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Message from the Chair

Once again, this past year has brought to the Ontario Review Board a record number of hearings regarding individuals with verdicts of either Unfit to Stand Trial or Not Criminally Responsible on account of mental disorder. This is so even though the actual number of newly accused subject to our jurisdiction is slightly lower than the previous year. Our data confirm 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 schemes which are proving to be very effective.

As I am at the two year mark as Chair of the ORB we have made considerable progress and have identified three key target objectives:

1. Reduction in hearing times through more extensive pre-hearing conferencing,
2. Reduction in the time from hearing to the production of our Reasons (with 4 weeks being the goal),
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’)

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.

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, 2014, the Ontario Review Board had 155 members. In addition to a full time Chair, the Ontario Review Board’s part time members include 38 alternate chairs, 13 legal members, 59 psychiatrists, 18 psychologists, and 26 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, especially with our ‘Charter competence’ confirmed by the Supreme Court in *R. v. Conway*, most of our hearings are now completed within the allotted time slot. This has been accomplished over the last year 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. Should Bill C-54 be proclaimed in full our obligations in this regard will add considerably to the time required to manage our case load. The Board will now be 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 hearings are adjourned at any of the junctures to permit the victim time to file statements.
New Accused (NCR and Unfit)

Figure 1 - Number of New Accused per Year

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 2013-2014 the courts found 61 accused to be unfit to stand trial and 128 not criminally responsible on account of mental disorder for the commission of a criminal offence for a total of 189 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 are often adjournments when insufficient information is available as to the mental condition of the accused or what, if any, threat the accused poses to the safety of the public. In fact, amendments to the Criminal Code that came into force on June 30, 2006 attempted to address this potential lack of information and there are now provisions in the Criminal Code that allow a Review Board to order an assessment of the accused, if such evidence is necessary to make a disposition.
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 2013-2014 was 2222 (see Figure 2).
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).
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 2013-2014 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 2013-2014, 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 comes 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. In 2013-2014 the Board conducted 59 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 well our yearly education seminars 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.

