

# **Police Use of Force Race- Based Data Technical Report, 2023**

*Ministry of the Solicitor General*

# Police Use of Force Race-Based Data Technical Report, 2023

---

Under the Anti-Racism Act, 2017 (ARA), and its associated regulation and guidance, the Ministry of the Solicitor General is required to collect and analyze race-based data on instances of police use of force.

This report provides a background on the data collection and reporting; a description of the data collection tool (Use of Force Report); an overview of the data cleaning, and analytic methods; a review of the scope and limitations of the data collected; and descriptive analyses.

Analyses were done using the data extracted from the provincially mandated Use of Force Reports for incidents that occurred between January 1 and December 31, 2023.

According to Statistics Canada, police in Ontario receive approximately four million calls for services a year. Based on these figures, over 99 per cent of these calls are resolved without the use of force.

The data for 2023 are available in the [Ontario Data Catalogue](#).

# Contents

- Section 1: Overview of Use of Force in Ontario ..... 6
  - 1.1 Legislative Background..... 7
    - 1.1.1 Ontario’s *Anti-Racism Act, 2017* ..... 7
    - 1.1.2 Ontario’s Anti-Racism Data Standards (ARDS) ..... 7
    - 1.1.3 Use of Force Data Collection ..... 8
  - 1.2 Use of Force Background ..... 9
    - 1.2.1 Ontario’s Use of Force Framework ..... 10
    - 1.2.2 Officer Training and Certification ..... 11
  - 1.3 The 2023 Use of Force Report ..... 12
    - 1.3.1 When Force Must be Reported ..... 12
    - 1.3.2 Addition of Race-Based Data Collection ..... 13
    - 1.3.3 Team Reports ..... 14
    - 1.3.4 Reporting Police Services ..... 16
- Section 2: Data Limitations..... 17
  - 2.1. Use of Administrative Data for Research ..... 18
  - 2.2 Lack of Standardization ..... 19
  - 2.3 Data Not Collected in the Use of Force Report..... 19
    - 2.3.1 Officer Experience and Demographics..... 19
    - 2.3.2 Information About an Individual..... 19
    - 2.3.3 Personally Identifiable Information ..... 20
    - 2.3.4 Number of Subject Individuals Involved in the Incident ..... 20
  - 2.4 Report Design Impacts on Data Quality..... 21
    - 2.4.1 Incident Number and Police Service Division..... 21
    - 2.4.2 Incident Type..... 21
    - 2.4.3 Location..... 22
    - 2.4.4 Rank Category ..... 22
    - 2.4.5 Injuries to Individuals or Officers from the Use of Physical Force ..... 22
  - 2.5 Limited Analysis Options without an Appropriate Benchmark Population..... 23
- Section 3: Use of Force Datasets..... 27

3.1 Overview.....	28
3.1.1 Out of Scope Reports.....	29
3.2 Datasets .....	30
3.2.1 Structure of Questions in the Use of Force Report.....	31
3.2.2 Main Records Dataset.....	32
3.2.3 Individual Records Dataset .....	32
3.2.4 Weapon Records Dataset .....	33
3.2.5 Cartridge/Probe Cycle Records Dataset .....	33
Section 4: Analysis and Results .....	35
4.1 Key Concepts for Analysis .....	36
4.1.1 Participant-Observer Information .....	36
4.1.2 Unit of Analysis: Report, Incident, and Observation.....	37
4.1.3 Scope of Technical Report.....	39
4.2 Perceptions of the Individuals upon Whom Force was Used.....	39
4.2.1 Race and Difficulty Perceiving Race .....	40
4.2.2 Age.....	43
4.2.3 Gender .....	44
4.3 The Police Services .....	44
4.4 The Officers .....	46
4.4.1 Number of Officers Applying Force .....	47
4.4.2 Officer Rank Category .....	49
4.4.3 Officer Length of Service.....	49
4.4.4 Assignment Type .....	50
4.4.5 Attire.....	51
4.4.6 Attempts to Gain Compliance.....	51
4.5 The Force Used .....	54
4.5.1 Distance from Individuals When Deciding to Use Force .....	54
4.5.2 Type of Force Category .....	55
4.6 Outcomes of Force .....	67
4.6.1 Injuries to Individuals upon Whom Force was Used.....	68
4.6.2 Injuries to Officers .....	71

Section 5: Conclusions..... 72

Section 6: Appendices..... 75

- 6.1 Appendix A: Ontario Use of Force Report 2023..... 76
- 6.2 Appendix B: Summary of the Principles Governing the Use of Force by Police .. 76
- 6.3 Appendix C: Disproportionality & Disparity Equations ..... 79
- 6.4 Appendix D: Glossary of Terms ..... 79

EMBARGOED COPY

# **Section 1:**

# **Overview of Use of**

# **Force in Ontario**

## 1.1 Legislative Background

### 1.1.1 Ontario's *Anti-Racism Act, 2017*

The Government of Ontario continually strives to address racial inequities in its policies, decisions, programs, and services. An important aspect of identifying and addressing racial inequity is the collection and analysis of robust, standardized, and comprehensive data that can be used to inform actions and monitor progress on this topic.

The *Anti-Racism Act, 2017* (ARA) provides a statutory framework that includes the legislative authority to mandate the collection of race and identity-based data, regulatory requirements relating to collection of race-based data, and the rules and standards to follow when collecting, analyzing, and reporting on this data.

Ontario Regulation 267/18<sup>1</sup> under the ARA (referred to as the ARA Regulation for the remainder of this technical report), sets out the information that various Public Sector Organizations (PSOs) are required or authorized to collect, as well as the date on which they may or must begin collecting the information.

### 1.1.2 Ontario's Anti-Racism Data Standards (ARDS)

Section 6 of the ARA requires the minister responsible for Anti-Racism to establish data standards for the collection, use, and management of information. Any PSO regulated under the ARA must follow the *Data Standards for the Identification and Monitoring of Systemic Racism*. This document is also referred to as Ontario's Anti-Racism Data Standards (ARDS)<sup>2</sup> and sets out standards for PSOs in identifying and monitoring racial disparities and disproportionalities. The ARDS are intended to ensure that PSOs generate reliable information to support evidence-based decision-making and promote accountability.

The ARDS include 43 standards that govern how PSOs manage the information, including the personal information, that they are required or authorized to collect under the ARA.<sup>3</sup> The ARDS speak to the collection and use of personal information; de-identification and disclosure of information; the retention, security, and secure disposal of personal information; the analysis of the data collected; and the publication and reporting of a) the data collected, and b) the results of the analyses conducted.

---

<sup>1</sup> [Link to O. Reg. 267/18: GENERAL](#)

<sup>2</sup> [Link to the Data Standards for the Identification and Monitoring of Systemic Racism](#)

<sup>3</sup> Not all 43 ARDS apply to every regulated collection data, for example, there are six ARDS on the collection of Participant Observer Information (POI) that only apply if the PSO is collecting POI.

ARDS 36 (Public Reporting of Results) requires PSOs to produce regular and timely reporting on the results of analyses, descriptions of benchmarks and/or reference groups used in the analyses, thresholds to identify notable differences between groups, and information about how the data were collected and the data quality (the accuracy, validity, and completeness of the data collected).

This technical report is presented for the purpose of complying with ARDS 36 to the greatest extent possible given the data available to the Ministry of the Solicitor General. The technical report includes descriptive analyses of data from police Use of Force Reports received by the Ministry and an assessment of the quality and limits of the existing data, including limitations on the use of benchmarks, reference groups, and thresholds.

### **1.1.3 Use of Force Data Collection**

Item 6 of the table in the ARA Regulation 267/18 requires the Ministry of the Solicitor General to collect and analyze, “as provided by police forces, the race of individuals as perceived by members of the police forces in respect of whom a use of force report is prepared by a member of the police force and any other information set out in the report, other than the name of the individual, that the police force is legally required to provide to the Ministry of the Solicitor General.”<sup>4</sup>

The Ministry has used three versions of the Use of Force Report since 2020, described below. The numbering of the versions in this technical report are for clarity and do not correspond to what may be printed on the report itself.

To collect the data required by Item 6, in 2019 the Ministry updated the original Use of Force Report<sup>5</sup> (Version 0) that had been in place since 1992. This updated report (Version 1.0) included a new data field to capture a police service member’s perception of the race of the person(s) upon whom the member used force and a report was required to be completed. Ontario police services began using Version 1.0 on January 1, 2020. Training was also provided to police service members via a guidebook and online materials. Version 1.0 was used by police services until December 31, 2022.

Version 2.0 was implemented on January 1, 2023. Version 2.0 was designed to improve the utility of the report as a data collection tool and address many of the data limitations of Version 1.0, while not adding undue burden to reporting officers. A technical update – Version 2.1 – was implemented in April 2023 to fix an issue that resulted in some information on conducted energy weapon (CEW) cycles not being saved. The data used

---

<sup>4</sup> See the table in s. 2 of the Regulation: [O. Reg. 267/18: GENERAL \(ontario.ca\)](https://www.ontario.ca)

<sup>5</sup> See Appendix A.



in this technical report were all derived from Version 2.0 and 2.1 of the Use of Force Report. Because of the changes between Version 1.0 and Version 2.0 (summarized below) and regulatory changes, many findings cannot be compared between the 2020-2022 data and 2023 data.

