Police

Attachments:

A letter from the Inspectorate of Policing – I.O.P. Complaint Number: 24-385/INV-25-50, Letter from Law Enforcement Complaints Agency: L.E.C.A. Complaint Number: E-202409071026412689 and, Report of Investigation – File Number: PRS-102706/2025.OTA-0065



15. Review of Board Advisory Bodies and Public Engagement



NEW BUSINESS

Date: November 6, 2025

**Item: 15 Review of Board Advisory Bodies
and Public Engagement**

Submitted by: Chair Carroll

Summary

As the Toronto Police Service Board advances development of its forthcoming Strategic Plan for Policing in Toronto, and continues to develop the implementation framework for the recommendations of the Ontario Human Rights Commission's *From Impact to Action* report on addressing anti-Black racism, it is timely to review the Board's overall framework for community engagement and advisory structures.

This includes a focused review of the Board's Mental Health and Addictions Advisory Panel (MHAAP) and Anti-

Racism Advisory Panel (ARAP), as well as a broader assessment of how the Board engages residents, community partners, and interest groups through its public meetings, deputations, and other consultation mechanisms.

The objective of this review is to ensure that the Board's engagement and advisory structures:

- Reflect the priorities and values of the forthcoming Strategic Plan;
- Support the implementation of commitments arising from the Ontario Human Rights Commission's recommendations on anti-Black racism;
- Are inclusive, accessible, and effective in soliciting and generating community-informed policy guidance; and
- Complement the Toronto Police Service's ongoing transformation work and modernization of its Chief's Community Consultative Committees (CCCs).

The review will identify opportunities to strengthen collaboration, accountability, and community voice across the Board's advisory and engagement ecosystem.

Recommendations:

THAT the Board

1. Direct the Executive Director to undertake a comprehensive review of the Board's advisory bodies and engagement mechanisms, including:
 - a. The Mental Health and Addictions Advisory Panel (MHAAP) and the Anti-Racism Advisory Panel (ARAP);
 - b. The Board's public engagement practices, including the deputation process and other forms of public consultation;
2. Direct the Executive Director to collaborate with the Service's Chief Transformation Officer (CTO) in his review of the Chief's Community Consultative Committees, ensuring alignment with the Service's ongoing community engagement modernization initiatives;
3. Direct the Executive Director report back to the Board by Q2 2026 with recommendations to enhance the effectiveness, representation, and coordination of the Board's advisory and engagement structures, including any proposed updates to mandates, terms of reference, recruitment processes, and reporting relationships; and
4. Temporarily pause recruitment processes and new appointments to its Mental Health and Addictions Advisory Panel (MHAAP) and Anti-Racism Advisory Panel (ARAP) pending the outcome of the review, and the implementation of any resulting recommendations.



16. Walk-on Agenda and report Correspondence from City Council – October 2025



**PUBLIC MEETING
WALK-ON AGENDA**

Thursday, November 6, 2025 at 9:00AM

Livestreaming at

<https://youtube.com/live/Bxk-1WjEzww?feature=share>

16. October 30, 2025 from Sandy Murray, Interim Executive Director

Re: Correspondence from City Council – October 2025

Next Meeting

Regular Board Meeting

December 10, 2025

Hybrid Board Meeting – at Police Headquarters, 40 College Street or virtually via WebEx

Members of the Toronto Police Service Board

Shelley Carroll, Chair
Amber Morley, Member & Deputy Mayor
Lily Cheng, Member & Councillor

Chris Brillinger, Vice-Chair
Lisa Kostakis, Member
Ann Morgan, Member

Nick Migliore, Member



PUBLIC REPORT

October 30, 2025

To: Chair and Members
Toronto Police Service Board

From: Sandy Murray
Interim Executive Director

Subject: **Correspondence from City Council – October 2025**

Purpose: ☒ Information Purposes Only ☐ Seeking Decision

Background:

The Board is in receipt of correspondence from Toronto City Clerk dated October 30, 2025, notifying the Toronto Police Service Board (the “Board”) that at its meetings held on October 8 and 9, Toronto City Council adopted the following items:

- [CC33.1](#) - Expanding Toronto Community Crisis Response to the Toronto Transit Commission
- [IE24.13](#) - Optimizing the Automated Speed Enforcement Program to Stop Speeding
- [IE24.1](#) – Micromobility Update
- [MM33.24](#) – Supporting the Elect Respect Campaign and Pledge

[CC33.1](#) - Expanding Toronto Community Crisis Response to the Toronto Transit Commission

The Clerk has notified the Board that City Council adopted Item CC33.1 and, in so doing:

- Requested the Toronto Police Service Board to report on the creation of a Safe Toronto Transit Commission (T.T.C.) Strategy where police officers are deployed at TTC stations to enhance safety for everyone.
- Directed the City Manager to work with the Toronto Police Service and report directly to the November 28, 2025, meeting of the Economic and Community Development Committee with information on:
 - total number of emergency response calls related to TTC stations and vehicles in 2025;

- the percentage for which only the Toronto Community Crisis Service could have been dispatched to resolve without additional resources; and
- the percentage for which special constables or police were required.

