

Ontario Review Board

Annual Report

Fiscal Reporting Period April 1, 2019 – March 31, 2020



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Message from the Chair.....	1
Overview of the Ontario Review Board.....	3
Jurisdiction of the Ontario Review Board.....	4
Organization of the Ontario Review Board.....	5
Increasing Complexity of Board Hearings.....	6
Performance Measures and Targets.....	7
By Way of Summary	11
Pre-Hearing Conferences.....	11
Education and Communication.....	12
Recruitment Activities and Membership.....	12
Members of the Board	13
Ontario Review Board Personnel.....	17
Financial Information.....	18



151 Bloor Street West, 10th Floor
Toronto ON M5S 2T5
Telephone: (416) 327-8866
Facsimile: (416) 327-8867

Message from the Chair

Once again, this past year has brought to the Ontario Review Board a great number of hearings regarding individuals with verdicts of either Unfit to Stand Trial or Not Criminally Responsible (NCR) on account of mental disorder. This remains so even though many prospective NCR verdicts are obviated through the provincial diversion program. Our data confirms that mentally ill individuals becoming involved with the criminal justice system remains a significant concern.

At the same time we are aware of the efforts being made with innovative programs to 'divert' many of these people out of the courts and Review Board systems earlier in the process. I am of the view that these efforts have great potential. In particular, there is the work of the various Mental Health Courts, the Ministry of the Attorney General's 'Diversion of Mentally Disordered Accused', and various 'pre-arrest' diversion strategies which are proving to be very effective.

As I am at the eight-year mark as Chair of the ORB we have, as indicated last year, made considerable progress and have identified three key target objectives which we have kept in focus and have been improving over the past three years:

1. Reduction in hearing times through more extensive pre-hearing conferencing,
2. Reduction in the time from hearing to the production of our Reasons,
3. Reduction in the number of adjourned hearings, accomplished through:
 - i. More extensive pre-hearing conferencing, and
 - ii. Scheduling of hearings 9 months in advance (so as to avoid parties' 'conflicts')
4. The newly implemented electronic distribution of hearing materials has resulted in substantial savings.

COVID-19: While the pandemic only reached florid proportions by the very end of the last fiscal year, the ORB immediately set about putting into operation a system whereby our administrative staff could all work remotely. As well, we set about mastering technology so that our hearings could be conducted remotely using an audio-visual platform. This video conferencing technology was up and running by the end of the last fiscal year. The ORB has, as a result, been operating at full capacity.

Meanwhile, the Review Board continues to fulfill its statutory mandate as set out in Part XX.1 of the *Criminal Code of Canada*, complemented by its strong membership and supported by a very effective

administrative office. All are dedicated to conducting efficient hearings all within the legislated time lines. In order to effect our mandate it is essential that the ORB can rely upon appointments and reappointments to the Board in accordance with relevant directives.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Richard D. Schneider', written in a cursive style.

The Honourable Mr. Justice Richard D. Schneider

Overview of the Ontario Review Board

The Ontario Review Board is a unique tribunal that, with its counterparts, forms a critical component of the Canadian justice system. While it operates within the province of Ontario, the Ontario Review Board is not governed by provincial legislation, but by federal legislation.

Established under Part XX.1 of the *Criminal Code*, the role of the Ontario Review Board is clearly defined as follows:

“A Review Board shall be established or designated for each province to make or review dispositions concerning any accused in respect of whom a verdict of not criminally responsible by reason of mental disorder or unfit to stand trial is rendered, and shall consist of not fewer than five members appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council of the province...”(Part XX.1)

While the role of each Review Board is the same from province to province, the *Criminal Code* states that “a Review Board shall be treated as having been established under the laws of the province.” This statement recognizes the fact that the efficiency and effectiveness of each Board in each province hinges on its connection to the province’s psychiatric facilities and mental health delivery system.