Version Number	Dates	Details
0	1992 – 2019	Original Use of Force Report. Race-based data was not included and there was no requirement for Ontario to report publicly on use of force.
1.0	Jan 1 2020 – Dec 31 2022	Data fields were added to Version 0 of the report to collect perceived race of up to three individuals upon whom force was used. Ontario became required by law to analyze and publicly report on the data.
2.0	Jan 1 2023 – Mar 31 2023	Significant redesign of the Use of Force Report, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• collecting location, perception of age and gender, and other variables;</li> <li>• improvements in automated data validations; and</li> <li>• ability to collect perceived race for up to 99 individuals per report.</li> </ul>
2.1	Apr 1 2023 – present	Technical update to Version 2.0 to a) correctly transfer select data fields on CEW discharge cycles, and b) add front-end validation to the date field.

## 1.2 Use of Force Background

On a daily basis, police officers may face situations where they use force to ensure their own safety or that of the communities they serve.

The parameters governing the use of force by police officers are contained in the *Criminal Code*, other federal and provincial legislation and regulations, the common law, and the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. The broad principles governing the use of force by police are summarized in Appendix B. In Ontario, the provincial statute that governed police use of force in 2023 was the Ontario *Police Services Act*<sup>6</sup> (PSA) and its

---

<sup>6</sup> [Link to Police Services Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.15](#)

Equipment and Use of Force Regulation (R.R.O. 1990, Regulation 926).<sup>7, 8</sup> Throughout, this may be referred to as the Use of Force Regulation.

In November 2022, the Ministry amended the Use of Force Regulation to clarify and enhance reporting requirements for use of force incidents. These amendments were intended to perform a number of functions. This includes clarifying areas that had been subject to differing interpretation (e.g., “an injury requiring medical attention”) as well as bring requirements in line with current best practices (e.g., reporting on display of a CEW to achieve compliance). Amendments also address reporting on the use of police dogs and horses, confirm exceptions to reporting (e.g., when a handgun is drawn for an administrative purpose or surrendered for an investigation) and establish clear requirements for reporting by teams (e.g., when a common type of force is used by multiple members). Lastly, the changes prescribe annual reviews of use of force trends within each police service and require each Police Services Board or the Solicitor General (in the case of the Ontario Provincial Police) to publish its annual report online.

The Ministry had also maintained a Use of Force Guideline for all police services governed by the *Police Services Act* (PSA) to provide additional guidance regarding police use of force training, the use of firearms and other weapons, and the reporting of officers’ use of force. This guideline was in use for all of 2023.

### **1.2.1 Ontario’s Use of Force Framework**

Ontario’s 2004 Use of Force Model showed response options that may be appropriate based on the situation in question. The model was based on the National Use of Force Framework.

On July 7, 2023, Ontario’s Use of Force Model was replaced with the Ontario Public-Police Interactions Training Aid (OPPITA). Like the model, the training aid outlines the general principles that govern police interactions with the public, including the use of force on those occasions when an application of force may be necessary. As interactions are fluid, officers continuously assess the situation to choose the most reasonable option according to the situation and the behaviour of the persons involved. Officers consider whether the individual is being cooperative; passively or actively resistant; assaultive; or behaving in a way that poses a risk of serious bodily harm or death to the officers or members of the public. The model is not prescriptive, does not dictate decisions or actions of a police officer, and does not change the applicable law.

---

<sup>7</sup> [Link to R.R.O. 1990, Reg. 926: EQUIPMENT AND USE OF FORCE](#)

<sup>8</sup> For further clarity, on April 1, 2024, the *Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019* (CSPA) replaced the PSA. The relevant regulation under the CSPA is the Use of Force and Weapons Regulation. However, all the use of force incidents included in this technical report occurred while the PSA was in force.

An officer assesses a situation, a person's behaviour, and other factors to decide if force is necessary and, if so, which force option to use from a range of options. At the lowest risk/threat level, the presence of an officer or officers may serve to adequately control a situation and change the behaviour of the person(s) involved without using force. At the highest risk/threat level, an officer may choose to use lethal force when there is risk of serious bodily harm or death for members of the public, officers, or individuals involved that cannot be resolved with any other non-force or force option. There is a range of other force options, including physical control and intermediate weapons, between the lowest risk/threat and highest risk/threat levels.

De-escalation may lead to a lower amount of force being used. It may even prevent the need for force. Increased force may be appropriate when the situation becomes more serious and the threat increases to members of the public, officers, or the persons involved. Employing de-escalation strategies to achieve peaceful resolutions is a fundamental goal during police interactions with the public.

### **1.2.2 Officer Training and Certification**

In Ontario, use of force and firearms training for officers is mandated in legislation. In 2023, this was the Equipment and Use of Force Regulation (R.R.O. 1990, Regulation 926) under the PSA.

All new Ontario police recruits complete foundational training through the Basic Constable Training (BCT) program, that includes training on de-escalation and the use of force. A member of a police service must not use force on another person unless the member has successfully completed training on use of force (s. 14.2(1)). There were two notable changes to the training in 2023: the addition of an online mental health crisis response module and a communication-based virtual reality session. These additions extended the BCT program by six days.

In addition, police officers are required to take annual use of force training, which is provided by their police service by qualified instructors who are accredited through the Ontario Police College. This training must include legal requirements, the exercise of judgement, safety, theories relating to the use of force, and practical proficiency. This content is typically delivered via classroom presentation, online courses, and scenario-based training activities.

Officers must complete a firearms training course before they are allowed to carry a firearm. Officers must complete training every twelve months to continue to carry a firearm (s.14.2(2)).<sup>9</sup>

Additionally, the Ministry's Use of Force Guideline, which was in use throughout 2023, recommended specific training on communication, physical control, impact weapons (e.g., baton), aerosol weapons (e.g., pepper spray), conducted energy weapons (CEWs), and firearms. This ongoing training is to ensure that an officer can assess a situation quickly and effectively to determine the appropriate response, and to evaluate whether a physical method is required to subdue an individual to bring them into custody, or to prevent injury to the individual, the officer, or a member of the public.

### **1.3 The 2023 Use of Force Report**

The Ontario Use of Force Report is an administrative form first implemented in 1992 (Version 0) through the Equipment and Use of Force Regulation (R.R.O. 1990, Regulation 926) under the *Police Services Act*. The Use of Force Report captures information about police use of force incidents. This includes the type of force used, whether an individual was perceived to be carrying a weapon, and the reason force was applied.<sup>10</sup> The purpose of Version 0 was to collect data on use of force incidents to inform police policy and training.

The perceived race of individuals upon whom force was used was added to the Use of Force Report on January 1, 2020, as required by the ARA Regulation.

This was to allow race-based analysis to identify potential instances of disproportionalities and disparities in police use of force. The data generated from this version had several limitations. These limitations significantly affected what analyses could be performed and what conclusions could be supported by the data.

The Use of Force Report was further updated and Version 2.0 rolled out on January 1, 2023. These updates improved available data quality and analytical capabilities.

#### **1.3.1 When Force Must be Reported**

The Ministry of the Solicitor General analyzed data from police Use of Force Reports collected under the Equipment and Use of Force Regulation (R.R.O. 1990, Regulation 26) for incidents between January 1 and December 31, 2023.

---

<sup>9</sup> Chiefs of Police can grant limited extensions to complete the mandatory training (s.14.3(2) and 14.3(3)).

<sup>10</sup> A copy of the Use of Force Report (Version 2.1) used for data collection is available in the Ontario Data Catalogue with the data used to prepare this report.

The Equipment and Use of Force Regulation (R.R.O. 1990, Regulation 926) was revised as of January 1, 2023. The circumstances under which force must be reported were changed, including requiring officers to report additional types of CEW use and including a checkbox for CEWs, rather than entering it as an “Other” type of force. As a result of this change, incidents that were not previously provincially reportable became reportable in 2023. This enhanced reporting was expected to result in a higher number of reports being submitted in 2023, relative to previous years. Such an increase in the total number of reports should not be interpreted as necessarily indicating an increase in these type of force incidents.

In 2023, members of police services were required under s. 14.5(1) to complete a Use of Force Report whenever a police service member drew a handgun in the presence of a member of the public; pointed a firearm at a person; discharged a firearm; or used a weapon on another person. It was also reportable if an officer drew and displayed a conducted energy weapon (CEW; i.e., TASER) to a person with the intention of achieving compliance, pointed a CEW at a person, or discharged a CEW. Force was also reportable if the force was used on another person, including through the use of a horse or a dog, that resulted in an injury requiring the services of a physician, nurse or paramedic, and the member was aware that the injury required such services before the member went off duty.<sup>11</sup> Full details about when force must be reported and exceptions to reporting requirements are available in the Use of Force Regulation.

### **1.3.2 Addition of Race-Based Data Collection**

To meet the requirements of Item 6 of ARA Regulation 267/18, the Use of Force Report includes the following question to capture the police service member’s perception of the race of the individual upon whom force was applied and a report was required to be completed.

*What race category best describes the subject(s)? (select only one per subject)<sup>12</sup>*

1. *Black*
2. *East/Southeast Asian*
3. *Indigenous (First Nations, Métis, Inuit)*
4. *Latino*

---

<sup>11</sup> When a Use of Force Report is required to be submitted under this regulation, these are referred to as “provincially reportable” uses of force.

<sup>12</sup> The language of the question on the Use of Force Report deviates slightly from the language in ARDS 40, which is “What race category best describes this individual” (select only one).” This small change was made to use language consistent with the Use of Force Report (subject vs individual) and because respondents can report perceived race for up to three individuals, however, only one race category can be chosen per individual as per the ARDS.