IE24.13 - *Optimizing the Automated Speed Enforcement Program to Stop Speeding*

The Clerk has notified the Board that City Council, on October 8 and 9, 2025, adopted Item IE24.13 and, in so doing:

- Requested the City Manager to report to the Infrastructure and Environment Committee on the impacts of removing all Automated Enforcement Cameras and constructing roundabouts at all 819 Toronto schools and speed humps on roads adjacent to Toronto schools, taking into account:
 - anticipated costs;
 - budgetary impacts, including the financial impacts of deploying Toronto Police to undertake speed enforcement at Toronto schools; and
 - emergency services operations and response time.
- Requested the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer to request the Toronto Police Service to provide information on the additional cost to Toronto taxpayers to maintain the current level of safety by deploying sufficient police officers to replace speed cameras with an equivalent level of enforcement, without degrading other police services, and report this information to the November 12, 13, and 14, 2025, meeting of City Council.
- Requested the Toronto Police Service Board to report on the creation of a Safe School Strategy where police officers are deployed at all Toronto schools to enforce speed limits.

IE24.1 – *Micromobility Update*

The Clerk has notified the Board that City Council, on October 8 and 9, 2025, adopted Item IE24.1 and, in so doing:

- Requested the General Manager, Transportation Services, to continue working with the Toronto Police Service on a schedule of coordinated public education campaigns and enforcement blitzes as part of ongoing micromobility safety initiatives, and to share information on regulations and safety with school boards and other groups to reach parents directly.
- Requested the Toronto Police Service Board to request the Chief of Police, in collaboration with the General Manager, Transportation Services, to conduct micromobility education and enforcement blitzes and publish data on the outcomes of these blitzes by the end of Q4 2026.

MM33.24 – *Supporting the Elect Respect Campaign and Pledge*

The Clerk has notified the Board that City Council, on October 8 and 9, 2025, adopted MM33.24 and, in so doing endorsed the Elect Respect Pledge and expressed support for the campaign.

Elect Respect Pledge:

As an ally to candidates and elected officials, and an advocate for democracy, I pledge to:

- Treat elected officials and each other with respect in all spaces—public, private, and online.
- Reject harassment, abuse, and personal attacks, and speak out when I witness them.
- Focus debate and political discussions on ideas and policies, not personal attacks.
- Help build a supportive culture where people of all backgrounds feel safe to run for and hold office, and engage in public life.
- Call on relevant authorities for the protection of elected officials who face abuse or threats.
- Model integrity and respect in public life, holding myself to the highest standards of conduct, and vote for leaders who model integrity and respect in public life, holding them to the highest standard of conduct.
- Forwarded this item to:
 - Association of Municipalities of Ontario
 - Ontario's Big City Mayors
 - Federation of Canadian Municipalities and its Big City Mayors' Caucus
 - Premier of Ontario and Opposition party leaders in the Ontario Legislature
 - Prime Minister of Canada and Opposition party leaders in the House of Commons
 - All Members of Parliament and Members of Provincial Parliament representing seats in the City of Toronto
 - Toronto Police Service
 - Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Conclusion:

It is, therefore, recommended that the Board receive this report for information.

Recommendation(s):

This report recommends that the Board receive the following report for information.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications arising from the recommendation contained in this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandy Murray
Interim Executive Director



List of Deputations

**Toronto Police Service Board
Public Meeting
November 6, 2025**

**** Speakers' List ****

1. Confirmation of Minutes

Deputations: Derek Moran (in person)
Kris Langenfeld (virtual)
Nicole Corrado (written only)

2. What We Heard

Deputations: Dave Shellnutt (virtual)
Derek Moran (in person)
Caryma Sa'd (in person)
Demar Kemar Hewitt, Black Legal Action Centre (virtual)
John Sewell (in person)(written submission included)
Kris Langenfeld (virtual)
Nicole Corrado (virtual) (written submission included)
Ester Eisen (written only)
Mir Bahmanyar (written only)

3. Toronto Police Service Intimate Partner Violence Annual Report for 2024

Deputations: Beauvier Duquesnay, Black Lives Matata (virtual)
Marissa Kokkoros, Aura Freedom (virtual)
Harmy Mendoza, WomanACT (virtual)
Sami Pritchard, YWCA (virtual)
Deepa Mattoo (virtual)
Barbra Schlifer Commemorative Clinic

Nicole Corrado (written only)
Boris Zemlo (written only)

