



## ARCHIVED - Archiving Content

### Archived Content

Information identified as archived is provided for reference, research or recordkeeping purposes. It is not subject to the Government of Canada Web Standards and has not been altered or updated since it was archived. Please contact us to request a format other than those available.

## ARCHIVÉE - Contenu archivé

### Contenu archivé

L'information dont il est indiqué qu'elle est archivée est fournie à des fins de référence, de recherche ou de tenue de documents. Elle n'est pas assujettie aux normes Web du gouvernement du Canada et elle n'a pas été modifiée ou mise à jour depuis son archivage. Pour obtenir cette information dans un autre format, veuillez communiquer avec nous.

This document is archival in nature and is intended for those who wish to consult archival documents made available from the collection of Public Safety Canada.

Some of these documents are available in only one official language. Translation, to be provided by Public Safety Canada, is available upon request.

Le présent document a une valeur archivistique et fait partie des documents d'archives rendus disponibles par Sécurité publique Canada à ceux qui souhaitent consulter ces documents issus de sa collection.

Certains de ces documents ne sont disponibles que dans une langue officielle. Sécurité publique Canada fournira une traduction sur demande.

**August 19, 2007**

**Chief Jack Ewatski,  
President, Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police**

**Police Information and Statistics (POLIS) Committee  
Annual Report 2006/07**

**Message/Executive Summary:**

The POLIS Committee has extensive representation from police agencies across Canada as well as members from Public Safety Canada and Justice Canada. It is strongly supported by and enjoys an excellent working relationship with the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics (CCJS) and has a formal linkage to the national Justice Information Council (JIC) through representation on the Federal, Provincial and Territorial (FPT) Liaison Officers Committee (LOC). Its work often proceeds slowly as changes to data gathering, analysis and reporting have long-reaching impacts. The POLIS Committee contributes value through the opportunity to develop, improve and deliver accurate statistical and analytical information to the Canadian public, police and government to better understand our environment with respect to offending, victimization and policing, and to thereby facilitate strategic decision making, policy development and resource allocation.

**Committee Mandate/Objectives:**

Vision:

Quality data for quality policing

Mission:

POLIS supports progressive change in policing, in partnership with the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics (CCJS) and other partners, through the development and communication of meaningful public safety information.

Mandate/Objectives:

- Represent the police community in ensuring that emerging police issues, priorities and concerns are addressed by CCJS surveys and products;
- Facilitate the development of partnerships among governments and criminal justice agencies to further the integration of justice information systems;

- Collaborate with CCJS and police organizations in the development of standard police performance indicators;
- Promote improved police management and decision making by identifying, developing and communicating best practices in the collection, analysis and application of statistical information;
- Ensure that, in the development of new and ongoing surveys of crime and police resources, data can be provided by the police community in a standardized and cost-effective manner, minimizing respondent burden and costs;
- Promote innovation in information systems, collection techniques, standard setting and other matters that improve the production and utility of quality police information;
- Review CCJS reports before public release to ensure that appropriate context surrounding issues and trends is included to explain differences in local and regional comparisons, as well as to explain changes in trends in various crimes, crime reporting, police resources and costs.

#### **Meetings Held:\***

August 20, 2006, St. John's (in conjunction with CACP Conference)  
 September 18-19, 2006, Peterborough  
 March 26-27, 2007, Ottawa

\*The minutes of all meetings are available in English and French and are posted on the CACP website.

#### **Summary of Activities and Initiatives:**

**Strategic Priorities 2007 - 2009** – The POLIS Committee has identified the following strategic priorities for its focus and work within the CACP over the next three year interval:

- Geo-coding
- Unreported / Un-investigated Crime – to mitigate and understand levels of unreported and under-counted crime, including the number of investigations being ‘parked’ (reported to police, but not investigated due to workload or other issues)
- Enhancing the comparability of crime statistics
- Sexual exploitation
- High-tech Crime (broader scope than cyber-crime, to include crimes like money laundering)

At its September 2006 and March 2007 meetings, the POLIS Committee reviewed the Strategic Priorities that it had established for itself for the period 2003 – 2006. The following is a brief progress summary:

- To mitigate and understand levels of unreported and under-counted crime – the CCJS’s Fraud study, which examines the feasibility of collecting fraud data from outside of the police community, is a good first step towards having more comprehensive data on fraud, an offence which is drastically under-reported to police.
- Crime and the vulnerability of the elderly – a CCJS report on the elderly as victims of crime released in the winter 2006-07 as part of the Victimization Survey Profile Reports provided detail on this issue.
- High-tech crime – A “cyber crime” variable was added to the latest version (2.2) of the UCR survey to begin addressing the extent of Internet crime. As well, discussions have been held with CCJS to produce a report on this topic once there is sufficient coverage from the UCR2.2 survey.
- Organized crime data collection – POLIS was instrumental in ensuring that a national definition of organized crime and street gangs was created and used for the implementation of these new fields on the UCR2.2 survey. Once survey coverage increases, more information on organized crime will be available through the statistical reporting process.
- Geo-coding – CCJS has produced a number of geo-coding reports for various police services (e.g., Winnipeg, Montreal and Regina) and continues to examine additional sites (e.g., Halifax, Thunder Bay and Edmonton) each year. These reports have been very well received by both the police and community partners.
- Bias-free policing – POLIS requested Statistics Canada to prepare a technical feasibility report evaluating the various methods of collecting data to address the issue of “racial profiling.” This report has been completed and POLIS has shared this report with the CACP Executive, and it will be posted on the CCJS Extranet site enabling access by all Canadian police services.
- Promote accurate inter-jurisdictional comparisons – POLIS is working closely with CCJS to identify key UCR data quality issues and come up with suggestions for improving the comparability in these areas. It was suggested that it should be made clear that the term “jurisdictional” includes “provincial” comparisons, not just comparisons between police services.
- Cross-border crime – No progress.

After reviewing these priorities, POLIS decided to remove the following three current strategic priorities as the objectives had been addressed: elderly, organized crime and bias-free policing, and to remove cross-border crime, as it was not being addressed as a stand-alone issue.

Committee members recommended the addition of the following 2 new strategic initiatives:

- enhancing the comparability of crime statistics – this refers to continuing to examine UCR data quality and comparability issues, developing and implementing a Crime Index, addressing the differences between police-reported data and victimization survey data, and enhancing communications between CCJS and police services in terms of concepts and standardization. This priority would

also include issues related to CPIC interfaces and coding consistencies within police records management systems (RMS).

- Sexual exploitation – this is an issue that appears to be growing and often involves the use of the Internet to facilitate sexual exploitation; more information is required to build understanding of the nature and scope of this problem.

### **Uniform Crime Report (UCR) data quality**

After CCJS staff raised the matter of some UCR inter-police service comparability issues, POLIS requested CCJS prepare a presentation of the top-10 most non-comparable offences. This report was reviewed at the September 2006 meeting. The top-10 list included: “disturbing the peace”, minor thefts and mischief, as well as numerous “administration of justice” offences such as “bail violations,” “breach of probation” and “YCJA offences.” While these offences are not on the more serious end of the offending scale, they are highly significant in terms of their overall number and their affect on a community’s reported “crime rate” (total offences x population).

The objective of the presentation was to discuss possible reasons for the rate differences between police services with the aim of being able to improve comparability. Many possible explanations were put forth for the differences among the agencies, including:

- Some police services may be using local by-laws to enforce what could also be viewed as minor Criminal Code offences
- Some police services were pro-actively doing “home visits” to ensure that conditions of probation or parole were being adhered to – this would result in an increase in administration of justice “breach” offences being detected and recorded in those jurisdictions
- Some police services score each “breach” as a new incident, while others score it on the original incident
- Local Crown policies and attitudes become a factor in many incidents, affecting police investigation and charging practices

Given the factors noted above, the discussion focused on what could be done to improve comparability. One suggestion was for CCJS / POLIS to host a national or regional Data Managers Workshop, similar to the one held about a decade ago. This would involve inviting RMS managers from all UCR2 police services to discuss UCR data quality as well as other related data issues. In addition to hosting a Data Quality Workshop, the POLIS Data Quality Working Group determined that it will continue work in the following areas: (i) pick 3 or 4 key variables to try and improve; (ii) examine the issue of multiple files for the same incident, particularly in respect to “breaches”; and, (iii) look at vehicle recovery data from both Record Management Systems (RMS) and CPIC.