5. *Middle Eastern*
6. *South Asian*
7. *White*

In accordance with ARDS 40, police service members are required to select which of the seven racial categories best describes the individual. Collection of race-based data in this manner, collecting one person's perception of the race of another person, is an example of Participant Observer Information (POI).<sup>13</sup>

This question is mandatory and reporting officers can only select one of the race categories provided. Under the ARDS, it is not permitted to include on the report a "don't know," "prefer not to answer," or open text response option. If an individual is perceived to be of mixed race, the officer must choose the race category that, in their view, the individual most resembles. Officers are instructed not to ask the individual to provide their self-identified race.

### **1.3.3 Team Reports**

In some circumstances, an officer was permitted to submit a Use of Force Report on behalf of a team. In the 2020-2022 technical report, team reports were primarily received from tactical/hostage rescue or emergency response teams.<sup>14, 15</sup>

A regulatory change that came into force on January 1, 2023, updated the reporting requirements related to team reports.

Under s. 14.6(1), the supervisor of a containment team, tactical unit or hostage rescue team, or an officer designated by the supervisor, could submit a report on behalf of the team, if, during an operational deployment of the team's emergency response functions and while acting under the command of the supervisor:

1. A member drew a handgun in the presence of a member of the public.
2. A member pointed a firearm at a person.
3. A member drew and displayed a conducted energy weapon to a person with the intention of achieving compliance.

---

<sup>13</sup> See Standards 38 to 43 of ARDS for more information on POI.

<sup>14</sup> For a description of police public order units and emergency response services, see section 18 "Public Order Maintenance" and section 21 "Emergency Response Services under the Reg. 3/99: ADEQUACY AND EFFECTIVENESS OF POLICE SERVICES of the Police Services Act [Link to O. Reg. 3/99: ADEQUACY AND EFFECTIVENESS OF POLICE SERVICES](#)

<sup>15</sup> Police Services may refer to their tactical-or emergency response teams by different names. The teams captured in this category include teams referred to as: Tactical, Tactical Rescue Unit, Tactical Containment Team, Emergency Task Unit, Emergency Services Unit, Emergency Response Team, Tactical and Rescue, Tactical Services Unit, Tactical Support Unit, Emergency Task Force, Emergency Response Unit, or Tactical Emergency Services Unit.

4. A member pointed a conducted energy weapon at a person.

If any member of the team used a force response that required a report to be submitted, other than the ones listed above, they were required to submit an Individual Report (s. 14.6(2)).

The requirements for team reporting for a public order unit were slightly different. Under s. 14.6(4), a supervisor of a public order unit, or an officer designated by the supervisor, could submit a Team Report if, during an operational deployment of the unit for public order maintenance and while acting under the command of the supervisor, one or more members did any of the following:

1. A member applied force resulting in injury requiring the services of a physician, nurse or paramedic.
2. A member pointed a firearm deployed with less lethal projectiles at a person.
3. A member discharged a firearm deployed with less lethal projectiles at a person.
4. A member drew and displayed a conducted energy weapon to a person with the intention of achieving compliance.
5. A member pointed a conducted energy weapon at a person.

Similar to the other team types, if any member of the team used a force response that required a report to be submitted, other than the ones listed above, they were required to submit an Individual Report (s. 14.6(5)).

Finally, s. 14.7 allowed officers to complete a Team Report if two or more officers were acting in co-ordination in response to a single event under specific circumstances, even if the officers did not belong to a dedicated, specialized team. This was an option under s. 14.7 of the regulation if:

1. An officer drew a handgun in the presence of a member of the public.
2. An officer pointed a firearm at a person.
3. An officer drew and displayed a conducted energy weapon to a person with the intention of achieving compliance.
4. An officer pointed a conducted energy weapon at a person.

However, s. 14.7(2) required that if an officer used a type of force other than the four listed above, they must complete an Individual Report.

This section (s. 14.7) allowed team reporting in many situations that would not necessarily have resulted in a Team Report previously. As such, direct comparisons with data collected using older versions of the Use of Force Report cannot be made.

Under the updated regulation from January 1, 2023, team reports could be submitted by specialized teams, who were acting in coordination in response to a single event. In all cases, if any team member used reportable force other than the types of force noted in sections 14.6(1), 14.6(4), or 14.7(2), that officer was required to submit an Individual Report.

### **1.3.4 Reporting Police Services**

As of January 1, 2020, all municipal police services and the Ontario Provincial Police were required to submit Use of Force Reports to the Ministry pursuant to the Equipment and Use of Force Regulation (s. 14.5 (4)). Race-based data are collected pursuant to Item 6 in the ARA Regulation 267/18 table.

First Nation police services were not required to complete or submit Use of Force Reports to the Ministry under the PSA.

In 2023, Ontario had 53 police services (43 municipal police services, nine First Nation police services, and one provincial police service).



# Section 2: Data Limitations

## 2.1. Use of Administrative Data for Research

The data analyzed in this technical report are derived from Use of Force Reports that were designed and implemented for administrative purposes. Although there was a full redesign to improve data collection, the Use of Force Report remains an administrative form. Administrative data is data that organizations use to conduct their regular operations.

Administrative data is frequently used for research, but there are often unique challenges related to the design, structure, and content of the information in datasets derived from administrative systems.<sup>16</sup> Unlike data specifically collected for research purposes, administrative datasets may not include all the information needed to answer research questions of interest or to develop or test theory. In addition, administrative datasets often require substantially more data management for cleaning, organizing, restructuring, and recoding to prepare the data for use in research compared to research datasets. A great deal of time and effort may be required to ensure that analysts understand how the information was generated and determine the appropriate uses for the data and its applicability for answering research questions of interest.

When using administrative data for research purposes, it is often necessary to link different administrative datasets together to create a comprehensive research dataset. This adds to the complexity and opens new opportunities for more fulsome and meaningful analysis. For police use of force analysis, individual police services can link data from Use of Force Reports to information in their Records Management Systems (RMS). The Ministry of the Solicitor General does not have access to information in police services' RMS, meaning that some research questions cannot be explored by the Ministry.

One benefit of administrative data is that it can be an efficient data collection method that often provides data about all – or nearly all – relevant individuals or events. In contrast, social science research typically involves collecting data from a sample of people and then generalizing the results from the sample to a larger population. This generalization involves the use of inferential statistics to assess whether findings in the sample data are generalizable to the population of interest (e.g., whether results of an opinion poll conducted with 1,500 Ontarians can be used to make inferences about the opinions of all Ontarians). This inferential step is typically not necessary with administrative data because it usually includes information about the whole population. This is the case with the Use of Force Report data. Analysis was conducted on all Use

---

<sup>16</sup> These challenges are discussed in greater detail by Connelly, Playford, Gayle, and Dibben (2016): [The role of administrative data in the big data revolution in social science research - ScienceDirect](#)

of Force Reports received by the Ministry, not a sampling, therefore, inferential analysis is not required for this technical report's analyses.

## **2.2 Lack of Standardization**

One challenge with using data collected from an administrative form, such as the Use of Force Report, is that individuals completing the form may have different understandings of what the question is asking and how to respond.

There is a provincial guide on how to complete the Use of Force Report, which was updated when the revised report was released. However, the guide does not necessarily provide explanations for all response options contained in the report. Individual police services may provide complementary guides and supports to reporting officers, but this is not standardized across Ontario at this time.

The result of this lack of provincial standardization for areas such as police calls for service codes, definitions<sup>17</sup> and response options can cause data quality challenges and additional time requirements when analyzing data collected from multiple police services. This does not affect individual police services' ability to analyze their own data.

## **2.3 Data Not Collected in the Use of Force Report**

Use of force incidents can be complex, with many factors contributing to the decisions made by everyone involved. The validity of the conclusions is heavily influenced by the completeness of the available data. If key information is not included, only tentative conclusions can be supported. A few key variables that were not collected on the current version of the Use of Force Report would significantly improve understanding of use of force incidents. Examples of these are outlined in this section.

### **2.3.1 Officer Experience and Demographics**

In the 2023 dataset, there is little information about the officers who used force. Rank category (i.e., constable, non-commissioned officer, commissioned officer) and years of service were collected, but other information could be useful.

### **2.3.2 Information About an Individual**

One significant improvement compared to previous years is that the Use of Force Reports used in 2023 included structured questions where officers can indicate what factors influenced their response to an individual. This includes the individual's

---

<sup>17</sup> For example, the impact of a lack of standardization for call type data on ability to understand counts or trends or conduct comparisons across services or regions.

behaviour, the nature of the call, past history with the individual, as well as their physical size, strength, and abilities.

One key factor not included is whether the individual appeared to be experiencing mental health distress and/or intoxication from drugs or alcohol. Collecting additional incident contextual information would permit a better understanding of how officers respond to varying situations.

### **2.3.3 Personally Identifiable Information**

The Use of Force Reports do not include any information that could be used to identify any individuals upon whom force was used. As a result, it is not possible to determine if any individual is described on more than one report related to a single incident, or in multiple incidents in a year. There are two key drawbacks.

First, it is not possible with these data to determine the number of unique individuals upon whom police used force in 2023. An incident that included two reports, each describing force used on two individuals, could have involved two, three, or four unique individuals. Regardless, the dataset includes four observations of individuals. As well, if an individual has multiple encounters with police that involve force that person will be described at least once for each incident. Because of this, the count of observations of individuals will necessarily overcount the number of actual individuals upon whom force was used.

Second, without the ability to identify when multiple observations of the same individual are provided, any individual-level analysis comes with major caveats. Any results of analysis based on the observation of an individual (rather than the report or the incident) could be directly related to perceived race. Alternately, it could be due to individuals of some perceived race categories being more likely to be involved in incidents with a greater number of officers, leading to those individuals being perceived more frequently in the dataset. This factor could also lead to inflated use of force incidents with the same individual being represented multiple times.