4. Update on the Implementation of Auditor General Recommendations

Deputations: Nicole Corrado (virtual) (written submission included)
Miguel Avila-Velarde (in person)

5. Annual Report on Training & Development – 2024

Deputations: Nicole Corrado (virtual) (written submission included)
Miguel Avila-Velarde (in person)

6. Annual Use of Force Report – 2024

Deputation: Beauvier Duquesnay, Black Lives Matata (virtual)
Nicole Corrado (virtual) (written submission included)
Law Union of Ontario (written only)

8. Facial Recognition System Follow-up

Deputation: Nicole Corrado (written only)

9. Special Constable Appointments and Re-Appointments – November 2025

Deputation: Miguel Avila-Velarde (in person)

10. Receipt of Donation

Deputations: Nicole Corrado (virtual) (written submission included)
Miguel Avila-Velarde (in person)

12. Chief's Administrative Investigation Reports

Deputation: Nicole Corrado (virtual) (written submission included)
Dave Shellnutt (virtual)

**13. Request for Review of a Service Complaint Investigation: –
Professional Standards Case Number – PRS-093892**

Deputation: Nicole Corrado (virtual) (written submission included)

**14. Request for Review of a Service Complaint Investigation: –
Professional Standards (P.R.S.) Case Number – PRS-102706
Inspectorate of Policing (I.O.P.) Complaint Number: 24-3851/INV-25-
50**

Deputations: Kris Langenfeld (virtual)
Nicole Corrado (written only)

15. Review of Board Advisory Bodies and Public Engagement

Deputations: Derek Moran (in person)
Kris Langenfeld (virtual)
Nicole Corrado (written only)

Name: Nicole Corrado

Organization: MMIT Community Member

Agenda item: 1. Confirmation of the Minutes from the regular public meeting held on September 11, 2025 and of the special public meeting held on October 6, 2025.

Format: Written only

Plain text: Please switch the Vulnerable Persons Registry to Medic Alert. Another possibility is to switch to the free www.ifineedhelp.org a VPR system that uses a QR code that can be screened using a camera, no need to touch the person.

Toronto Police Accountability Coalition

www.tpac.ca

info@tpac.ca

November 2, 2025

To: Toronto Police Service Board

Subject: Item 2, November 6 meeting

“What we heard”, community consultation

Please list TPAC as a deputation on November 6.

The community consultation of some 1200 individuals undertaken by the police service confirmed what other consultations have revealed in previous years. As the staff report notes, “Across every engagement and consultation, one message stood out: trust must be rebuilt — within the Service, and between police and the public. Communities want safety built on fairness, accountability, and respect. Service Members want leadership that supports, listens, and leads with integrity. Both groups called for lasting cultural change and genuine partnership, not symbolic gestures.”

This is nothing new. Surveys of Toronto residents have shown time and time again that trust in the police service is deficient. The Board and the senior leadership of the police service bear much of the responsibility for the lack of trust.

Here are a few examples in which TPAC has attempted to get remedial action.

a) In April 2024 the judge in the Zameer case alleged that the three officers who testified in that case had colluded in their evidence and were not truthful in their testimony. Now, 18 months later, no investigation has been completed and no discipline has been meted out – the officers continue to

work as though nothing had happened. Several months ago TPAC asked the Board to intervene and it refused. No one wants to trust an organization where members do not tell the truth in court and senior leadership turns a blind eye.

b) In June 2025, a judge alleged that Detective Guy Kama was not truthful in his evidence and that the police service did not respect the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. TPAC asked the Board to take disciplinary action, but was told that what Detective Kama did – not telling the truth in court – was a ‘personal’ matter and the public was not entitled to learn what action the police service would take. No one wants to trust an organization where members do not tell the truth in court and senior leadership turn a blind eye.

c) Many Toronto officers refuse to comply with requests from the Special Investigations Unit to tell the SIU what they did regarding incidents the SIU was looking into. Those officers refused to be accountable for their actions in cases where members of the public were injured or killed. No wonder the public does not have trust in the police service. TPAC has suggested to the Board on several occasions ways to ensure that police are accountable but the Board and the police leadership has always dismissed those suggestions.

d) In 2001 the Supreme Court of Canada ruled that the Toronto police service was unnecessarily strip searching too many people. Virtually every year after that ruling TPAC asked the Board to reduce the number being strip searched and on every occasion the Board took no remedial action. In 2018 a provincial agency reported that the Toronto police service was strip searching 40 per cent of those arrested while other large police forces in Ontario strip searched 1 per cent, yet again the Board did nothing. Finally the service and the Board took action in 2020 after George Floyd was murdered and adopted the recommendation of the Supreme Court – 18 years later. Who trusts an organization which is so lackadaisical about implementing a decision of Canada’s highest court?