The Ontario Review Board’s procedures are directed solely by the *Criminal Code* and the *Public Inquiries Act*. Unlike adjudicative agencies that are created by provincial statute, the Ontario Review Board is not subject to the provisions of the *Statutory Powers Procedure Act*. Appeals from decisions of the Ontario Review Board are made to the Court of Appeal for Ontario.

Jurisdiction of the Ontario Review Board

The Ontario Review Board has jurisdiction over individuals, referred to in the *Criminal Code* as “accused,” who the Ontario courts have found to be either unfit to stand trial (unfit), or not criminally responsible (NCR) on account of mental disorder for the commission of a criminal offence.

Individuals found to be unfit to stand trial continue to be subject to the jurisdiction of the Ontario Review Board until it finds them fit to stand trial. At that time, they are returned to the court and if the court confirms that verdict, their cases proceed in the normal course.

In dealing with accused found not criminally responsible on account of mental disorder, the Ontario Review Board’s responsibility is to hold a hearing and to make a disposition for each accused under its jurisdiction, taking into consideration the “*need to protect the public from dangerous persons, the mental condition of the accused, the reintegration of the accused into society and the other needs of the accused.*”

These complex factors must be considered at each hearing conducted by the Ontario Review Board. They affect both the liberty of individuals and the safety of the public. The importance of the Ontario Review Board’s decisions as they relate to these basic human rights is further underlined by the fact that appeals from the Ontario Review Board’s decisions are made directly to the Court of Appeal for Ontario.

Decisions of the Ontario Review Board are referred to as dispositions. Following a hearing, the Ontario Review Board renders one of three dispositions:

- 1) An absolute discharge
- 2) A discharge subject to conditions; or
- 3) Detention in a hospital, subject to conditions.

For those detained in hospital, the Ontario Review Board issues a warrant for detention as set out in the *Criminal Code*.

Other than absolute discharges, dispositions of the Ontario Review Board are to be reviewed by the Ontario Review Board at least once every twelve months.

Parties to a hearing typically include the accused, the person in charge of the hospital in which the accused is or may be detained or to which the accused reports, and a representative of the Attorney General. Other persons who have a substantial interest in protecting the interests of the accused may be made a party if the Ontario Review Board is of the opinion that it is just to designate such persons as parties.

Organization of the Ontario Review Board

In carrying out its mandate as directed by the *Criminal Code*, the Ontario Review Board operates in a fashion similar to the courts.

As of March 31, 2020, the Ontario Review Board had 149 members. In addition to a full time Chair, the Ontario Review Board's part time members include 33 Alternate Chairs, 21 Legal Members, 60 Psychiatrists, 22 Psychologists, and 12 Public Members. All are residents of Ontario. The members of the Ontario Review Board are appointed by Order-in-Council.

Board Composition

The *Criminal Code* stipulates that the Chairperson must be a judge of the Federal Court or of a provincial superior, district or county court, or a person who has retired from or is entitled to be appointed to such a judicial office. "Chairperson" by definition includes not only the Chairperson as appointed by the provincial Cabinet, but also any other qualified member whom the Chairperson designates as an "alternate chairperson" to act on the Chairperson's behalf. In Ontario, the Chair usually appoints alternate chairs who are lawyers with 10 years' experience, judges or retired judges.

The *Criminal Code* also specifies that a quorum for a hearing consists of three Ontario Review Board members. Each panel must have a Chairperson or Alternate Chairperson, a Psychiatrist and any other member. The Ontario Review Board usually sits in panels of five consisting of the Chair or Alternate Chair, two Psychiatrists, or one Psychiatrist and one Psychologist, a Legal Member and a Public Member.

Board Hearings

An initial hearing, held after an individual has been found unfit to stand trial or not criminally responsible on account of mental disorder for the commission of a criminal offence in court, is usually conducted in the hospital where the accused is detained or directed to attend, or in a court house. The Ontario Review Board no longer holds hearings in jails or detention centres. The Ontario Review Board is required by statute to hold an initial hearing within 45 or 90 days following the verdict of the court.