### **2.3.4 Number of Subject Individuals Involved in the Incident**

On each Use of Force Report, officers are required to indicate the number of individuals upon whom reportable force was used. Any other individuals present would not be counted anywhere on the report. For example, if officers arrived on scene to find a group of nine individuals and only used force on one, any reports would only provide information about the one individual. The other eight individuals who were present would not necessarily be noted on the report. Including a total number of individuals involved in the incident would provide necessary additional context to the officer's report.

## **2.4 Report Design Impacts on Data Quality**

Based on analysis of the data as well as feedback from police services, there are some variables that could be changed to enhance the quality and usefulness of the data.

### **2.4.1 Incident Number and Police Service Division**

The Ministry began receiving incident numbers on Version 2.0 of the Use of Force Report on January 1, 2023. These incident numbers are generated by the police services' Records Management System (RMS) to link all occurrence or other reports related to the call for service. Each service has its own format for incident numbers.

On the Use of Force Report, officers are to enter the incident number in an open-text field. This field has no restrictions on the types of characters that can be included or guidance on the structure of the data to be entered. This led to discrepancies in the formatting of incident numbers within police services, which hampers the ability to link reports for the same use of force incident. For example, if the RMS generates 2023-57209 as an incident number, officers may enter 23-57209, 2023/57209, 202357209, or other variations. Although best efforts were made to resolve discrepancies in incident numbers, it is possible that some links were missed or unable to be confirmed.

### **2.4.2 Incident Type**

For 2023, officers were instructed to select one incident type from a drop-down list of 22 options that best described the final disposition of the incident. There was no option to provide a response other than the ones on the list. This is an update the previous form, where officers could select multiple incident types for any given encounter as well as provide a written description.

Officers were instructed to use their best judgment for the type of incident. There are no province-wide standardized instructions on how to select an option when multiple options could be accurate. This makes it difficult to know how many of a particular incident type resulted in a use of force incident.

An additional challenge is the type of incident at disposition may not be the type of incident that officers were called to and may have influenced their response options. An incident could begin as a traffic stop or disturbance and end as an active attacker or violent crime incident. Conversely, the initial call for service could be reported to officers as a weapons call, causing them to arrive on scene with handguns drawn; however, after arriving officers determined the "weapon" was a spray paint can for graffiti and the final disposition may be coded as "property crime."

A possible enhancement could be to collect data on what type of incident officers believed they were entering and what type of incident it turned out to be in the end.

### **2.4.3 Location**

Location data were not analyzed in this technical report due to the variety of response options that require standardizing to enable use in analysis. Officers have five open-text options for entering location data: GPS coordinates, address, postal code, closest intersection, and other. Only the postal code field includes data validations. Some locations, particularly in urban centres, could be identified in multiple ways. For example, the Eaton Centre Mall in downtown Toronto could be entered as: 220 Yonge St.; M5B 2H1; Yonge and Dundas, Yonge and Shuter, or Yonge and Queen; or 43.654434, -79.380852.

As well, incidents may take place in more than one location, even though the report currently can only capture one location. In these incidents, it is not clear how officers decided which location to report.

### **2.4.4 Rank Category**

Results from the previous report showed the vast majority of Use of Force Reports were submitted by Constables and Special Constables. Constables also made up a substantial proportion of officers in Ontario. Currently, it is not possible to compare different classes of Constable (i.e., 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>) or to look separately at Special Constables, whose duties and equipment are different than other Constables.

### **2.4.5 Injuries to Individuals or Officers from the Use of Physical Force**

#### **2.4.5.1 Treatment of Injuries**

The questions on the Use of Force Report related to treatment of injuries sustained during physical force could be improved by clarifying who provided the treatment. Under the Use of Force Regulation, physical force is only provincially reportable if it resulted in injuries requiring the services of a physician, nurse, or paramedic.

Currently the treatment response options included: No; First Aid; Medical Attention by Personnel at Scene; Admission to Medical Facility; Medical Attention at Facility; Don't Know; and Other. Any report that included admission or attention at a medical facility was clearly a reportable incident under the Use of Force Regulation. However, for the other response options, the incident was only reportable if services were provided by a physician, nurse, or paramedic. First aid or medical attention provided by officers would not require a report to the Ministry. The current version of the report does not allow officers to indicate who provided attention or treatment.

The result is that it may not be possible for the Ministry to exclude reports from non-provincially reportable incidents. Police services may require officers to complete reports for non-provincially reportable incidents to inform their own decisions about service-level operations and training.

#### **2.4.5.2 Lack of Clarity on when Injuries to Individuals Should be Reported**

A second challenge with the data on injuries is that there may be confusion on when injuries should and should not be reported. Officers should only include physical injuries that were caused by their own use of force, not injuries caused anyone else. This does not mean that the injury was inconsequential or unimportant, however the intention of the report is to capture injuries caused specifically by the reporting officer's use of force.

Based on data available, it appears that some reports noted injuries caused either by other officers or by the individuals themselves.

As well, many of the "Don't Know" responses for subject individual injuries were related to incidents where officers were attempting to capture a driver who was impaired or driving a stolen vehicle.

#### **2.4.5.3 Lack of Clarity on when Injuries to Officers Should be Reported**

The instructions guide does clarify that officers should only report injuries that they themselves sustained as a result of using force. They are not meant to include injuries to other officers. However, the wording on the report itself about officer injuries does not make this clear. The section is called "Officer Involved Injuries" and the question on whether there were injuries was "Were physical injuries sustained because of the force applied?" Officers may be also recording injuries to their colleagues, based on the wording on the Use of Force Report even though they are not meant to do so.

#### **2.4.5.4 Injuries to Officers Caused by the Force Applied on Team Reports**

On Individual Reports, officers are required to indicate whether they were injured as a result of using force and what kind of medical attention was required, if any. These questions were not included on Team Reports. Consequently, any figures on officer injuries are likely to be an undercount. Including these details on Team Reports could be explored.

### **2.5 Limited Analysis Options without an Appropriate Benchmark Population**

ARDS 29 requires organizations to compute racial disproportionality and/or disparity indices. Whenever possible, the Ministry calculated the indices that are required by the

ARDS. However, it is not always possible to do so, primarily because an appropriate benchmark population is not available. Most notably, the Ministry still cannot calculate racial disproportionality for police use of force that accounts for how often members of different racial groups come into contact with police.

Measuring disproportionality requires a benchmark population to compare observed data against. ARDS 30 requires PSOs to choose the benchmark<sup>18</sup> population appropriate to their sector and research context for disproportionality analyses. The benchmark must be the most relevant population for the outcome of interest from the best available datasets and must be useful for interpreting year-over-year trends.

In research, a “population” is the group *that is of interest* or about which the research intends to draw conclusions. This is different from the colloquial meaning of “population,” which usually refers to the people living in a geographical region. For example, the appropriate population for a study on the experiences of Canadian cancer patients would be people in Canada diagnosed with cancer, rather than everyone living in Canada.

The appropriate research benchmark population is determined by the questions the research is intending to answer. For this technical report, the principal research question is whether there are differences in police use of force depending on the perceived race of the individual upon whom force was used. Consequently, the most relevant benchmark population would be individuals who interacted with police.

Selecting the most appropriate benchmark population is crucial. The benchmark population chosen will affect whether disproportionality is detected at all, and the size and direction of any racial disproportionality identified.

For example, if analysis indicates that 10 per cent of use of force incidents involved people perceived as Indigenous, the interpretation of the finding will be different depending on whether Indigenous people are five per cent of the benchmark population (indicating overrepresentation) or 25 per cent of the benchmark population (indicating underrepresentation).

It is relatively common for researchers to use resident population data from the Census as a benchmark population for calculating disproportionalities, including in policing research. Although this approach is frequently used and provides valuable insights there are considerable drawbacks that make this resident benchmark population less suitable for measuring disproportionality in the specific event of police use of force.

---

<sup>18</sup> ARDS provides the following definition of a benchmark: “A benchmark is a point of reference, or standard, against which things can be compared, assessed, or measured.”



Using resident population to calculate disproportionality in police use of force requires that all residents in an area be equally likely to encounter police. There is literature from Ontario and other jurisdictions showing that members of some racial groups come into contact with police more often than members of other racial groups. This applies to self-identified and perceived race. The result of these drawbacks is a substantial concern with the ability of resident population to provide an accurate and reliable measure of disproportionality in police use of force.

Using resident population as the benchmark to measure disproportionality does not distinguish between racial disproportionality in police use of force specifically and racial disproportionality resulting from high frequency-policing generally. This distinction is important if the intent is to understand if any disproportionalities seen in police use of force are related to the incidents themselves, rather than broader factors related to high-frequency policing. As a result, using resident population as a benchmark, can overcount disproportionality in use of force for some racial groups (e.g., high-police contact groups) and undercount or erroneously indicate no disproportionality for other racial groups (e.g., low-police contact groups).

A hypothetical scenario illustrates this challenge. The residents of the community in question are 50% “race A” and 20% “race B.” Encounters with police there are not evenly distributed across the two racial categories; 30% of police encounters occur with members of “race A” and 40% of encounters occur with members of “race B.” In the instances where officers use reportable force, 30% of the incidents involve members of “race A” and 40% involve members of “race B.” A comparison between use of force and resident population indicates disproportionalities of 0.6 (underrepresentation) for “race A” and 2.0 (overrepresentation) for “race B.” However, when use of force is compared to the rates of police encounters, the disproportionality for each group is 1.0 (no disproportionality). If comparing to resident population, it appears there are disproportionalities in police use of force for the two racial groups. However, when accounting for rates of police encounters, the use of reportable force is not more frequent for one group than the other.