e) The Toronto police service did not respond well to the concerns about men missing from the gay community in Toronto almost ten years ago and the Board retained Judge Gloria Epstein to report on the matter. Her 2021 report 'Missing and Missed' made many recommendations for change which were endorsed by the Board and service. But as we learned from the murder of Jennifer Johnson in 2023, the service hasn't followed those recommendations, and Ms Jackson's murder was not even investigated for 14 months after her body was found. TPAC tried without success to get this matter before the Board so it could be publicly discussed but the Board refused. How does the public trust a police service which says it is changing but in the end just carries on in the same incompetent ways?

f) The Toronto Police Association endorsed Doug Ford in the recent provincial election and Pierre Poilievre in the recent federal election. Board policies state that such endorsements contravene provincial regulations and disciplinary action must be taken. The Board has refused to take ensure disciplinary action is taken. How can one trust a police service which is so partisan?

We know of many other examples of the failure of the Board and the police leadership to take actions which ensure that the public can trust the service. We do not hold out much hope that the Board and service will come up with anything useful in the Strategic Plan expected in four or five months: your track record shows you will avoid responsibility.

Here are the actions that need to be taken right now:

1. Action must be immediately taken in the Zameer and Kama cases to address the issue of officers not being truthful in court; disciplinary action must be taken immediately, in conformity with Board policy, regarding police officers endorsing political candidates.

2. Appoint someone from outside the policing community -= someone with a strong track record in civil rights – to head up the Professional Standards Branch. That will help to ensure that when officers are accused of wrong-doing immediate remedial action is taken. The current holder of that position is an officer who has spent more than thirty years with the Toronto police force and is deeply imbued in police culture.

3. Appoint several new deputies from outside the policing community so the culture begins to change. Only appointing senior officers from within – which is the long-time practise of the Toronto police service - does nothing to change police culture which thinks it need never change.

4. Mandate that funding for the police service in 2026 will be no more than in 2025. In the 2024 budget process Chief Demkiw was very critical of Mayor Chow when she decided she would not recommend every cent the Chief had requested, and he threatened to reduce key services. Every year the police demand more money which is a good way to avoid responsibility and accountability. Requiring the police service to operate on a more limited budget – thus permitting community agencies and other city services to have more funds – will send a strong message that the Board expects police leadership to get serious about change.

There are many other changes which must be made, but these are the four critical changes we expect from the Board. Once these changes are made it makes sense to look at further things that can be done.

Yours truly,

John Sewell for
Toronto Police Accountability Coalition

Name: Nicole Corrado

Agenda item: 2: What we Heard report

Format: WebEx

Plain text: The What We Heard Report is good, but the survey did not have a category for neurodivergent. Therefore it is impossible to know how many respondents were neurodivergent. I know one person who filled it out is. Many Neurodivergent people have a negative association with police. There is no training by neurodivergent people, nor have we been consulted for training. The current Autism and Fetal Alcohol Syndrome course is by non autistic people and it focuses on children. I do not feel safe around police and would prefer to call an alternative. I have developed a phobia of police after people have called them on me when my strange behaviour has been misunderstood. Please support alternative responses that don't involve people with guns.

Name: Ester Eisen

Agenda item: 2. What We Heard - Insights Informing the Strategic Plan for Policing in Toronto

Format: Written only

Please note that I'm submitting under a pseudonym and secondary email address to protect my family's privacy. This form required that I enter my phone number and I would be grateful if the number could be withheld from the public record.

Every hour matters when someone is missing or in mental health crisis. I'm suggesting 2 urgent changes that could save lives.

(1) Prioritize missing persons and welfare check calls over other police non-emergency calls:

- I waited 5–6 hours on hold when I called the non-emergency number to file a missing persons report in August 2025.
- I agree that missing person and welfare check calls should not go through 911.
- But I believe missing persons and welfare check calls should be prioritized over other non-emergency calls as they may involve risk to life.

(2) Treat doctor-issued mental health assessment forms with the same urgency as missing persons reports:

- In certain situations, doctors can file a form the police bring a patient to hospital for assessment under the Mental Health Act.
- The police explained to me that these forms are not treated with the same urgency as missing persons reports.
- But individuals in crisis may be at immediate risk so I believe these forms should be prioritized.

In August 2025, I read that staffing is increasing for 911 calls. That is great news and in addition these crucial non-emergency calls need to be treated with the appropriate priority and speed.

I would be grateful to learn if action will be taken on these issues.
Thank you for your service.

First Name: Mir

Last Name: Bahmanyar

Agenda item: 2. What We Heard – Insights Informing the Strategic Plan for Policing in Toronto

Format: Written only

Plain text: The TPS is biased when it comes to pro-Palestine marches. I have been to 30-40 if not more and when there are problems they are always started by hate speech and physical threats from Zionists and Canada Firsters. TPS is so busy trying to intimidate the peaceful protesters that they do a terrible job keeping genocide supporters at a distance. Usually the march organizers safety personnel tries to build a barrier separating the violent counter protesters. This is unacceptable.