An annual hearing is required for those accused who are already subject to the Ontario Review Board's jurisdiction. Annual reviews are conducted in the provincially-designated psychiatric facility where the accused is detained or reporting, in a courtroom, or in other meeting rooms open to the public.

Those who are declared to be unfit to stand trial must be represented by counsel at hearings conducted by the Ontario Review Board, and most accused persons found not criminally responsible on account of mental disorder for the commission of a criminal offence are also represented by counsel. At each hearing, evidence from the hospital where the accused is detained or to which an accused is required to report is considered along with other evidence which may be adduced. Following deliberation by the panel who has conducted the hearing, a written disposition and the written reasons for that disposition are issued.


Increasing Complexity of Board Hearings

We have been able to attenuate considerably the trend toward longer and more complex hearings which we had been experiencing over the past several years. While our hearings are complex, most of our hearings are now completed within the allotted time slot. This has been accomplished through more effective use of pre-hearing conferences which serve to obviate much of what might otherwise have been litigated. It remains the case that most parties to the Board's hearings are represented by counsel.

Continued guidance from the Court of Appeal assists the Board in providing fair hearings to the people under its jurisdiction. Appellate decisions in the past fiscal year reiterated the obligation of the Board to convene timely hearings, especially where restrictions of liberty have resulted. Appellate decisions both articulate the expectations of the court and clarify the Board's statutory mandate; however, they can increase the obligations upon the Board's operation.

Since the amendments to the *Criminal Code* in 2006, and continuing to date, more administrative time is required to meet the Board's responsibility to victims, and to provide them with information about the Board. The Board's data-base of notified victims now surpasses the number of accused persons under the Board's jurisdiction. Now that Bill C-14 has come into force (July 11, 2014) our obligations in this regard have added considerably to the time required to manage our case load. The Board is now being required to notify victims whenever an accused is either absolutely or conditionally discharged, every time the Board sends a High Risk Accused ('HRA') to court for review and every time the Board receives a new accused with a verdict of NCR. The Board must also ensure victims receive Notices of Hearings, Dispositions and Reasons, as well as Notice that hearings have been adjourned or re-scheduled to permit the timely filing of victim impact statement.

New Accused (NCR and Unfit)



2019/20	192
2017/18	198
2015/16	206
2013/14	189
2011/12	251
2009/10	275
2007/08	318
2005/06	269
2003/04	148
2001/02	179
1999/00	200
1997/98	196
1995/96	222
1993/94	210
1991/92	80
1989/90	82
1987/88	73

Figure 1 - Number of New Accused in the system (Biennial)

Performance Measures and Targets

The core business of the Ontario Review Board is to conduct hearings and issue dispositions in accordance with the *Criminal Code* within the mandatory timeframes - 45 or 90 days after the verdict is rendered, and at least annually thereafter.

During the fiscal year 2019-2020 the courts found 46 accused to be unfit to stand trial and 146 not criminally responsible on account of mental disorder for the commission of a criminal offence for a total of 192 new accused coming under the jurisdiction of the Board (see Figure 1).

The ongoing influx of new accused continues to have a significant financial impact on the Ontario Review Board. The initial hearings for these new accused are more expensive to convene as they must be scheduled on an *ad hoc* basis and typically require more travel and accommodation. The hearings are held where the accused is being detained or resides. These matters are usually heard singly rather than organized with a group of other cases as are the annual hearings because they need to be conducted within 45 days of the court verdict. There had often been adjournments when insufficient information was available as to the mental condition of the accused or what, if any, threat the accused posed to the safety of the public. To address this last problem, pre-hearing conferences are initiated for all initial hearings where the accused is either detained in jail or living in the community, in order to narrow issues, determine if an assessment is required, and witnesses need to be called. Where an accused is not connected to a hospital at the time of an initial hearing the ORB ensures that there is sufficient information to conduct a hearing.