As the example above illustrates, the most relevant benchmark for exploring disproportionality that is attributable specifically to police use of force is the population of people who have experienced police contact or enforcement.<sup>19</sup> An “encounters” dataset with race-based information would enable the use of multiple benchmarks in analysis. This would allow analysis to understand potential disproportionalities in police contact generally and use of force specifically, rather than confounding

---

<sup>19</sup> Conceptually, this is similar to an analysis of a service or program using those who are eligible as the benchmark population, rather than all individuals in the catchment area.

disproportionality in use of force and contact with police. At this time, the Ministry does not have access to data that could be used to construct a police enforcement benchmark population.

Another significant challenge with using resident population as a benchmark is that it is not known whether the event involved residents of the community. Using resident population cannot account for individuals who live in one community but spend time in other areas. For example, individuals may commute from one area to another for work; may stay in or pass through areas on vacation;<sup>20</sup> may be apprehended along provincial highway corridors;<sup>21</sup> or may be engaging in criminal activity or hiding in a location far away from their primary residence. Comparing use of force on non-residents to a resident benchmark population to measure disproportionalities can result in both false positives (saying there is disproportionality when there is not) and false negatives (saying there is no disproportionality when in fact there is disproportionality).<sup>22</sup>

As a result of the lack of a proper relevant benchmark population, this technical report does not include calculations of disproportionality indices of police use of force relative to police contact.

---

<sup>20</sup> There are rural Ontario towns that experience a large influx of non-residents during the summer season. In that case, the Census population of the town's year-round residents does not represent the people present during the summer. If most use of force events occurred during the summer season and involved non-residents, using the Census population of year-round residents as the benchmark population would lead to an inaccurate measure of disproportionality.

<sup>21</sup> This is particularly relevant for investigations of drug and human trafficking, vehicle theft rings, and organized crime. The police interaction along highways that included use of force may take place hundreds or even thousands of kilometres away from where individuals live or work.

<sup>22</sup> In some use of force-related research, the research question may be best examined using resident population as the benchmark and comparing a non-resident's race to the racial makeup of the surrounding community. Research focused on exploring race-out-of-place theory would require both benchmarks. Comparisons between the individuals involved in use of force events – residents and non-residents – to the racial breakdown of the community in which the event took place can be used to test for race-out-of-place theories of systemic discrimination. Again, it is vital to select the most appropriate benchmark population to answer the specific research questions of interest.

# Section 3: Use of Force Datasets

### 3.1 Overview

The 2023 provincial dataset was created from data extracted from Use of Force Reports for incidents that occurred between January 1, 2023, and December 31, 2023, and were received by the Ministry of the Solicitor General by July 26, 2024.<sup>23</sup>

The Use of Force Report was an Adobe Acrobat Portable Document Format (PDF) fillable form used by most police services<sup>24</sup> to record information related to provincially reportable use of force incidents.<sup>25</sup> These forms were then emailed to the Ministry through a secure file transfer process. The data extracted from these forms were cleaned, reorganized, restructured, and recoded as required to create datasets usable for analyses. Any reports that did not meet the provincially reportable criteria were not included in this technical report.<sup>26</sup>

A revised Use of Force Report was implemented on January 1, 2023 (Version 2.0).<sup>27</sup> This Version 2.0 Report is a substantial change in data and structure from the previous version.<sup>28</sup>

Between January 1 and March 31, 2023, the responses to one sub-question in the Version 2.0 Report were not being stored and thus were not retrievable for analysis due to a technical issue. If an officer indicated discharging a conducted energy weapon (CEW) in Cartridge/Probe mode, their response to the question on the number of CEW

---

<sup>23</sup> Police services are required under the ARA Regulation to submit their Use of Force Reports to the Ministry. An All Chiefs Memo (23-0086) was sent on December 19, 2023 to ensure all police services were aware of this obligation and inform them that all reports were due to the Ministry by February 29, 2024. A reminder was sent in late January 2024. The Ministry followed up in March 2024 and April 2024 with all police services to confirm that the number of reports received matched the number of reports the services were required to transmit. From March to mid-July, all police services had the opportunity to correct any submitted reports and/or add reports that had not been provided.

<sup>24</sup> Some police services have developed applications that their members use to enter the use of force incident information. This data is sent to the Ministry in XML format. The data collected in these applications are meant to be identical to the data collected on the PDF form.

<sup>25</sup> Some police services instruct their members to also use the provincial Use of Force Report to record information on use of force incidents required by their local police service but not required under the PSA. If these reports were sent to the Ministry, they were deleted from the dataset. As a result, numbers reported by the Ministry may not match numbers reported by police services.

<sup>26</sup> On the Use of Force Report, there is no way to specify what type of force caused any injuries. For example, if a report described use of a baton, which caused an injury, and the use of physical control, which did not cause a physical injury, only the baton use would be reportable under the Regulation. Where it is clear that physical control did not cause an injury, or caused an injury that did not require medical treatment, that force type category was removed from analysis.

<sup>27</sup> As noted previously, the numbering of the versions in this technical report are for clarity and do not correspond to what may be printed on the report itself.

<sup>28</sup> Due to technical issues, a small number of 2023 reports (three reports) were submitted using the outdated Version 1.0 form. Police services were asked to resubmit reports using the Version 2.0 or 2.1 form whenever possible, though it cannot be determined if they did so. These three reports using the Version 1.0 form were excluded from analysis because the data were not comparable.

cycles was not saved. Version 2.1 of the Use of Force Report was released to resolve this issue, effective April 1, 2023.<sup>29</sup>

Due to substantial changes between Version 1.0 and 2.0 of the Use of Force Report, changes in the data collected by the Ministry, as well as changes to the Use of Force Regulation, it is not possible to directly compare provincial data from 2023 to provincial data from previous years.

Additional details on the data variables can be found in the data dictionary in the Ontario Data Catalogue.

### **3.1.1 Out of Scope Reports**

In total, 10,935 provincially-reportable Use of Force Reports were submitted to the Ministry for the 2023 dataset from across all 44 in-scope police services. There were 1,603 reports not used in the race-based analyses as these did not involve force on people. The final 2023 dataset used for these analyses is composed of data from 9,332 reports required under the provincial Use of Force Regulation.

#### **3.1.1.1 Reports Involving Only Animals or Accidental Firearm Discharges**

The focus of the ARA analysis is on identifying racial disparities and inequalities between people. Officers are required to submit all provincially mandated reports to the Ministry. Some of these reports are not relevant to analysis on racial differences in use of force. Use of Force Reports involving only animals (e.g., humanely destroying an injured animal)<sup>30</sup> or the accidental discharge of firearms were excluded from this analysis. These incidents do not meaningfully add to analyses focused on racial disparity or disproportionality.

For 2023, the Ministry received 1,258 reports involving only animals. These were excluded from analysis; however, they are available in the Ontario Data Catalogue.

The Ministry did not receive any reports of unintentional firearm discharges in operational settings. The Ministry received one report of an unintentional CEW discharge. This report was not relevant to race-based data analysis, so it was excluded from analyses; however, data from the report is available in the Ontario Data Catalogue.

#### **3.1.1.2 Reports that Did Not Involve Interaction with Individuals**

---

<sup>29</sup> Between April and approximately July 2023, some reports were submitted using Version 2.0, in error.

<sup>30</sup> This applies whether the officer was responding to a call for an animal or to another type of call that turned out to only involve an animal.

Officers are required to submit a Use of Force Report any time they draw a handgun in the presence of a member of the public, even if the subject individual(s) fled without the officer being able to observe, identify, or interact with them. For example, officers receive a call that armed individuals are present inside a residence. Prior to entering the residence, the officers draw their handguns in the presence of members of the public standing outside the residence. In this case, a Use of Force Report is required. If the armed individuals fled before police arrived, there would have been no interaction between the armed individuals and the officers; however, a Use of Force Report would still be required as the officers' handguns were out in the presence of members of the public. In this scenario, the officer would choose "No interaction with the subject" on the Use of Force Report.

Although it is important to track these types of force incidents for policy and training purposes, as the risk for the use of lethal force is heightened whenever firearms are used, these reports are excluded from these analyses. This is a change from the methods in the 2020-2022 Technical Report that used data from Version 1.0 of the Use of Force Report. On the Use of Force Report Version 2.0 and 2.1, if an officer selects the checkbox indicating no interaction with subject, they will not provide any data on individuals upon whom force was used. On the Version 1.0 Report (used between 2020-2022), officers were instructed to make their best guess about the likely race of the individual based on cues available to them at the time.

Although not included in the analyses of this technical report, the data from these 345 reports are available in the Ontario Data Catalogue.

## 3.2 Datasets

The data collected by the Ministry were organized into four connected normalized<sup>31</sup> datasets, which were used for analysis in this technical report.<sup>32</sup> This structure is for organizing the data and eliminating redundancy. The Main Records dataset includes the data elements that apply to the event as a whole (e.g., date and time, location). Each Use of Force Report is included in this dataset as one row. The other three datasets include data about more specific data elements, which may or may not apply to each record in the Main Records dataset. These three specific datasets correspond to data

---

<sup>31</sup> Database normalization is a design principle for organizing data in a consistent way, avoiding redundancy and complexity, eliminating duplicates, and maintaining the integrity of the database. In a normalized database, the data are divided into several data tables that are linked together, typically using primary keys, foreign keys, and composite keys. In contrast, a denormalized dataset exists in a single flat table, which may include substantial redundancy.