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.
Members of the Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Date First Appointed</th>
<th>Date Current Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Honourable Mr. Justice R. D. Schneider</td>
<td>June 27, 2012</td>
<td>June 12, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternate Chairs (& Legal Members)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Date First Appointed</th>
<th>Date Current Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. P. Band</td>
<td>March 24, 2010</td>
<td>March 23, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. L. Banks</td>
<td>October 20, 2010</td>
<td>October 19, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. H. Bloom</td>
<td>January 25, 1990</td>
<td>September 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. R. J. Braudo</td>
<td>August 21, 2001</td>
<td>August 20, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Honourable J. W. Brooke, Q.C. *</td>
<td>December 8, 1999</td>
<td>December 7, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Kathryn Chalmers</td>
<td>October 20, 2010</td>
<td>October 19, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. K. Chown</td>
<td>April 8, 2009</td>
<td>April 7, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. R.G. Coates</td>
<td>February 7, 2007</td>
<td>February 6, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. W.B. Donaldson</td>
<td>June 25, 2003</td>
<td>June 24, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. C. Fromstein</td>
<td>August 25, 2004</td>
<td>August 24, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. J. Goldenberg</td>
<td>November 3, 2004</td>
<td>November 6, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Honourable J.D. Greco</td>
<td>December 4, 2002</td>
<td>February 14, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. R. Grinberg</td>
<td>April 11, 2006</td>
<td>April 10, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. J. Holding, Q.C.</td>
<td>July 5, 2007</td>
<td>July 22, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. S. Kert *</td>
<td>April 29, 1999</td>
<td>April 28, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Honourable J.M. Labrosse</td>
<td>May 14, 1997</td>
<td>May 13, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Michele Labrosse</td>
<td>November 3, 2009</td>
<td>November 24, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. S.E. Lavine *</td>
<td>December 4, 2002</td>
<td>December 3, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. J.A. Leiper *</td>
<td>April 2, 2008</td>
<td>April 1, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. C. Lewis, Q.C.</td>
<td>June 1, 2005</td>
<td>May 31, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. R. Linton</td>
<td>June 27, 2007</td>
<td>June 26, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Honourable H.R. Locke</td>
<td>October 21, 1998</td>
<td>November 6, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. C. MacDonald *</td>
<td>March 25, 2009</td>
<td>March 24, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. C.M. MacIntyre, Q.C. *</td>
<td>February 18, 2004</td>
<td>February 17, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. T.J. Madison</td>
<td>June 20, 2007</td>
<td>June 19, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Honourable Mr. Justice D.J. McCombs</td>
<td>February 27, 2008</td>
<td>February 26, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Honourable N.D. McRae, Q.C.*</td>
<td>August 8, 2005</td>
<td>August 7, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. W. Miller</td>
<td>September 30, 2009</td>
<td>September 29, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. J. Munn</td>
<td>April 8, 2009</td>
<td>April 7, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. J. A. Neuberger *</td>
<td>June 19, 2002</td>
<td>February 20, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. E.J. Polak</td>
<td>June 17, 2009</td>
<td>June 16, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Honourable Mr. Justice J.C.L. Scime *</td>
<td>January 5, 2006</td>
<td>January 4, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. L. Stam</td>
<td>May 6, 2009</td>
<td>May 5, 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Date First Appointed</th>
<th>Date Current Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. R. Steinberg *</td>
<td>July 15, 2005</td>
<td>July 14, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. L. Stoyka *</td>
<td>March 25, 2009</td>
<td>March 24, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. F. Yaskiel</td>
<td>April 11, 2006</td>
<td>April 10, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal Members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. G. Beasley *</td>
<td>January 9, 2013</td>
<td>January 8, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. A. Cader</td>
<td>April 18, 2011</td>
<td>April 17, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. J. Cameron *</td>
<td>January 9, 2013</td>
<td>January 8, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Honourable J.D Carnwath, Q.C</td>
<td>February 18, 2009</td>
<td>February 17, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Honourable Frank Caputo</td>
<td>November 17, 2010</td>
<td>November 16, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Honourable Mr. Justice R. DelFrate</td>
<td>January 13, 2010</td>
<td>January 12, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. H. Dhillon *</td>
<td>November 5, 2008</td>
<td>November 4, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Honourable Madam Justice T. Dunnet</td>
<td>February 17, 2010</td>
<td>February 16, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Honourable Mr. Justice A. Gans</td>
<td>November 20, 2013</td>
<td>November 19, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. J. Hodgson</td>
<td>December 17, 2013</td>
<td>December 16, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Honourable R. Kealey *</td>
<td>January 9, 2013</td>
<td>January 8, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. F. McArde</td>
<td>December 17, 2013</td>
<td>December 16, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms J. Mills</td>
<td>December 17, 2013</td>
<td>December 16, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. L. Morphy</td>
<td>December 17, 2013</td>
<td>December 16, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. D. Murphy *</td>
<td>April 2, 2008</td>
<td>April 1, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. R. Richardson</td>
<td>December 4, 2013</td>
<td>December 3, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. M. Segal *</td>
<td>January 9, 2013</td>
<td>January 8, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms J. Trehearne</td>
<td>December 4, 2013</td>
<td>December 3, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. J. Wepper</td>
<td>November 3, 2010</td>
<td>November 2, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychiatrists</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. A.G. Ahmed</td>
<td>August 25, 2004</td>
<td>August 24, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. R.M. Andreychuk</td>
<td>March 21, 2007</td>
<td>March 20, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. G. Azadian *</td>
<td>September 3, 2008</td>
<td>September 2, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. M.H. Ben-Aron</td>
<td>October 4, 2000</td>
<td>December 13, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. B. Bordoff</td>
<td>July 31, 2001</td>
<td>July 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. D. Bourget</td>
<td>May 28, 1997</td>
<td>May 27, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. D.H. Braden</td>
<td>June 20, 2007</td>
<td>June 19, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. J.M.W. Bradford</td>
<td>February 1, 1984</td>
<td>February 28, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. R. Buckingham</td>
<td>June 12, 1992</td>
<td>February 28, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. D.S. Byers</td>
<td>March 1, 1983</td>
<td>February 28, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. L.E. Cappe</td>
<td>August 24, 1998</td>
<td>August 23, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. G.A. Chaimowitz</td>
<td>December 4, 1996</td>
<td>December 3, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. R. D. Chandrasena</td>
<td>December 6, 2000</td>
<td>February 3, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. S. Chatterjee</td>
<td>July 19, 2007</td>
<td>July 18, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. S. Cohen</td>
<td>April 10, 2013</td>
<td>April 9, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. P.E. Cook *</td>
<td>May 29, 2002</td>
<td>December 21, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. A. Côté</td>
<td>November 30, 1989</td>
<td>February 28, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. I. Côté</td>
<td>June 13, 2001</td>
<td>June 12, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. S.A. Darani</td>
<td>September 15, 2010</td>
<td>September 14, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. P.L. Darby</td>
<td>June 12, 1992</td>
<td>February 28, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Under O. Reg 88/11 of the Adjudicative Tribunal Accountability, Governance and Appointments Act, members were reappointed using an Automatic Waiver Form.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Date First Appointed</th>
<th>Date Current Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. K.D. DeFreitas</td>
<td>January 13, 2005</td>
<td>January 12, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. J. Ellis</td>
<td>October 21, 1998</td>
<td>November 20, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. L. Faucher</td>
<td>February 27, 2008</td>
<td>February 26, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. J. P. Fedoroff</td>
<td>October 17, 2001</td>
<td>November 6, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. J.C. Ferencz</td>
<td>December 4, 1996</td>
<td>November 27, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. F.W. Furlong</td>
<td>October 4, 2000</td>
<td>October 3, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. D.A. Galbraith</td>
<td>November 3, 1994</td>
<td>February 3, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. G. D. Glancy</td>
<td>March 1, 1988</td>
<td>February 28, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. K. Hand</td>
<td>November 3, 2010</td>
<td>November 2, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. R.W. Hill</td>
<td>December 15, 2004</td>
<td>December 14, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. S.J. Hucker</td>
<td>December 11, 1996</td>
<td>January 9, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. I. Jacques</td>
<td>April 28, 2010</td>
<td>April 27, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. W. Johnston *</td>
<td>April 2, 2008</td>
<td>April 1, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. A.D. Jones *</td>
<td>October 6, 1999</td>
<td>November 1, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. P.F. Kelly *</td>
<td>December 30, 1999</td>
<td>December 29, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. E. Kingstone</td>
<td>January 13, 1995</td>
<td>April 17, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. P.E. Klassen *</td>
<td>October 13, 1999</td>
<td>October 12, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. A. Kolodziej</td>
<td>August 21, 2003</td>
<td>October 4, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. W.J. Komer</td>
<td>February 5, 1997</td>
<td>May 2, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. R. Kunjukrishnan</td>
<td>December 4, 1996</td>
<td>December 3, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. S. Lessard</td>
<td>February 27, 2008</td>
<td>February 26, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. A. McDonald</td>
<td>August 24, 1998</td>
<td>August 23, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. P. D. Norris *</td>
<td>October 9, 2002</td>
<td>January 17, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. D. Pallandi *</td>
<td>March 1, 2006</td>
<td>February 29, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. M.V.A. Prakash</td>
<td>August 24, 1998</td>
<td>August 28, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. P. J. Prendergast</td>
<td>June 12, 1992</td>
<td>February 28, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. L. Ramshaw</td>
<td>December 9, 2009</td>
<td>December 8, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. J. Rootenberg</td>
<td>June 22, 2006</td>
<td>June 21, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. A. Seif</td>
<td>June 27, 2007</td>
<td>June 26, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. R.R.B. Sheppard</td>
<td>December 11, 1996</td>
<td>December 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. G.S. Sidhu *</td>
<td>December 7, 1994</td>
<td>May 31, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. W.R. Surphlis *</td>
<td>March 30, 1999</td>
<td>April 19, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. S. Swaminath *</td>
<td>December 8, 1993</td>
<td>April 19, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. T. Verny *</td>
<td>January 9, 2013</td>
<td>January 8, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Z. Waisman</td>
<td>January 15, 2007</td>
<td>January 14, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. T. Wilkie</td>
<td>April 22, 2009</td>
<td>April 21, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. S. Woodside</td>
<td>May 4, 2011</td>
<td>May 3, 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Psychologists**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Date First Appointed</th>
<th>Date Current Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. R.B. Cormier</td>
<td>December 2, 1998</td>
<td>December 1, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. P. Firestone *</td>
<td>October 9, 2002</td>
<td>October 17, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. J. Freedman</td>
<td>October 22, 2009</td>
<td>October 21, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. G. B. Jones *</td>
<td>March 31, 2000</td>
<td>March 30, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. C. Lee</td>
<td>August 12, 2009</td>
<td>August 11, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. L.O. Lightfoot</td>
<td>November 20, 1992</td>
<td>February 3, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. L.C. Litman</td>
<td>February 25, 1998</td>
<td>February 24, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Under O. Reg 88/11 of the Adjudicative Tribunal Accountability, Governance and Appointments Act, members were reappointed using an Automatic Waiver Form.
**Member** | **Date First Appointed** | **Date Current Term Expires**
--- | --- | ---
Dr. W. Loza | July 5, 2007 | July 4, 2016
Dr. M. Mamak | January 27, 2005 | January 26, 2018
Dr. G. Nexhipi * | March 20, 2002 | April 19, 2018
Dr. D. Nussbaum | December 3, 1997 | March 23, 2017
Dr. N. Pollock | November 3, 1994 | February 3, 2017
Dr. D.J. Simourd | December 1, 2004 | November 20, 2017
Dr. G.M. Turrall | February 24, 1993 | February 28, 2017
Dr. C.D. Webster | December 13, 2000 | March 23, 2017
Dr. S.E. Wiseman | August 25, 2004 | August 24, 2017
Dr. P.N. Wright | August 24, 1998 | August 23, 2017