Number of Hearings




Figure 2 - Number of Hearings (Biennial)

After making a disposition, the Ontario Review Board must review that disposition within 12 months and every 12 months thereafter until such time as the Board cannot conclude that the accused remains a significant threat to the safety of the public.

In addition to initial hearings and annual hearings, the *Criminal Code* provides for a discretionary early review of a disposition at the request of any party. An early review is mandatory if requested by the hospital or if an individual's liberties are restricted for more than seven days. The total number of all hearings conducted by the Board in 2019-2020 was 1960 (see Figure 2).

Absolute Discharges




Figure 3 – Absolute Discharges (Biennial)

Accused persons that are not criminally responsible or under the former term, Not Guilty by Reason of Insanity (NGRI), remain under the jurisdiction of the Ontario Review Board until such time as they are granted an absolute discharge by the Board. In 1999 the Supreme Court decision in *Winko* clarified the test for an absolute discharge, and the Ontario Review Board experienced a significant increase in the number of absolute discharges it granted (see Figure 3).

Those found Unfit to Stand Trial remain under the jurisdiction of the Board until such time as the court either finds the accused fit to stand trial or until the court grants a stay (if it finds the unfit accused both permanently unfit and not a significant threat to the safety of the public).

Number of Accused Under Board's Jurisdiction




Figure 4 – Number of Accused (Biennial) (Note: this includes 'Fit Return to Court' files which are kept open pending Court confirmation.)

As a result of *Winko*, the Ontario Review Board experienced more equilibrium between the number of accused entering the system, and those exiting via absolute discharge, although the Board continues to see an annual increase in the total number of accused persons under its supervision in recent years.

Variables such as amendments to the *Criminal Code*, court decisions, intake hearing fluctuations, and rate of discharge dictate the Ontario Review Board's workload, which can fluctuate dramatically from month to month. The Ontario Review Board overall meets its demanding schedule and delivers quality service.

Occasionally the Board exceeds the deadline for a hearing, but this represents a small percentage of overall scheduled hearings. Reasons for an adjourned hearing include:

- Adjournment at the request of a party;
- Adjournment to obtain evidence or an assessment;
- Failure of the Board to be notified of new accused;
- Clerical error.

The Ontario Review Board continues to pursue methods of increasing the efficiency of its operations and processes, and the delivery of a high quality of service.

By Way of Summary

As can be seen from the number of hearings conducted during the 2019-2020 year, the Ontario Review Board is continually challenged to provide hearings in accordance with the legislated timelines while also providing a high quality of service.

Each year the Board is able to achieve these timelines in the vast majority of cases, as we did in 2019-2020, while integrating a significant number of new accused persons into the existing work load.

Pre-Hearing Conferences

In recognizing that with the increasing complexity of hearings come increased costs, we have implemented a pre-hearing conference process for any case that is identified by the Board or any party as requiring more than 1.5 hours of hearing time. This process has allowed the Board over the past year to best maximize the time allotted for annual review hearings. An experienced alternate chair is assigned to meet with all counsel to rationalize time requirements, and to define the issues in order to improve the hearing process. Pre-hearing conferences ensure that we act in a proactive manner to identify and narrow issues, and to allot appropriate resources to cases that have greater complexity.

Pre-hearing conferences are also initiated for all initial hearings where the accused is either detained in jail or living in the community, to narrow issues, determine if an assessment is required, and witnesses need to be called. Where an accused is not connected to a hospital at the time of an initial hearing the ORB will have to ensure that there is sufficient information to conduct a hearing.

In 2019-2020 the Board conducted 312 (155 initials, 157 annuals) pre-hearing conferences.

Education and Communication

In keeping with our commitment to provide a high quality of service and expertise for the community and the accused persons who come before the Board, we have remained vigilant in communicating changes in the law and forensic psychiatry/psychology to all members throughout the year. These are often distributed in memorandums, or meetings with Alternate Chairs and Legal Members. As a matter of practice, the ORB has held yearly education seminars which tackle topical issues in the forensic field and are directed to better inform our members with the most up to date evidence and practices concerning forensic patients. These three sessions had been specifically designed for Public Members, Legal Members, and one session for the entirety of the membership.