<sup>32</sup> Part B of the Report collects personal information of officers who complete or review the form, or who were involved in the incident. These are the only questions on the Use of Force Report that are not collected by the Ministry and are not included in the datasets.

about 1) the individuals upon whom force was used, 2) the weapons these individuals were perceived to have, and 3) probe cycle records for police use of CEWs.

Across all four datasets, there are a total of 207 columns for analysis. These include all the data that was collected by the Ministry, except for 29 columns that were suppressed for privacy.

This section first describes the structure of questions on the Use of Force Report (Version 2.0 and 2.1) and how it shaped the four datasets for analysis. It then describes each dataset in further detail.

### **3.2.1 Structure of Questions in the Use of Force Report**

The Use of Force Report (Version 2.0 and 2.1) is an interactive form. When first opened, it contains 26 questions, and additional questions are shown based on the responses provided. This is to reduce the time required by officers to complete the reports. For example, if an officer checks a box to indicate using physical control techniques, they will be shown additional mandatory questions to capture details about the physical force (e.g., grounding, joint locks, and strikes). If the officer does not check the box for physical control techniques, the additional detailed questions will not be shown. The only question that is never mandatory is the narrative.<sup>33</sup>

The Use of Force Report contains single-response, multiple-response, restricted-input, and open-text questions. These question types are stored as follows in the datasets:

- For single-response questions, officers must choose only one response from a set of response options. These may be choosing one of a set of checkboxes or selecting one option from a drop-down menu. In the datasets, each single-response question is represented in a single column.
- For multiple-response questions, officers can select as many of the available responses as apply.<sup>34</sup> Each possible response to the question is assigned its own column in the dataset, which indicates whether that response was selected. For example, officers can report more than one reason why they used force. Each of the possible responses (e.g., effect arrest, prevent escape, protect self) has its own column in the dataset.

---

<sup>33</sup> The instruction guide informs officers that the narrative section must be completed if there is no accompanying occurrence report.

<sup>34</sup> This is the general rule for multiple-response questions, although additional restrictions may apply in the combination of responses accepted based on logical sense. For example, Treatment of Subject Injuries is one multiple-response question but does not allow the officer to specify other treatment response options if they selected that no treatment was required.

- For restricted-input questions, data quality checks were added to the form requiring officers to type their response in a specific format. For example, officers must provide a numeric response (e.g., “7”) for their length of service in years. Non-numeric characters (e.g., “seven”) will be rejected. Any dates must be provided in YYYY/MM/DD format. In the datasets, each restricted-input question is represented in a single column.
- For open-text questions, officers can type a response with no restrictions on the type of information. Many of these are questions where there is an “Other” response option with a text space allowing the officer to provide additional information. In the datasets, each open-text question is represented in a single column.

### 3.2.2 Main Records Dataset

The Main Records dataset is made up of one entry for each Use of Force Report received by the Ministry. Included are the variables that are relevant to all reports. These include data related to time, date, location, police service, incident type, etc. It also includes a unique identifier (i.e., primary key) for each Use of Force Report.

The Main Records dataset contains 9,332 rows, representing 9,332 reports that were received by the Ministry.

At the end, there were 81 total variables in the Main Records dataset, of which 64 are available in the Ontario Data Catalogue because 17 were suppressed.

### 3.2.3 Individual Records Dataset

If an officer specifies that the incident involved one or more individuals upon whom force was used,<sup>35</sup> there are up to 53 additional questions that may be shown to capture information about each of those individuals. An officer would only be shown questions that may be relevant to the reporting of the incident. For example, if an officer specified that de-escalation techniques were used on a subject, they will be asked to specify the type of de-escalation technique(s) used. They must also specify whether de-escalation assisted in controlling the behaviour of the subject. However, if no de-escalation techniques were used, the officer must specify the reason(s) why de-escalation was not used. These questions must be answered for each individual upon whom the officer used force.

---

<sup>35</sup> Although all the incidents analyzed in this technical report involve at least one individual upon whom force was used, there are other reports (e.g., dispatching an animal) that do not involve force on an individual. These reports are included in the datasets in the Ontario Data Catalogue.



There are two key sets of variables in this dataset. First, the dataset contains officers' perceptions of the individual upon whom they used force. This includes perceptions of race, age, and gender; whether there was any difficulty perceiving the race of the individual; and the distance between the officer and individual.

Second, this dataset includes variables about the use of force on the individual. This includes the type of force used on the individual, the reason(s) force was used; factors that influenced the officer's response, including whether the individual was perceived or believed to have access to weapons. Subsequently the data set includes use of de-escalation, whether officers' responses were effective at gaining compliance with an individual, whether the individual was injured or required treatment and lastly whether the officer issued the Police Challenge, if relevant.

The Individual Records dataset contains 12,805 rows, representing 12,805 officer perceptions of individuals. Note that an individual could be perceived more than once, for example by two or more officers reporting on the same incident. Each row cannot be assumed to reflect a unique individual.

### **3.2.4 Weapon Records Dataset**

The Weapon Records dataset includes information about any weapons that individuals are perceived or believed to have access to. On the report, officers complete information about weapons for each individual upon whom force was used. For each perceived weapon, up to three questions were asked. Each row of the Weapon Records dataset contains information related to a perceived weapon. The dataset includes variables about what type of weapon (e.g., handgun, edged weapon) was perceived or believed to be present and the location of these weapons.

The section on perceived weapons is presented on the report for each individual upon whom force was used. As a result, it is possible that one weapon may be listed several times, once for each relevant individual. For example, if two individuals are standing right next to a firearm on a table, the firearm is within reach for both. An officer may include the firearm as a perceived weapon for both individuals, though they may also include it only once. The instructional guide does not provide direction on this.

If the officer did not perceive any weapons nor believe any weapons were present, there would be no rows in the Weapon Records dataset associated with the information on the Main Records or Individual Records datasets.

The Weapon Records dataset includes 8,711 rows, representing 8,711 weapons that were perceived or were believed by officers to be present.

### **3.2.5 Cartridge/Probe Cycle Records Dataset**

The Cartridge/Probe Cycle Records dataset contains information about the cartridges used by officers for CEWs in cartridge/probe mode. For cartridge/probe mode, the Use of Force Report allows officers to enter information for multiple cartridges. In the other two deployment modes (drive/push stun and three-point contact), officers can only enter information about a single cartridge; details about these other two modes are captured in the Individual Records dataset. Note that officers can report using a CEW in more than one mode.

The Cartridge/Probe Cycle Records dataset includes 1,136 rows, representing 1,136 cartridges used by officers during use of force incidents.

# Section 4: Analysis and Results

EMBARGOED COPY

## 4.1 Key Concepts for Analysis

This section outlines select findings from the analysis of the 2023 Use of Force Reports received by the Ministry of the Solicitor General. A few points and concepts to assist in interpreting the results are outlined first.

### 4.1.1 Participant-Observer Information

The Use of Force Report collected the reporting officer's perception of the individual's race, age range, and gender. This is also known as Participant Observer Information (POI), addressed in ARDS 40. The ARDS provides the race categories that must be included on the Use of Force Report. Police were instructed not to ask an individual to provide their self-identified race. Although the ARDS note that age and gender may also be important to collect, there is no prescribed language for those questionnaire items.

For each question, officers could only choose one response option. Instructions to officers specified that this should be the perception they had at the time of the force incident. If the officer later learned that an individual self-identified differently than the officer's perception, they should still report their perception. These perceptions may not match how the person self-identifies. As well, multiple officers involved in the same use of force incident may have perceived the same person as a different race category, age range, or gender.

These questions were mandatory on the Use of Force Report, even if officers experienced challenges in perceiving the individual's race, age range, or gender. For example, an individual may have been wearing a mask or disguise. If the incident location was dark or poorly lit, or if the scene was chaotic or evolving rapidly, it may have been particularly challenging to perceive the individual's race, gender, or age. It may not have been possible for the officer to see well enough to perceive the individual, their clothing or accoutrements, hear their voice, or note any other attributes that may have led the officer to perceive a particular racial group, approximate age, or gender. Other aspects of the incident, such as weapon focus,<sup>36</sup> may also have hampered perception of a person's appearance or attributes. Despite this, officers were required to provide their best guess. There was a question on the report that allowed officers to indicate they had difficulty perceiving the individual's race.

---

<sup>36</sup> The Weapon Focus Effect refers to the tendency of individuals to focus their attention on a weapon that is present. The result is less attention focused on the appearance of the person holding the weapon and the individual providing less detail about that person when they are later asked for a description.

## 4.1.2 Unit of Analysis: Report, Incident, and Observation

The ideal unit of analysis depends on the specific research question being analyzed. For the analyses conducted in this technical report, different units of analysis were used depending on the specific analyses conducted. These were primarily the: use of force incident, use of force report, and individual observations. Whenever results are reported, the unit of analysis is noted in that section.

Standard 27 of the ARDS provides guidance on the primary units of analysis for race-based analysis, namely the disaggregated categories of perceived race. In other words, the unit of analysis for perceived race includes each of the race categories, where possible, rather than combining race categories.

### 4.1.2.1 Analysis by Incident

One significant change from previous years' provincial reporting is that it is now possible for the Ministry to link Use of Force Reports associated with the same force incident.<sup>37</sup>

For the purpose of this technical report, a use of force incident is defined as an event, or continuous series of events, known or believed to have involved at least some of the same subject individual(s). This definition may not match how police services define an incident, in general, or a use of force incident specifically.