The fish they say stinks from the head down and we do know of the poor reputation of the Chief of Police Myron Demkiw vis-à-vis the queer community and his pro-Israel position - why else accept a personal call from Heather Reisman who actively supports genocide and then use the power at his disposal to raid and imprison peaceful protesters whose crime was smearing red paint on a window at Chapters Indigo in Yorkville (and also during protest when taggers get violently arrested). Yet Robert Walker of pro-Zionist Honest Reporting spray paints dozens upon dozens of hate messages at least on two occasions but his home was not raided and neither was he arrested but paid a \$1000 donation to Sick Kids instead - shameful. That is anti-Palestinian racism for all to see. The aggressive posturing and violent arrests at recent anti-genocide marches is also a reflection of this. People who march for peace and against genocide are "othered" while genocide supporters in their annual march for Israel are treated as victims and are protected. TPS needs to stop posturing - their job should be the safety of the anti-genocide marchers, not kettling them in and slamming people to the ground when they get arrested for whatever real or imagined reason. Supporters of genocide ought to be treated as such - a threat to democracy and a threat to the safety of Torontonians. To be fair TPS and OPP did a reasonably good job driving Canada Firsters away from the Pro-Immigrant crowd recently at Queen's Park but it took them way too long.

In light of the fact that TPS trained/trains with Israeli police and uses Israeli software for intelligence gathering, it only makes sense that the TPS and its leadership view pro-Palestinian marchers as the enemy. This must stop - no more training or liaising with Israeli apartheid police. No more budgets wasted on anything Israel-related and no more money wasted on the "Bubble Zone" law. When a "vulnerable" place actively supports genocide it

is not an innocent by-stander but should be protested and that includes CIJA, the JCC, B'nai Brith, councillors et al - protecting them gives them immunity and exposes the current double standard. TPS should enforce laws when vulnerable places have events selling stolen Palestinian lands - which is illegal under Canadian and International law - or when they advocate for the displacement or death of Palestinians under the disguise of terrorism (freedom fighters to most of the world). Why are protesters not allowed at the Israeli consulate - is that a vulnerable place as well? Why are protesters forced to assemble across the street from the US consulate? Clearly the TPS protects supporters of racism and genocide.

In any event, TPS has a poor reputation and it is well deserved. No, not all cops are bastards (and not all are like the Brown Shirts of Nazi Germany) but there are certainly a number that are entirely unprofessional in their conduct and that includes pushing older women. I kid you not. If you do not like to serve the public and interact with them, then find another job. Associations protect their officers, and often wrongly, while wielding too much power. The Chief of Police enforces the will of pro-genocide elites while asking for more tax payers money - this is rich in irony. Meanwhile my neighbour was beaten by three college students some years back and there were no arrests made despite us having identified two of them. Ah, but the vulnerable places...

This is the state of TPS when it comes to the most important issue of the 21st century - a genocide - and how Toronto, afraid of a handful of hateful Zionist organizations and its members, supports Israel and Zionists while othering peaceful protesters. Like the famous saying in the US many years ago: "It's the economy, stupid." Well, today, it is the genocide, stupid.

Thank you for your time.

Name: Nicole Corrado

Agenda item: 3. Toronto Police Service Intimate Partner Violence Annual Report for 2024

Format: Written only

Plain text: Thank you for participating with the Purple Leash campaign. This campaign is excellent and saves many lives. A lot of women stay in abusive relationships if they can not bring their animal companions to a safe place. Please add statistics on animals in your IPV report.

Name: Boris Zemlo

Organization: Health Care Worker Protection Society

Agenda item: 3. Toronto Police Service Intimate Partner Violence Annual Report for 2024

Format: Written only

Plain text: micro-violence adherence protection from

can i call the police on in-visible violence or violations? will they understand?

will they be prosecuted so that violence doesn't occur again?

Name: Nicole Corrado

Agenda item: 4. Update on the Implementation of Auditor General Recommendations

Format: By WebEx/Phone

Plain text: 911 calls are unfortunately still managed by police. This leads to a biased towards a police response. Alternative responses are not prioritized. People call 911 because they are met with a person, not prompts as with 211 or 311. Please add Toronto Community Crisis Service and Toronto Animal Services as first response emergency options through 911.

Name: Nicole Corrado

Agenda item: 5. Annual Report on Training & Development – 2024

Format: By WebEx/Phone

Plain text: I hope all first aid training is done using simulators, rather than real animals.

Animals do not accurately represent human health.

I am also concerned about the lack of canine encounter training for the police, resulting in ten dogs being shot last year.