The Education Session held for all members this past fiscal year, tackled topical issues in the field of mental disorder and the law and provided members with the most up to date evidence-based information and practices concerning decision making for forensic patients. The session provided an opportunity for members to learn about key legal decisions and policies, the field of risk assessment and risk management necessary for day-to-day decision making at hearings. Members were able to familiarize themselves with the Board's policies and procedures involved in the ORB's operation.

Unfortunately, despite the importance of these sessions, and despite the fact that the cost of these sessions was more than recouped with other operational savings, the ORB was not able to get Ministry approval to conduct our education sessions for the Public Members and the Legal Members.

Finally, we communicate with courts and consult on issues that may arise at the time that an accused person is found NCR or unfit and maintain an ongoing dialogue with the Courts to enhance the timeliness and quality of service provided to the community and the accused persons who come within our jurisdiction.

The Board is thankful for the cooperation we receive from the Courts and the Ministry in helping us achieve these goals. We look forward to reporting on more achievements next year.

Recruitment Activities and Membership

There were a large number of Order in Council appointments which expired over the past fiscal year. The ORB urged the government to reappoint these members. The failure to reappoint members as requested greatly impacted the composition of panels and the scheduling of hearings. Advertisements were posted on the Public Appointments Secretariat website for Psychiatrist, Legal, and Public members in September 2019. While we have had a number of new appointments over the past year, we have not been able to obtain approval for education sessions required to train these new members.

Members of the Ontario Review Board

Member	Date First Appointed	Date Current Term Expires
Chair		
The Honourable Mr. Justice R.D. Schneider (Full-time Chair & Sitting Judge)	June 27, 2012	June 12, 2022
Alternate Chairs (& Legal Members)		
The Hon. R. Armstrong*	May 29, 2013	December 31, 2019
Ms. L. Banks	October 20, 2010	October 19, 2020
The Hon. W. Bassel*	December 10, 2014	December 9, 2019
Mr. G. Beasley	January 9, 2013	January 8, 2023
Mr. R. Bigelow	January 15, 2016	January 14, 2021
Dr. H. Bloom	January 25, 1990	September 30, 2022
Ms. J.D. Burnside	May 4, 2005	May 3, 2021
Ms. J. Cameron	January 9, 2013	January 8, 2023
Mr. P. Capelle*	January 5, 2015	January 4, 2020
Ms. Kathryn Chalmers	October 20, 2010	October 19, 2020
Ms. K. Chown*	April 8, 2009	April 7, 2019
Mr. R.G. Coates	February 7, 2007	February 6, 2022
Dr. K. Connidis	February 24, 2016	February 23, 2021
Mr. W.B. Donaldson	June 25, 2003	June 24, 2021
Ms. C. Fromstein	August 25, 2004	August 24, 2022
Mr. J. Goldenberg	November 3, 2004	November 6, 2022
The Hon. G.Y. Goulard	June 30, 2000	June 21, 2021
Ms. R. Grinberg	April 11, 2006	April 10, 2021
Mr. P. Hageraats*	April 2, 2014	April 1, 2019
Mr. J. Hodgson	December 17, 2013	December 16, 2019
Ms. S. Kert*	April 29, 1999	January 16, 2020
The Hon. J.M. Labrosse	May 14, 1997	May 13, 2021
Ms. Michele Labrosse*	November 3, 2009	November 24, 2019
Ms. C. MacDonald*	March 25, 2009	March 24, 2020
Mr. C.M. MacIntyre	February 18, 2004	February 17, 2021
Mr. F. McArdle	December 17, 2013	December 16, 2021
The Hon. D.J. McCombs	February 27, 2008	February 26, 2023
Ms. J. Mills*	December 17, 2013	January 16, 2020
Mr. J. A. Neuberger	June 19, 2002	February 20, 2021
Ms. E.J. Polak*	June 17, 2009	June 16, 2019
Mr. R. Richardson	December 4, 2013	December 11, 2019
The Hon. A. Roy	January 28, 2015	January 27, 2020
Mr. I. Scott*	January 5, 2015	January 4, 2020
Mr. M. Segal	January 9, 2013	January 8, 2023
Mr. R. Steinberg*	July 15, 2005	July 14, 2019
Mr. J. Weinstein*	March 25, 2015	March 24, 2020
Mr. J. Weppler	November 3, 2010	November 2, 2020