## **Proposed National Data Quality Workshop**

*Background:* It is a significant issue when CCJS releases reported crime and police administration surveys containing data from different police agencies that has been counted and categorized by divergent methods. These reports inevitably lead to cross-jurisdiction comparisons and can have serious impacts for individual agencies. Contributing police agencies need to understand the importance of consistency not only within their own organization but across the breadth of Canada, whether the subject matter is the number of reported incidents, clearance rates, or the cost of providing policing. A presentation at the March 2006 POLIS meeting highlighted some UCR data comparability issues (i.e. large differences in the crime rates) among large police services for certain minor offences. These offences included counterfeiting, bail violations, fail to appear and disturbing the peace. POLIS members recommended that a working group be struck to embark on a project over the next year to examine the “top 10” offences having the most comparability issues among the largest forces. This would involve Centre staff contacting police services directly and asking about local policies, guidelines and practices that might explain some of the differences in rates for these offences. Members from Regina, Edmonton, Saint John, Halifax and the RCMP volunteered to assist the Centre with this work.

*Current Status:* The POLIS Data Quality Working Group will be hosting a 2007 UCR Managers Data Quality Workshop to be held in Ottawa in place of the regular fall POLIS committee meeting. The current plan is to invite all POLIS members and their RMS manager or equivalent position, as well as RMS representatives from a number of other police services not represented by POLIS.

The workshop will focus on key issues of UCR data quality and comparability, and links with the key POLIS strategic issue of “enhancing the comparability of crime statistics and promoting accurate inter-jurisdictional comparisons.” Some of the issues which will be discussed include the consistency in the scoring of incidents cleared “otherwise” and the scoring of Criminal Code incidents which are charged under municipal by-laws or provincial statutes. Members were very enthusiastic about the workshop, saying that it may be one of the most important discussion forums for police services in a long time. Contemplated agenda items, subject to finalization, are as follows:

1. Standardization of reporting practices for minor incidents
  - Non-reportable occurrences – some police services classify incidents as non-reportable to CCJS by using internal codes
  - Clearing incidents by a lesser charge – some police services record CC infractions as municipal by-laws rather than CC violations (e.g. disturbing the peace, possession of marijuana)
  - A clear recommendation is needed from CACP for all police services to record all CC incidents
2. Bail violations/Fail to appear/Fail to comply

- Consistent with CCJS scoring rules, police services should be creating a new incident for bail violations; however, some attach it to the original offence or send each condition violated
3. Reconcile how much information moves from the CAD to the RMS
    - To determine what is being misclassified or not reported (e.g. disturbing the peace)
  4. UCR rules for scoring incidents
    - Scoring multiple violations within the same incident
    - At what point a violation becomes a new incident
  5. Capture *Criminal Code* violations and UCR violations
    - Is this feasible? e.g. use a drop-down menu (to avoid formatting errors)
  6. Definitional issues
    - Provide clear direction on the use of those variables which tend to cause the most confusion
      - Over/under use of certain clearance options (i.e. “departmental discretion” and “complainant declines to lay charges”)
      - Location (e.g. what is a dwelling, why do car dealerships have special rules, when does location change)
      - Property stolen (e.g. where to code Blackberry)
      - Motor vehicle theft (when and how to use counters)
      - Fraud (when and how to score fraud, fraud counter, type)
  7. Overuse of “unknown” response codes
  8. Separate traffic violations from other CC violations within the same incident

### **Development of a National Crime Index**

*Background:* In September 2004, POLIS examined the differences in the rates of relatively non-serious, high-volume offences for all of the police services represented on the committee. Much discussion was generated surrounding the data and the possible explanations for wide differences between police services. POLIS determined to address this issue over the next few years with an aim to develop "best practices" and communicate these to the entire CACP. POLIS also decided to explore with CCJS the potential development of a national "Crime Index" that would reduce the impact of high-volume offences (which are prone to non-reporting) on overall crime rates, providing a more meaningful portrayal of crime to Canadians. In March 2005, POLIS received a presentation from Mr. John Turner on CCJS work on the possible development of a national “Crime Index.” A number of different options, ranging from a sub-set of serious, comparable offences to looking at all offences using a “seriousness index,” based on court sentencing data to weight individual offences were examined. In most of the

presented options, the offences driving the “Crime Index” turned out to be the more serious ones--such as robbery, break-ins and motor vehicle theft. POLIS thought pursuing this initiative would be worthwhile and undertook to form a working group, consisting of representatives from the police community, police boards, federal/provincial justice ministries and the academic community to refine the “Index.” During 2005 – 2006, the Crime Index Working Group (which includes nine POLIS members) led by Mr. John Turner began a series of tele-conference meetings.