I am also very concerned about the lack of autism training. The course by the CPKN is not by autistic people. It is by agencies that the autistic community finds offensive. Please add autism training developed by autistic people themselves and make it mandatory for all officers. Please also make animal encounter training mandatory.

Name: Nicole Corrado

Agenda item: 6. Annual Use of Force Report - 2024

Format: By WebEx/Phone

Plain text: I will be deputing on Use of Force against People In Crisis on a later agenda item, so on this item I will focus on another huge problem police killing animals. Last year, eight or ten animals were intentionally shot by police two “aggressive” animals and six sick or injured animals. Several things are seriously wrong here. For one, there is no Canine Encounter training whatsoever, only a brief training module regarding police service dogs. No wildlife training either. No veterinary training. So police encounter terrified injured animals and “deal with them” by shooting. No deescalation. The Use Of Force model is very similar to the Integrated Pest Management model used by pest control companies that use cruel methods.

<https://www.facebook.com/DogsShotByCanadianPolice?> is a civil run volunteer organization that catalogs incidents reported by the public. Police do not have to report what species, what circumstances, nor what could have been done differently. No third party investigation every time takes place. This is a huge ethical and public safety issue.

Please demand that Toronto reinstate 24/7 Animal Services. I am guessing most animal shootings happen between 11pm to 6am when Toronto Animal Services is off duty.

Please also change your antiquated Animal Control procedural. It mentions livestock and promotes the killing of animals. It is outdated, since Toronto has very few cattle running around, no terrestrial rabies since 1996, and the Provincial Animal Welfare Act is now used instead of the OSPCA Act. The OSPCA no longer have any police powers.

https://www.tps.ca/media/filer_public/a4/f9/a4f95d21-dcce-4065-b4b4-e43fb178bcb0/cc97a09b-8c74-491a-bcc9-338fc0861e0a.pdf?fbclid=IwAR1-IgXsddCW10Z-f7c20SyYJPhMFTojaP_XLJjrmAELdbUF50ag2U1Egag

Please work with agencies like www.coyotewatchcanada.com
www.ontariowildliferescue.ca

Please also create a civilian oversight committee to oversee any police animal interactions.

A person online describes Post Traumatic Stress Disorder after watching police shoot bears as a child. “When we were kids in Atikokan they would tree a bear who came into our

neighbourhood and the police would shoot them. I remember how bad that made me feel. I had trouble sleeping after watching the poor bears fall from the tree and then be dragged away.”

Name: Nicole Corrado

Agenda item: 6. Annual Use of Force Report - 2024

Format: By WebEx/Phone

Plain text: After looking closely at the training received by police, it is obvious they have no training on animal encounters and peaceful de escalation of animal encounters, nor do they have training on animal health assessments or animal euthanasia. Due to this lack of training, 10 animals were shot last year, 6 injured or sick animals, 2 "aggressive" animals, and 2 other animals. The species and circumstances are not specified, nor was there any third party investigation into the shootings. In Ontario, only shootings of domestic dogs or horses are recognized. That suggests that police are acting as dog behaviourists and veterinarians, albeit untrained and rather violent ones. Shooting is not generally considered to be an appropriate euthanasia method for animals. Shooting is essentially whacking an animal in the head, which causes the animal to die from a massive epileptic seizure crisis due to brain hemorrhaging. This violence is traumatic for everyone involved.

Here is an AI overview of the many issues with shooting.

Based on veterinary and scientific evidence, shooting is not considered an appropriate method of euthanasia due to the high risk of a non-instantaneous, inhumane death. While a perfectly aimed gunshot to the brain can cause immediate unconsciousness, achieving this outcome consistently is extremely difficult, and failed attempts can cause significant suffering and distress.

Factors contributing to inconsistent and inhumane outcomes

Inaccurate shot placement: Achieving the precise angle and location needed to destroy the brainstem is challenging, even for trained individuals. Studies on gunshot-euthanized animals show that a significant number of shots miss the critical brain structures required for instant death. This can cause a prolonged and agonizing death or leave the animal paralyzed but still conscious.

Animal movement: A distressed or anxious animal is highly likely to move its head, making proper shot placement almost impossible. This is particularly true in field conditions where proper restraint and calming may not be feasible. In contrast, chemical euthanasia is performed after the animal is sedated, making the process calm and painless.

Insufficient firearm power: The wrong firearm or ammunition can fail to penetrate the skull, especially in large animals with thick skulls like bulls or horses. This can result in a non-fatal injury and cause severe pain and terror for the animal.

Human error and training gaps: The lack of formal, hands-on training for performing

gunshot euthanasia leads to inconsistent and often inhumane results. While guidelines exist, proficiency is difficult to attain, and failed attempts are deeply distressing for observers and the personnel involved.