The Ministry can now report on the number of unique use of force incidents as well as the number of Use of Force Reports connected with each incident.

The capability to analyze at the incident level addresses several gaps from the previous technical report, in particular:

- Generating a count of the total number of provincially reportable use of force incidents that occurred
- Improving data quality by identifying and removing duplicates
- Reducing the risk of overcounts, which may affect results and conclusions. For example, if a police service generated a total of 50 reports for 2023, and 15 were all related to a single use of force incident, analyzing based on report would result in that one incident having a disproportionate influence on results. For example, it could appear that force occurs most frequently at a particular time of

---

<sup>37</sup> This is because the Ministry began receiving incident numbers as of January 1, 2023. Each police service has its own format for incident numbers, which are generated by their records management system. Reporting officers included these in an open-text variable on the report. Discrepancies in how the incident number was provided within police services (e.g., 2023-123456, 23-123456, 23/123456) introduced some challenges in linking reports. Although best efforts were made to resolve the discrepancies, it is possible that some links were missed.

day or time of the year, or involve people perceived to be members of a specific race category, because of one large incident.

#### **4.1.2.2 Linking Reports to Identify Incidents**

Linking reports that pertain to the same incident is done primarily through incident or occurrence numbers generated by police services. Other information may also be used, such as matching reports with the same date and approximate time, location, as well as noting when a report from one police service indicates that officers were assisting another police service. As such, the number of incidents reported by police services may not match the number of incidents reported here.

For enforcement actions where more than one police service responds, it may be possible to link the reports as well, even though there will be different incident numbers. This could involve members of several police services responding to one event and using force. It could involve several police services responding to a series of events involving the same individual(s) that make up a single incident.

It is also possible that several police services were responding to an incident, but only members from some of those services used reportable force. One example is an incident where members of one police service are providing coverage for an incident, with handguns drawn (reportable), and members of another police service apprehend the individual without using force (non-reportable). In this case, although one service was assisting another service, there would only be reports from one police service.

In the case of large joint operations among police services, for example simultaneous execution of high-risk warrants across Ontario, each warrant execution where force was used, whether by different teams of the same service or simultaneously by different police services as part of a coordinated operation, were treated as separate incidents because there was no overlap in location, individuals or officers involved.

Finally, if there are multiple force events involving the same individual(s), over time and involving different police services, these would be treated as one incident. For example, the series of events begins in Scarborough and ends in Milton two hours later. Although the different police services involved may not assign the same incident number for these reports, and the call or incident type, location, and time of day may be different for each reportable force, for the purpose of analysis these reports would be considered belonging to single incident that were a continuous series of events known to involve – or believed to have involved – the same subject individual(s).

In the 2023 dataset, there were 6,269 use of force incidents that generated 9,332 reports.

### **4.1.3 Scope of Technical Report**

This technical report focuses on providing a detailed description of how the data were collected and cleaned, an assessment of data quality, and descriptive statistics of key variables in the datasets. The focus of this technical report is to provide an overview of topics of interest and the dynamics that may be involved in use of force incidents.

## **4.2 Perceptions of the Individuals upon Whom Force was Used**

This section presents analysis about the observations officers made about individuals upon whom force was used. In these analyses, officers' observations about individuals involved in the same use of force incident are often aggregated to categorize the incident by perceived race, age, and gender. Examples below describe aggregation for perceived race; the aggregation principles were the same for perceived age and gender.

For incidents with only one officer's Use of Force Report describing force used on one individual, the perceived race for that individual represents the incident. In other words, if the one individual was perceived as "race A," the incident was classified as an incident involving individuals perceived as "race A."

For incidents with multiple reports and/or individuals, if every perceived race response across all reports matched, the incident was aggregated as that race category. For example, if an incident had three reports each involving multiple individuals and every race perception was "race A," the incident was classified as an incident involving individuals perceived as "race A."

For the remaining incidents (approximately 9.5 per cent), where perceived race did not match across Use of Force Reports and/or observations, two approaches to aggregating were applied to these incidents.

In one approach, the incidents that involved perceptions of more than one race category were coded as "Multiple Races." This could be one officer perceiving several individuals as belonging to different racial groups. It could also be multiple officers perceiving the same individual as different race categories. The "Multiple Races" category was created for the purposes of analysis; it was not a checkbox option on the Use of Force Report.

One advantage of creating and using a "Multiple Races" category in analyses is that the total use of force incidents for each racial category adds to 100 per cent. One drawback to this approach is that the "Multiple Races" category is of limited use for analyses about racial differences.

The second aggregation approach addresses this limitation by including all race categories perceived by officers involved in an incident, in the counts for these incident race categories. An incident is aggregated to more than one race category if there is more than one perceived race involved. For example, if one report indicated that an officer perceived one individual as “race A” and a second individual as “race B,” the incident would be aggregated to both “race A” and “race B” categories. This enables reporting of all incidents that involved at least one individual perceived as belonging to a particular racial category; there is no “Multiple Races” category in this method of aggregation.

This second approach is most consistent with the requirements in the ARDS to report results at the disaggregated race categories. As a result, it is the most frequently used aggregation for many of the race-based analysis in this technical report. The “Multiple Races” category is used when appropriate for a particular analysis.

It is important to keep in mind that observations of individuals in these force incidents do not necessarily represent unique individuals. Multiple officers perceiving the same individual will each provide observations. As such, the number of individual observations is higher than the number of actual individuals described in the Use of Force Reports.

One notable caveat for all analyses involving perceived race, gender, or age is that it is not possible to parse out the potential effects of police contact rates on the rate of police use of force due to the current lack of an appropriate benchmark population. Any race, age, or gender use of force disproportionalities derived by comparing proportion of groups within the use of force dataset to their proportions in the general population, could be due to differences in rates of police use of force with members of that group. Alternatively, they could be due to differences in the number of times individuals of different groups come into contact with police.<sup>38</sup> In other words, it cannot be assumed that any differences observed reflect differences in rates of police use of force, rather than differences in rates of interactions with police. Disproportionality calculated using Ontario resident populations may be overcounted for high-contact groups and undercounted for low-contact groups. This limitation does not apply to disparity indices calculated comparing groups within the use of force dataset.

#### **4.2.1 Race and Difficulty Perceiving Race**

On the Use of Force Report, reporting officers selected one of seven race categories to describe the perceived race of each individual upon whom they used force. There was

---

<sup>38</sup> Which could itself be due to broader factors driving higher police contact for certain groups compared to other groups, including over policing, poverty, profiling by proxy, etc.



no “I don’t know” option. This reflected the requirements of the ARDS. There was also no option for “Mixed Race” or opportunity for officers to select multiple race categories for an individual. Even if an officer knew the individual identified themselves as two races, they were to select the category that they believed the person most resembled.

As well, officers reported whether they had any difficulties perceiving the race of any individual.

What race category best describes this individual? (select only one)

Black  East / Southeast Asian  Indigenous  Latino  Middle Eastern  South Asian  White

Did you have any difficulties perceiving the race of the subject?  Yes Specify  No

Figure 1; Perceived Race Question

#### 4.2.1.1 Race

Overall, use of force incidents most frequently involved individuals who were perceived as White, Black, or Indigenous, in that order. The proportion of incidents involving at least one individual perceived as being a member of the applicable race category were:

- Black: 1,408 incidents (22.5 per cent)
- East/Southeast Asian: 393 incidents (6.3 per cent)
- Indigenous: 533 incidents (8.5 per cent)
- Latino: 164 incidents (2.6 per cent)
- Middle Eastern: 429 incidents (6.8 per cent)
- South Asian: 220 incidents (3.5 per cent)
- White: 3,792 incidents (60.5 per cent)

The number of incidents for any one race category indicates that at least one officer perceived at least one subject individual to be a member of that race category. For the majority of incidents, 90.5 per cent (5,675), all individuals involved were perceived to be of the same race by all officers involved. In 9.5 per cent (594) of incidents, the individuals involved were perceived as belonging to different race categories. This may have involved unique individuals or the same individual perceived differently by multiple officers. Because these incidents were included in the count of all relevant race categories, the total is over 100 per cent.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> There were no notable differences in the ranking of perceived race categories by incident based on how the incidents were aggregated.

The total number of incidents in the dataset was 6,269. Percentages for race category are derived using the total number of incidents, 6,269, because the correct denominator is the total number of incidents reported.

#### 4.2.1.2 Difficulty Perceiving Race

The Use of Force Report Version 2.0 and Version 2.1 used in 2023 allowed officers to indicate, for each individual, whether they had difficulty perceiving that individual's race. If they selected yes, there was an open-text field to specify the difficulty. Officers were not asked whether they had difficulty perceiving the individual's age or gender.

For most observations of individuals (94.7 per cent, 12,125 of 12,805 individual observations),<sup>40</sup> officers reported no difficulty perceiving the individual's race.

In the small number of observations of individuals (5.3 per cent, 680 of 12,805 individual observations) where officers did report difficulty perceiving an individual's race, officers noted several reasons.

These reasons could be grouped into two main categories: difficulty discerning race and not having a clear view of the individual. Difficulty discerning race could occur with individuals who had a light complexion or who were perceived as racially ambiguous. This would lead to difficulty choosing the best race category of those available on the report. Difficulty seeing the individual involved several factors. These included cars with tinted windows making it difficult to see the individuals inside; the individual wearing clothing, a hat, and/or face coverings; individuals hiding behind an object; the distance between the individual and officer; the individual having their back to the officer; and darkness or poor lighting. Officers were instructed to provide their best estimation of the race of the individual in these types of situations, consistent with the guidance in Standard 40 of the ARDS.