*Current Status:* the Working Group has resolved all of the significant methodological issues with the exception of the impact that “counterfeiting” offences are having on both the current “crime rate” and potentially on the proposed “Crime Index.” Consultations are underway with various Statistics Canada methodological experts and committees who specialize in these sorts of indices. POLIS is aware that any proposed national “Crime Index” would have to have extensive support from the CACP in order to be successfully implemented. Funding has been received from within Statistics Canada to work on the development and communication of the Crime Index over the next two years. When the work is done, and if a recommendation for change results, POLIS will bring the proposal forward as a report and request a formal CACP resolution. The current plan is to make a presentation on this initiative at the 2008 CACP conference, targeting implementation in time for the release of 2008 crime statistics in July 2009.

### **Mental Health Study**

At the fall 2006 meeting, POLIS strongly recommended that CCJS undertake a special study on mental illness and its impact on police and the entire justice system. This study was later approved for the 2007-08 fiscal year and Sara Johnson, project manager, used the opportunity of a face-to-face POLIS meeting in Ottawa in March 2007 to consult members on a variety of issues for this study.

In a round-table discussion of mental illness-related issues facing police, the following issues were raised as major concerns for the police:

- Need for a clear definition of “mental illness” before any meaningful statistics can be gathered
- Chronic mentally ill, homeless and drug addicted offenders in downtown areas of major cities
- Wait times for police in dealing with mentally ill offenders
- Having police now responsible for transporting mentally ill offenders to hospital in certain communities instead of by ambulance
- How to de-classify someone who has been labelled as “mentally ill” – these classifications can have a long-term effect on individuals for things like “background checks” – related is the issue of records retention
- More mentally ill persons are being released from institutions and police are often left to deal with them – related is the lack of follow-up on mentally ill persons released



- Police have had to create special teams to deal with these types of offenders – resource implications
- Community sentencing without sufficient resources to supervise

### **Fraud Special Study to address under-reporting**

*Background:* POLIS has been working for some time to address the problem of accurately capturing fraud data and analyzing trends. CCJS has planned a cost-recovery project to develop a national survey of fraud as it impacts major sectors of the economy. POLIS has been working with the **Private Sector Liaison Committee** as well as other stakeholders to improve reporting in this area. In September 2004, POLIS adopted the following three changes to be incorporated in the next major update of the UCR2 survey:

1. that the fraud counter be used in any analyses concerning fraud to more accurately portray the incidence of this offence. This effectively ensures a similar method of counting for both cheque and transaction card fraud;
2. that the "type" of transaction card fraud be expanded on the UCR2 survey to create more distinct categories such as: debit/ATM, credit card (financial institution), other credit card (retail), and other transaction cards (telephone); and,
3. that the "jurisdiction" for fraud be determined by using the following scoring rule: the location of the victim (person or company) determines which police service is responsible for reporting unless other agreements between police services have been made; however, if the accused was arrested in a different jurisdiction from the victim, then the arresting location of the accused becomes the jurisdiction.

CCJS undertook a special study to assess the feasibility of improving the measurement of fraud by businesses in Canada. A consultation document was circulated to determine the information needs and priorities of committee members, including types of fraud, measuring fraud, reasons for reporting/not reporting to police, and satisfaction with police responses. In preparation of the feasibility study, Ms. Rebecca Kong of the CCJS Integration & Analysis Program conducted 24 consultations on data needs and data availability with 43 different organizations as well as focus-group question testing sessions that began in late October 2005. The **CACP Private Sector Liaison Committee** has been very helpful in identifying contacts in many of these organizations.

*Current Status:* The feasibility study on the potential collection of fraud data directly from businesses to enhance the limited amount of information reported to the police is complete. A pilot survey to collect fraud data from businesses is underway and CCJS is attempting to secure funding for a fraud household survey. This is important work and when complete should substantially assist with the determination of offence levels in this traditionally under-reported, under-counted category.

## **Aboriginal identity UCR2 data collection – Pilot Study**

*Background:* At its fall 2001 meeting, the POLIS Committee passed a motion to recommend to the Liaison Officers Committee (LOC) the discontinuation of the Aboriginal data variable from the UCR2 survey due to inconsistent applications and varied usage by police jurisdictions across Canada, resulting in problems with accuracy, completeness and comparability. Areas of particular concern were the use of visual identification as a method to identify an Aboriginal person, as well as the practical constraints faced by front-line officers asking race-based questions of the victim and/or offender during the course of an arrest or investigation. Another critical concern was whether jurisdictional privacy or freedom of information legislation or policies placed any restrictions on the collection of race-based statistics.