Legal Members		
Mr. A. Cader	April 18, 2011	April 17, 2021
Mr. L. Calzavara*	January 28, 2015	January 27, 2020
The Hon. Mr. Justice R. DelFrate*	January 13, 2010	January 12, 2020
Mr. H. Dhillon	November 5, 2008	January 16, 2020
Mr. G. Evans	January 5, 2015	January 4, 2020
Ms. C. Finley	October 31, 2019	October 30, 2021
Mr. B. Garrow*	April 5, 2017	April 4, 2019
Mr. J. Hanbidge	January 15, 2016	January 14, 2021
Mr. S. Hebscher	May 27, 2015	May 26, 2020
Mr. C. Herold*	November 29, 2017	November 28, 2019
The Hon. R. Kealey	January 9, 2013	January 8, 2023
The Hon. E. Kruzick	January 31, 2020	January 30, 2022
Ms. A. La Viola*	April 5, 2017	April 4, 2019
Ms. L.M. Landry	January 31, 2020	January 30, 2022
The Hon. Mr. Justice T. Lipson	January 31, 2020	January 30, 2022
Ms. C. Lund	January 31, 2020	January 30, 2022
The Hon. A.D.K. MacKenzie*	March 1, 2017	April 8, 2023
Ms. T. Mann	October 25, 2019	October 24, 2021
Ms. L. Maunder	August 29, 2019	August 28, 2021
Mr. K. McKenna	January 9, 2020	January 8, 2022
The Hon. C. Nelson	October 31, 2019	October 30, 2021
Mr. L. J. Richardson	November 28, 2019	November 27, 2021
Mr. D. Sandor	March 5, 2020	March 4, 2022
Ms. L. Silver	October 31, 2019	October 30, 2021
The Hon. E. Then	August 29, 2019	August 28, 2021
Psychiatrists		
Dr. A.G. Ahmed	August 25, 2004	August 24, 2022
Dr. Y. Alatishe*	March 22, 2017	March 21, 2020
Dr. M.H. Ben-Aron	October 4, 2000	December 13, 2021
Dr. B. Bordoff	July 31, 2001	July 30, 2022
Dr. D. Bourget	May 28, 1997	May 27, 2021
Dr. D.H. Braden	June 20, 2007	June 19, 2021
Dr. J.M. Bradford	February 1, 1984	February 28, 2022
Dr. R. Buckingham	June 12, 1992	February 28, 2022
Dr. L.E. Cappe	August 24, 1998	August 23, 2022
Dr. G.A. Chaimowitz	December 4, 1996	December 3, 2022
Dr. R.D. Chandrasena	December 6, 2000	February 3, 2022
Dr. S. Chatterjee	July 19, 2007	July 18, 2021
Dr. E. Coleman	April 15, 2015	April 14, 2020
Dr. S. Cohen*	April 10, 2013	December 31, 2019
Dr. P.E. Cook*	May 29, 2002	December 11, 2019
Dr. A. Côté	March 1, 1990	February 28, 2022
Dr. I. Côté	June 13, 2001	June 12, 2022
Dr. S.A. Darani	September 15, 2010	September 14, 2020