**Public Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Date First Appointed</th>
<th>Date Current Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Mr. S. Auty | September 29, 2010 | September 28, 2015 |
Ms. N. Boivin * | March 11, 2009 | March 10, 2019 |
Mr. J. Cyr * | January 9, 2013 | January 8, 2018 |
Ms. M. M. Dow | February 6, 2002 | February 5, 2016 |
Mr. T. Elek | May 16, 2007 | May 15, 2017 |
Mr. W. Gee | January 31, 2008 | January 30, 2018 |
Rev. W. A. Jupp | May 2, 2007 | May 1, 2017 |
Ms. N. Lemieux-McKinnon * | July 15, 2005 | July 14, 2016 |
Ms. M. Linton* | October 5, 2005 | October 4, 2016 |
Ms. C.E. Little* | December 7, 2005 | December 6, 2016 |
Dr. L.L.Q. Lum | November 19, 1997 | March 31, 2016 |
Mr. Y. Mahdavi * | July 15, 2005 | July 14, 2016 |
Ms. R. MacIntyre | January 13, 2005 | January 12, 2016 |
Ms. K.A. Maharaj | March 21, 2007 | March 20, 2017 |
Ms. C. McGrath * | March 25, 2009 | March 24, 2019 |
Ms. L. Montgomery | April 8, 2009 | April 7, 2014 |
Ms. B. Murray | October 20, 2010 | October 19, 2015 |
Ms. B. Naeglele * | January 9, 2013 | January 8, 2018 |
Mr. A. Okon * | April 20, 2005 | April 19, 2016 |
Ms. D.M. Ormston * | May 17, 1999 | February 2, 2016 |
Mr. P. Poirier | June 28, 2007 | June 27, 2016 |
Mr. P. Schur | May 30, 2006 | May 29, 2014 |
Ms. L. Steadman | December 21, 2004 | December 20, 2014 |
Mr. K. Turner | January 15, 2007 | January 14, 2017 |
Dr. D.M. Winkler | May 12, 2004 | May 11, 2017 |