Following the POLIS motion to discontinue UCR2 Aboriginal data collection, the federal/provincial/territorial Liaison Officers Committee (the POLIS Chair sits on this committee) established a Working Group on Aboriginal Data Needs in an effort to better understand current practices and to make recommendations that could improve data collection and lead to the retention of this data element on the UCR2 survey.

The Working Group has made progress in addressing some of the POLIS concerns. Consultations conducted with jurisdictions in 2003 indicated that the collection of Aboriginal/race data or the transmission of these data to Statistics Canada is not explicitly prohibited by federal/provincial/territorial privacy or freedom of information legislation. As well, on definitional issues, the Working Group recommended that “self-identification” be the preferred method for collecting data on Aboriginal persons in the justice system, and that, in recognition of the problems faced by police in collecting Aboriginal data, visual identification is also considered to be acceptable where self-identification is not practical.

Notwithstanding the progress made, police continue to have concerns regarding the collection of Aboriginal data, and POLIS has upheld its recommendation to discontinue collection of Aboriginal identifying information. Coverage is uneven, with some police services refusing to provide the data and others engaging in diverse or incomplete data collection practices. Significantly, the RCMP are no longer providing Aboriginal identity information to the Homicide survey and are not going to provide these data on the UCR2 survey, as they implement their new records management system (RMS).

POLIS is upholding its recommendation that the Aboriginal variable be discontinued from the UCR2 survey. POLIS is of the view that the decision for police to collect aboriginal identifying information must be made by government and direction from government is needed to enable police to collect it. Additionally the POLIS committee has recommended that determining the support of Aboriginal people for police collection of these data is an important step that should precede any governmental direction in this regard.

As such, at the March 2004 committee meeting, POLIS agreed with the LOC Working Group recommendation to request federal/provincial Deputy Ministers responsible for justice (Justice Information Council - JIC) to formally endorse the importance of police collecting quality information on the involvement of Aboriginals in crime, as well as to consider undertaking

consultations with Aboriginal organizations. In addition, John Turner, on behalf of POLIS, attended the June 2004 meeting of the **CACP Policing with Aboriginal People Committee** to provide an update of the POLIS work in this area.

*Current Status:* The issue of data quality concerns over the police collection of Aboriginal identity information for both victims and accused persons by police for the UCR2 survey has been ongoing for about five years. POLIS has been on record as not supporting the collection of this information by police until such time as support by senior government officials was received. In June 2005, the Justice Information Council (JIC – the FPT Deputy Ministers responsible for justice) provided a clear affirmation of their support for the collection of Aboriginal identity data by police, and approved a plan to address concerns regarding police-reported data collection on a jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction basis, beginning with a “pilot” project in Saskatchewan. The principal aspects of this project will include consultations with key stakeholders, training and communication strategies, developing best practices and evaluation of the results. Approximately \$100,000 is required to hire a contractor to conduct consultations with Aboriginal groups in Saskatchewan to determine if there is support from the Aboriginal community for police to be collecting this information. This project would also involve talking to all police services in the province to arrive at a best-practices document for the collection of data by police on the Aboriginal identity of all crime victims and accused persons. As of June 2007, it appears that federal funding for the pilot could be available in the latter part of 2007.

### **UCR Coverage**

CCJS reports that the current coverage of the UCR2 incident-based survey (as opposed to the previous aggregate survey) is now over 90% of the national volume of police-reported crime in Canada. The only significant coverage gap is in British Columbia, where the province is still implementing its province-wide BC PRIME system. That work is scheduled to be completed by March 2008, meaning the entire province will then be implemented on the UCR2 survey.

### **The evolving nature of organized crime “groups”**

At the March 2007 meeting, Ms. Carol-Anne Gendre of Criminal Intelligence Service Canada (CISC) presented a new typology of categorizing organized crime groups currently under consideration by CISC. Ms. Gendre stated that there have been recent trends towards multi-ethnic composition of organized crime groups, meaning that the traditional “ethnic” terminology used to categorize these groups may no longer be as useful as it once was. CISC was asked to make this presentation by CCJS as the traditional organized crime group names are currently being used in the new 2.2 version of the UCR survey. CISC has recently switched their focus for reporting organized crime activity towards the various types of criminal markets, such as: illicit drugs, financial crimes, contraband, motor vehicle theft and human trafficking. They have agreed to keep

POLIS and CCJS notified of any significant decisions regarding changes in the naming conventions of organized crime groups over the next few years.