Dr. P.L. Darby	June 12, 1992	February 28, 2022
Dr. K.D. DeFreitas	January 13, 2005	January 12, 2021
Dr. G. Eayrs*	April 26, 2017	April 25, 2019
Dr. J. Ellis	October 21, 1998	November 20, 2022
Dr. L. Faucher	February 27, 2008	February 26, 2023
Dr. J.P. Fedoroff	October 17, 2001	November 6, 2022
Dr. J.C. Ferencz	December 4, 1996	December 3, 2022
Dr. F.W. Furlong	October 4, 2000	October 3, 2021
Dr. D.A. Galbraith	November 3, 1994	February 3, 2022
Dr. G. D. Glancy	March 1, 1988	February 28, 2022
Dr. J.A.C. Gojer	October 21, 1998	November 30, 2022
Dr. K. Hand	November 3, 2010	November 2, 2020
Dr. R.W. Hill	December 15, 2004	December 14, 2021
Dr. S.J. Hucker	December 11, 1996	February 1, 2023
Dr. W. Johnston*	April 2, 2008	December 31, 2019
Dr. A.D. Jones	October 6, 1999	November 1, 2021
Dr. J. Kis	October 31, 2019	October 30, 2021
Dr. P.E. Klassen	October 13, 1999	October 12, 2021
Dr. A. Kolodziej	August 21, 2003	October 4, 2022
Dr. W.J. Komer	February 5, 1997	May 2, 2021
Dr. C. Krasnik*	January 28, 2015	January 27, 2020
Dr. R. Kunjukrishnan	December 4, 1996	December 3, 2022
Dr. S. Lessard	February 27, 2008	February 26, 2023
Dr. M. Marshall	June 27, 2007	June 26, 2021
Dr. M. Mathias	May 31, 2017	May 30, 2019
Dr. A. McDonald*	August 24, 1998	September 25, 2019
Dr. R. McMaster	July 26, 2019	July 25, 2021
Dr. P. D. Norris	October 9, 2002	January 17, 2021
Dr. D. Pallandi	March 1, 2006	February 28, 2021
Dr. M.V.A. Prakash	August 24, 1998	August 28, 2022
Dr. P. J. Prendergast	June 12, 1992	February 28, 2022
Dr. L. Ramshaw*	December 9, 2009	December 8, 2019
Dr. J. Rootenberg	June 22, 2006	June 21, 2021
Dr. A. Seif	June 27, 2007	June 26, 2021
Dr. R.B. Sheppard	December 11, 1996	December 10, 2022
Dr. G.S. Sidhu	December 7, 1994	May 31, 2021
Dr. S. Swaminath*	December 8, 1993	January 16, 2020
Dr. T. Verny	January 9, 2013	January 8, 2023
Dr. Z. Waisman	January 15, 2007	January 14, 2022
Dr. H. Ward	February 24, 2016	February 23, 2021
Dr. J. Watts*	March 1, 2017	February 27, 2020
Dr. T. Wilkie	April 22, 2009	April 21, 2019
Dr. S. Woodside	May 4, 2011	May 3, 2021