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

*Up to March 31, 2014*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Honourable Mr. Justice Richard D. Schneider</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Wright</td>
<td>Legal Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angie Baggetta</td>
<td>Registrar and Senior Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Wallace</td>
<td>Executive Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila McDermott</td>
<td>Deputy Registrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manny Tan</td>
<td>Board Order Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewranie Narine</td>
<td>Board Order Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amsale Mamo</td>
<td>Board Order Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radica Roopsingh</td>
<td>Case Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puja Karia</td>
<td>Case Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Cook</td>
<td>Case Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhea Duketovsky</td>
<td>Case Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloe Vice</td>
<td>Distribution Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonia Virzi</td>
<td>Distribution and Records Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olga Lenskaia</td>
<td>Coordinator, Business Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alisha McKendrick</td>
<td>Administrative and Financial Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie Goldenberg</td>
<td>Bilingual Receptionist/Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fran Bolton</td>
<td>Secretary to Chair/Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Smith</td>
<td>Systems Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Financial Information

2013-2014 Expenditures by Standard Account

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Printed Estimates</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Surplus/ (Deficit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and Wages</td>
<td>855, 100</td>
<td>1, 287, 961</td>
<td>- 432, 861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>99, 100</td>
<td>170, 869</td>
<td>- 71, 769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation &amp; Communications</td>
<td>527, 800</td>
<td>768, 397</td>
<td>- 240, 596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>5, 836, 800</td>
<td>4, 591, 061</td>
<td>1, 245, 739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and Equipment</td>
<td>56, 600</td>
<td>46, 881</td>
<td>9, 718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7, 375, 400</strong></td>
<td><strong>6, 865, 169</strong></td>
<td><strong>510, 321</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditures by Function

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Wages</td>
<td>1, 287, 961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Benefits</td>
<td>170, 869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration &amp; Hearing Support</td>
<td>224, 392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Hearings</td>
<td>3, 403, 055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Hearings</td>
<td>1, 147, 821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>214, 450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjudicative Operations</td>
<td>210, 984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td>67, 509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORB Accommodation</td>
<td>138, 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6, 865, 169</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Direct Operating Expenses
(not including salaries, wages and accommodation)