### **First release of UCR 2.2 data on organized crime and hate crime**

In February 2007, the first release of UCR2.2 data on organized crime, street gangs, hate-motivated crime and cyber crime was made from data available from the Ottawa and London police services, the only 2 police services who were able to provide a full year of 2005 data. The coverage of this latest version of the survey (UCR2.2) will continue to expand and training will continue with police agencies. Both the Niche RMS system and the MIP system in Quebec should be fully UCR2.2 compatible by January 2008. In addition, CCJS received funding from Canadian Heritage to do a “supplemental” hate crime survey in 2007 in order to have virtually full national coverage of hate crime in Canada for 2006. This report is expected to be released in the spring 2008.

### **CCJS Products for 2007-08**

Each fall, CCJS begins its planning process for products to be done in the next fiscal year. As such, POLIS members are asked to put forward any suggestions they may have for topics that address key issues facing the police community, as well as provide feedback to the topics that CCJS is considering putting forward.

Members recommended two ideas be put forward for consideration: a report on prostitution, focusing on massage parlours, and a report on cyber crimes, including fraudulent e-mail scams and spamming. Of the topics identified by CCJS, POLIS was in favour of the Juristats on “violent crime and firearms,” and on “youth crime in relation to the YCJA.” POLIS was also very supportive of the proposed special study on “mental illness and its impact on the entire justice system.”

At the March 2007 meeting, Ms. Val Peters, Senior Analyst at CCJS, presented the Centre’s ideas relating to a changing product line to meet the needs of today’s users and move the Centre’s products into alignment with federal policies on digital access. Changes under consideration would allow CCJS to free-up resources to make better analytical use of the increasing wealth of microdata at CCJS, including UCR2 data. She discussed each major policing-related product with members, indicating that the objective was to provide more streamlined, easy-to-read, issue-driven reports without removing any pertinent information. Members provided suggestions and cautions regarding these proposed changes. Val mentioned that the annual Crime Statistics Juristat would be the first report to follow this new format and members were encouraged to provide comments when they received it for review.

### **Activities / Meetings Planned for 2007/08:**

October 25-26, 2007, Ottawa – Data Quality Workshop

March / April, 2008, (date and location to be determined) – semi-annual meeting

### **Committee Members:**

Hohn-Martens	Lana	Ms.	Calgary Police Service
MacKay	Ken	Inspector	Edmonton Police Service
Kijewski	Kristine	Director	Toronto Police Service
Sanders	Trevor	Mr.	Public Safety Canada
Frei	Brian	Major	Canadian Forces Provost Marshall
Fugère	Paul	M.	Sûreté du Québec
Gravill	Larry	Chief	Waterloo Regional Police
Johnston	Calvin	Chief	Regina Police Service ( <i>Chair</i> )
Jolliffe	Eric	Deputy Chief	York Regional Police
McLaren	Terry	Chief	Peterborough Lakefields Community Police
Falkenham	Cliff	Inspector	Halifax Regional Police
Latimer	Jeff	Mr.	Justice Canada
O'Sullivan	Sue	Deputy Chief	Ottawa Police Service
Malone	Brian	Mr.	Saint John Police Service
Richard	Guy	Chef de service	Montréal Urban Community Police
Schnitzer	Steve	Inspector	Vancouver Police Service
Scott	Corrine	Superintendent	Winnipeg Police Service
Singleton	Ab	Inspector	St. John's, RNC
Goodfellow	Rob	Superintendent	Ontario Provincial Police
Turner	John	Mr.	CCJS ( <i>Vice-Chair</i> )
Perry	Darlene	Ms.	Victoria Police
Walker	Chuck	Superintendent	RCMP

### **Committee Partners / Sponsors:**

The POLIS Committee would not be viable without the continuous support (logistical, administrative and financial) of the Statistics Canada Centre for Justice Statistics (CCJS) Police Program led by Mr. John Turner, as well as the many police agencies who contribute the time and resources for their members to participate. POLIS is further strengthened by the active membership and participation of senior representatives from Justice Canada (Mr. Jeff Latimer) and Public Safety Canada (Mr. Trevor Sanders).

### **New POLIS Committee Chair**

Effective August 2007, it is expected that the President of the CACP will endorse a recommendation from the POLIS Committee that Deputy Chief Sue O'Sullivan of the Ottawa Police Service be named POLIS Chair. Having served as the Chair for the past five years and having been a POLIS member for almost eight years, it is time for new leadership and more change. It has been a pleasure and a powerful learning experience to have been part of this work and this group of people; thank you for the opportunity and the support ... all the best as you continue to move forward.

Chief Cal Johnston, Chair