Physical side effects: Even a properly placed shot can result in violent and frightening convulsions as the body's systems shut down. While the animal may be unconscious during this, the visual effect is highly disturbing for owners and bystanders and can spread bodily fluids, creating a public health risk.

Operator safety: The use of firearms carries significant risks to the person performing the euthanasia and anyone nearby. The potential for ricochet is a major safety concern and a reason many organizations prefer safer methods.

Preferred alternative methods

Major veterinary organizations, including the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA), list other methods as preferred or acceptable under specific conditions, often in a clinical setting. These methods offer greater reliability, control, and a more humane outcome for the animal.

November 5, 2025

Chair Shelley Carroll
Toronto Police Services Board
40 College St.
Toronto, ON M5G 2J3

Item 6 Annual Use of Force Report – 2024

Dear Chair Carroll:

We have the following concerns relating to this Report and the need for this Board to adopt its draft Policy, *De-Escalation and Appropriate Use of Force*, to replace the inadequate and outdated Board policy on Use of Force.

1. The Report does not accurately reflect the actual use of force by Toronto Police Service officers.

The Report understates the actual use of force by TPS officers because it is based solely on Use of Force Reports submitted by police officers in accordance with the limited requirements of the provincial use of force regulation, O. Reg. 391/23, *Use of Force and Weapons* (formerly O. Reg. 926, *Equipment and Use of Force*).

A Use of Force Report is only required for force “that results in an injury requiring the services of a physician, nurse or paramedic.” Problematic uses of force by police officers, such as so-called “distraction blows” (punches to the head), kicks, knee strikes, armlocks, unnecessary tackles, neck and choke holds, slamming or forcibly pressing a person’s face or head on a sidewalk or other hard surface, and the like will not be reported if the police decide that the injuries inflicted do not require outside medical care.

This reporting threshold has a second requirement: effective January 1, 2023: the police officer must be “aware that the injury required such [medical] services before the member goes off-duty.” Previously, the threshold was simply whether the injury required medical attention. This requirement creates an unnecessary exception about when a Use of Force Report must be filed. Medical care may be provided only after the officer went off-duty or the officer may simply plead ignorance whether the injury required medical care. This change in reporting threshold makes it impossible to compare the use of force statistics from the years before 2023 to those after. It also makes the threshold for reporting subjective (was the officer aware that the injury required medical attention) rather than objective (did the injury require medical attention), providing officers with a ready-made excuse not to report their use of force.

2. The Board should adopt its draft Board policy, *De-Escalation and Appropriate Use of Force*.

In 2023, this Board began a consultative process to replace the inadequate and outdated Board policy on the Use of Force and held a public consultation in February 2024. The Board then issued a draft policy for consultation, *De-escalation and Appropriate Use of Force*. Since then, nothing. To date, the draft policy has not been adopted.

The existing policy is woefully out of date. It was last reviewed and revised in **2011**. Since then, the *Police Services Act* was replaced in April 2024 by the *Community Safety and Policing Act* and the applicable Regulation amended 10 times. The failure to update this important policy is yet another example of this Board's unwillingness and inability to provide effective civilian governance of the Toronto Police Service.

The Toronto Police Services Procedure, 15-01 *Incident Response (Use of Force/De-Escalation)*, is similarly out of date. It refers to the repealed *Police Services Act* and repealed regulations made under that Act and makes no mention of the new Act and the new regulations.

We urge this Board to adopt its draft policy and direct the Chief to revise TPS Procedure 15.01 and related procedures accordingly.

The draft Board policy if adopted would help rectify the current underreporting of the use of force. It would require the reporting of all police use of force which exceeds mere physical contact and focuses on the real issue, the use of force, and not whether medical care was required or whether the officer was on duty when medical care was provided. If adopted and implemented, the policy would enable the police force to more easily identify officers unnecessarily resorting to force and to take proactive steps to deal with this conduct. It would also provide the Board with better data about the actual use of force by TPS officers.

More importantly, section 9 of the draft policy creates an explicit ban on the use of chokeholds, carotid holds and other techniques intended or likely to prevent respiration (e.g. placing a knee on a detainee's neck as in the murder of George Floyd):


9. Use of techniques such as chokeholds, carotid holds, or any other techniques intended or likely to prevent respiration is prohibited, unless no other reasonable alternatives exist to prevent grievous bodily harm or death of a Service Member or a member of the public during an interaction.

Since George Floyd's death there have been reports of TPS officers using similar holds, including most recently the October 2024 report of the demotion of a TPS officer for excessive force, including placing a knee to a U. of T. student's knee in case of a mistaken identity.

The use of chokeholds has long been recognized as dangerous. Their use can trigger a deadly feedback loop where the person being choked struggles desperately to breathe while the officer applies still more force to subdue a seemingly increasingly uncompliant prisoner. The result can be a crushed airway, severe neck injury and/or death. Racist and discriminatory stereotypingacerbate the dangers. Black and Indigenous suspects and mentally ill persons disproportionately die from the use of neck restraints.