Psychologists		
Dr. G. Boulais	August 29, 2019	August 28, 2021
Dr. R.B. Cormier	December 2, 1998	December 1, 2022
Dr. P. Firestone	October 9, 2002	October 17, 2021
Dr. M. Green	August 29, 2019	August 28, 2021
Dr. J. Hawes	October 17, 2019	October 16, 2021
Dr. G.B. Jones	March 31, 2000	March 30, 2021
Dr. M. Kalia	October 17, 2019	October 16, 2021
Dr. L. Leong	October 17, 2019	October 16, 2021
Dr. L.O. Lightfoot	November 20, 1992	February 3, 2022
Dr. L.C. Litman	February 25, 1998	February 24, 2022
Dr. W. Loza	July 5, 2007	July 4, 2021
Dr. M. Mamak	January 27, 2005	January 26, 2023
Dr. H. Mouldan	October 31, 2019	October 20, 2021
Dr. G. Nexhipi*	March 20, 2002	December 31, 2019
Dr. D. Nussbaum	December 3, 1997	March 23, 2022
Dr. M. Pomichalek	August 29, 2019	August 28, 2021
Dr. C. Rose	August 29, 2019	August 28, 2021
Dr. D.J. Simourd	December 1, 2004	November 30, 2022
Dr. S. Southmayd	September 24, 2008	November 13, 2019
Dr. G.M. Turrall	February 24, 1993	February 28, 2022
Dr. C.D. Webster	December 13, 2000	March 23, 2022
Dr. S.E. Wiseman	August 25, 2004	August 24, 2022
Dr. P.N. Wright	August 24, 1998	August 23, 2022
Public Members		
Ms. J. Albert	January 9, 2020	January 8, 2022
Mr. W. Apted	March 11, 2015	March 10, 2020
Mr. S. Auty	September 29, 2010	September 28, 2020
Mr. A. Bouvier*	March 23, 2016	January 16, 2020
Mr. J. Cyr	January 9, 2013	January 8, 2023
Mr. S. Duffy	August 29, 2019	August 28, 2021
Ms. N. Lemieux-McKinnon	July 15, 2005	July 14, 2022
Ms. C.E. Little	December 7, 2005	December 6, 2021
Ms. R. MacIntyre	January 13, 2005	January 12, 2023
Mr. K. Makin	December 10, 2014	December 9, 2019
Ms. B. Murray	October 20, 2010	October 19, 2020
Ms. B. Naegele	January 9, 2013	January 8, 2023
Mr. A. Okon	April 20, 2005	December 31, 2019
Ms. C. Plyley	August 29, 2019	August 28, 2021
Ms. L. Steadman	December 21, 2004	December 20, 2019
Ms. R. Zitney	August 29, 2019	August 28, 2021

* Under O. Reg 88/11 of the *Adjudicative Tribunal Accountability, Governance and Appointments Act*, members were reappointed using an Automatic Waiver Form.

Ontario Review Board Personnel

Name	Position
The Honourable Mr. Justice Richard D. Schneider	Chair
Joe Wright	Legal Counsel
Angie Baggetta	Registrar and Senior Manager
Manny Tan	Deputy Registrar
Amanda Wallace	Executive Assistant
Jolanta Tuz	Coordinator, Business Operations
Rhea Duketovsky	Board Order Administrator
Fran Bolton	Board Order Administrator
Amsale Mamo	Board Order Administrator
Slobodan Grbic	Case Coordinator
Puja Karia	Case Coordinator
Sosan Haidari	Case Coordinator
Carolyn Nguyen	Case Coordinator
Preeti Wadhwa	Distribution Coordinator (A)
Antonia Virzi	Distribution and Records Clerk
Inna Eskin	Administrative and Financial Assistant
Sophie Goldenberg	Bilingual Receptionist/Secretary
Sara Liden	Secretary to Chair/Counsel
Nasser Naoshad	Systems Officer

Financial Information

2019-20 Expenditures by Standard Account

Description	Allocation	Expenditures	Surplus/(Deficit)
Salaries & Wages	1,008,500	1,286,209	-277,709
Benefits	146,200	171,030	-24,830
Transportation & Communications	527,800	577,489	-49,689
Services*	5,040,800	4,511,324	529,476
Supplies & Equipment	56,600	20,016	36,584
Total	6,779,900	6,566,068	213,832

* Includes accommodation and total remuneration of \$3,739,009 for all Part-time Per Diem Appointees

2019-20 Expenditures by Function

Function	Expenditures
Salaries & Wages	1,286,209
Employee Benefits	171,030
Administration & Hearings Support	94,462
Annual Hearings	3,694,210
Initial Hearings	776,191
Education	137,190
Adjudicative Operations	206,213
Information Systems	72,686
ORB Accommodation	127,877
Total	6,566,068

Other Direct Operating Expenses (not including salaries, wages and accommodation)