In 1979 the RCMP explicitly banned the use of chokeholds. This Board should do the same by adopting its draft Policy.

Yours Truly,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'H. Morton', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Howard Morton

For the Police Committee of the Law Union of Ontario

Name: Nicole Corrado

Agenda item: 8. Facial Recognition System Follow-up- 2025

Format: Written only

Plain text: Facial recognition is very racially biased and is not very accurate for people of colour, and people with disabilities, especially people with Down syndrome and people with facial differences. Please be careful about false accusations and privacy.

Facial recognition is not accurate to people with Down Syndrome or people of colour, or any facial difference. False accusations can happen, so can privacy violations.

Name: Nicole Corrado

Agenda item: 10. Receipt of Donation

Format: By WebEx/Phone

Plain text: Please do not accept the donation for purchasing a new horse. For one, animals are not property who should be purchased. They are sentient beings who are not consenting to dangerous police work. The police should be retiring all the horses. The pavement is bad for their feet. The noise of crowds is terrifying, and people sometimes attack the horses, leading to injuries and deaths. Horses who are seriously injured are usually shot by police. There is no need for police horses in 2025. There are animal free alternatives. <https://www.ethicalglobe.com/blog/why-horses-and-dogs-have-no-place-in-protest-policing#>

https://m.facebook.com/story.php?story_fbid=pfbid0VYxXQYbzVKYg6LUt24BnDJ2kifgT8fBuYGxobuTsJGPo3LxY1s7wF6FQzy385eScl&id=100064748167397

<https://www.currentaffairs.org/news/animals-shouldnt-be-weapons-for-the-police>

Name: Nicole Corrado

Agenda item: 12. Chief's Administrative Investigation Reports

Format: By WebEx/Phone

Plain text: Once again, the various human deaths and injuries prove why police are the worst response to mental health crises. In 2024.26 12.1 a man told police he has psychosis and needs medication. His behaviour was odd, and police, who know nothing about neurodivergent behaviour, thought the man was drunk and arrested him. Police should have brought him to a hospital since he was probably having a seizure. He died in a prison cell. This terrifies me because, as a person with autism, this easily could have been me.

In 12.2 a man who was neurologically disregulated was cruelly described as having unsound mind. Police were called after he stole a hammer and metal file. Taking weird random things is a sign of neurological disregulation, not aggression or malice. Police screamed at him and shot him dead, possibly disembowelling him with their guns. Absolutely cruel and completely overreacting.

In 12.4 the police handled things well, but the issue is that police were there in the first place. The police presence lead to a panic response (elopement) and subsequent injury. A non police response would have been better.

In 12.5 a suicide completed in police presence. Police presence may cause a person to panic. Laws need to be changed to allow a non police response to suicide attempts that do not involve a firearm.

In 12.10 a suicide by firearm was completed in police presence. It is possible the ETF and no knock raids threatened with tear gas and a lot of screaming could trigger a violent response. Please consider a gentler approach.

In 12.2 a suicidal woman was cruelly described as being of unsound mind. A suicidal mind is a stuck mind, not an unsound one. Police managed the situation well, but perhaps the fire department could have handled things better. Please ask the laws be changed so a non police service can respond to suicidal people who do not have a weapon.

Name: Nicole Corrado

Agenda item: 12. Chief's Administrative Investigation Reports

Format: By WebEx/Phone

Plain text: I would like to discuss the shooting death of an unarmed neurologically disregulated man in crisis. The man had a hammer. Not a gun. He could have been calmed down. Not screamed at, tasered, and shot while in sensory overload. I have a phobia of police because of my autism. And because of this crap. I know an autistic person who has to have plastic utensils and plates because they throw them after eating. Not aggressive just disregulated.

Name: Nicole Corrado

Agenda item: 13. Request for Review of a Service Complaint Investigation: – Professional Standards Case Number – PRS-093892

Format: By WebEx/Phone

Plain text: In this case, a woman with psychosis believed the walls were talking to her. She called police. There is a need for police to learn about how to redirect people to 211, while respecting their perceived reality.

Name: Nicole Corrado

Agenda item: 14. Request for Review of a Service Complaint Investigation: – Professional Standards (P.R.S.) Case Number – PRS-102706 Inspectorate of Policing (I.O.P.) Complaint Number: 24-3851/INV-25-50

Format: Written only

Plain text: This is an accessibility issue that needs to be brought up with the city Accessibility Committee.

Name: Nicole Corrado

Agenda item: 15. Review of Board Advisory Bodies and Public Engagement

Format: Written only

Plain text: Please consult neurodivergent people, not just people who work with them.