There were differences between the perceived races, with the greatest proportion of difficulty for individuals perceived as Latino (15.3 per cent) and the lowest for individuals perceived as White (2.7 per cent).

- Black: 199 observations (6.9 per cent)
- East/Southeast Asian: 51 observations (6.5 per cent)
- Indigenous: 90 observations (10.5 per cent)
- Latino: 44 observations (15.3 per cent)
- Middle Eastern: 95 observations (10.2 per cent)

---

<sup>40</sup> To determine whether officers reported having more or less difficulty in perceiving individuals of different racial categories, data were examined using an officer's observation of each individual they used force on as the unit of analysis. This is the most relevant unit of analysis in this context because difficulty perceiving race was reported for each individual observation and the analytical lens is examining officer difficulty in perceiving race. In other contexts, data may be aggregated to the report or incident as unit of analysis. In this context, aggregating this same data to the incident level, the results are 6.6% (412 incidents) involved at least one person who at least one officer had difficulty perceiving their race.

- South Asian: 20 observations (4.5 per cent)
- White: 181 observations (2.7 per cent)

Caution is warranted when interpreting these results at the observation level. One incident with several subject individuals and several officers making observations will have a disproportionate impact on the results. This is particularly the case with race categories that had a small number of incidents.

#### 4.2.2 Age

Reporting officers selected one of eight age range categories to describe the perceived age of each individual upon whom they used force. They could only select one option for each individual.

What age category best describes this individual? (select only one)

Under 12     12-17     18-24     25-34     35-44     45-54     55-64     65 and older

*Figure 2; Perceived Age Report Question*

The proportion of incidents involving at least one individual perceived as being a member of the applicable age category were:<sup>41</sup>

- Under 12: 22 incidents, 0.4 per cent
- 12-17: 475 incidents, 7.6 per cent
- 18-24: 1,288 incidents, 20.5 per cent
- 25-34: 2,685 incidents, 42.8 per cent
- 35-44: 1,835 incidents, 29.3 per cent
- 45-54: 803 incidents, 12.8 per cent
- 55-64: 420 incidents, 6.7 per cent
- 65 and older: 99 incidents, 1.6 per cent

As with perceived race, officers reporting perceptions of the same individual may provide different responses (e.g., when one officer indicates an individual is 18-24 and another indicates 25-34).

---

<sup>41</sup> Totals add to more than 100 per cent as one incident could involve individuals of different age groups.

### 4.2.3 Gender

Officers were required to report their perception of the gender of each individual upon whom they used force. The options were: Male, Female, Trans/non-binary/other.<sup>42</sup> Officers could only select one option per individual.

What gender category best describes this individual? (select only one)  Male  Female  Trans/non-binary/other

Figure 3; Perceived Gender Report Question

Most incidents (92.2 per cent) involved at least one individual perceived as male (5,781). In 80.7 (5,061) per cent of incidents, all individuals were perceived as male. A smaller proportion of incidents involved at least one individual perceived as female (1,181, 18.8 per cent) or at least one individual perceived as trans/non-binary/other (30, 0.5 per cent).<sup>43</sup>

As with perceived race and age, officers reporting perceptions of the same individual may provide different responses. Also, similar to age, the disproportionality compared to the resident population may be due to officers being more likely to use force on individuals perceived as male and/or these individuals being more likely to come into contact with police.

### 4.3 The Police Services

Officers were required to indicate their own police service when completing the report. For officers who selected Municipal Police Service, a drop-down menu of municipal police services in Ontario was provided. For officers who selected Ontario Provincial Police (OPP), a drop-down menu of OPP regions was provided; the options were Central Region, East Region, General Headquarters, Highway Safety Division, North East Region, North West Region, and West Region.

The Use of Force Report included an option for a reporting officer from an “Other Agency,” but the Ministry did not receive any Use of Force Reports from agencies other than the 44 in-scope police services.

---

<sup>42</sup> Due to the structure of the response options, it was not possible to explore differences between individuals perceived as trans women, trans men, or non-binary. In addition, the number of reports that included individuals perceived as trans, non-binary, or another gender identity (N=37 subject observation reports) was too small to support any meaningful analysis of this question.

<sup>43</sup> Some incidents (722, 11.5 per cent) included perceptions of different genders; these were counted in each applicable category, (i.e., incidents with at least one person perceived as male, female, or trans/non-binary/other).

Select Police Service\* (select only one)

- Municipal Police Service   ▶ Division/District/Other (Appendix A) \_\_\_\_\_
- Ontario Provincial Police   ▶ Detachment (Appendix B) \_\_\_\_\_
- Other Agency   ▶ Specify \_\_\_\_\_

Figure 4; Select Police Service Report Question

All 44 police services in scope provided at least one Use of Force Report in 2023. All 44 provided at least one report involving individuals (i.e., other than for dispatching an injured animal or for accidental discharge of a firearm).

The number of reports submitted to the Ministry by a particular service, including reports related to injured animals or without interaction with an individual, ranged from two to 2,984. As described in section 3.1.1 of this technical report, some Use of Force Reports were excluded from the race-based data analysis herein. The number of reports per service used in the race-based analysis in this technical report ranged from two for to 2,092. Data from all reports, those included and excluded from analyses in this technical report, are available in the Ontario Data Catalogue.

The proportion of force incidents involving people perceived as a particular race varied greatly across Ontario police services. Many factors likely influenced this variability. One important factor was likely the racial makeup of the population who reside in the police service catchment area, which varies significantly across the province. As previously noted, one limitation of the existing provincial data is the lack of an appropriate police contact benchmark. However, even if police contact benchmark data existed at the provincial level, use of force should still be investigated at the police service level as well, given the high variability in local resident populations and likely high variability in police contact rates across Ontario communities.

Analyzing use of force incidents by police service adheres to the principle of primary units of analysis and disaggregation in the ARDS Standard 27. This also helps protect against Simpson's paradox, a statistical phenomenon where results at one level of analysis reverse or disappear when combined at another level. For example, overrepresentation of a particular racial group at a local level may not be identified when combined with data from other locations in a provincial dataset. This racial group may even appear underrepresented at the provincial level. Conversely, the apparent overrepresentation of a group at the provincial level may originate from a small number of police services with a high number of residents and police contacts with people of that racial category. In that case, the group may appear overrepresented in the provincial dataset but would not in fact be overrepresented in use of force in most police services.

Some key differences across police services in the proportion of incidents involving individuals perceived as particular races were:

- Four smaller, rural police services only reported Use of Force incidents involving people perceived as White.
- Fourteen services only had reports where the individuals were perceived as two of the seven racial categories.
- Most incidents involving individuals perceived as South Asian (69 per cent, 151 incidents) were from Peel (76 incidents, 16 per cent of Peel's total incidents) and Toronto (75 incidents, 6 per cent of Toronto's total incidents). Most police services (66 per cent, 29 services) did not have any use of force incidents involving individuals perceived as South Asian.
- Most incidents involving people perceived as Latino (73 per cent, 120 incidents) were generated by four police services: Toronto, Peel Region, OPP, and Waterloo Region.
- Twelve police services had zero use of force incidents including individuals perceived as Black. In contrast, individuals perceived as Black were involved in 40.4 per cent of incidents reported by Toronto Police Service.
- Eleven police services had no use of force incidents involving individuals perceived as Indigenous. In contrast, individuals perceived as Indigenous were involved in 60.5 per cent of incidents submitted by Thunder Bay Police Service.

As noted above, these findings should be contextualized by considering the appropriate benchmark population for that geographical location. This will typically be a benchmark of police contact, but this is not currently available.

#### **4.4 The Officers**

This section describes data related to the officers involved in use of force who submitted Individual Reports. As noted in Section 1, the analysis conducted for this technical report does not examine specific use of force incidents to determine the appropriateness of the force that was used. The intent of the analyses was to identify and examine any general patterns that may be relevant to identifying systemic issues, which can assist future policy or programming reviews. Areas of research related to police officer characteristics and use of force include officer training and years of experience, as well as the demographic attributes of the officer and police services.

The type, breadth, and amount of training Canadian officers and recruits receive has increased in the previous few decades, including in Ontario.<sup>44</sup> In particular, there has been increased emphasis on de-escalation training. Some research has found a lower risk of use of force, including lethal force, when responding officers have had substantial training in crisis intervention or de-escalation; other research has noted additional data is required to demonstrate empirically the efficacy of this training.<sup>45</sup>

Data from the Use of Force Report Versions 2.0/2.1 can be used, in some limited ways, to investigate some of these theorised use of force correlates. Officer rank category, length of service, assignment type, and attire were captured on Individual Reports. There were no fields to capture officers' race, gender, or extra training. Results in this section are based on the number of Individual Reports submitted; a single officer may be involved in more than one use of force incident and thus submit more than one report. For this reason, results do not represent unique officers.

#### 4.4.1 Number of Officers Applying Force

**Report Type \***

<input type="checkbox"/> Individual	▶ Total years of service as a police officer	Rank category (select one) (Appendix C)
<input type="checkbox"/> Team	▶ Type of Team (select one) (Appendix D)	How many officers were part of the team response, including yourself?

**Type of Assignment \***

Attire:  Non-Uniform  Uniform

Assignment Type (select one) (Appendix E)	<b>Type of Incident *</b> (select one) (Appendix F)
---	---

Figure 5; Report Type and Type of Assignment Report Questions

For 2023, there were 7,735 Individual Use of Force Reports received by the Ministry.<sup>46</sup> It is not known how many unique officers submitted reports.

<sup>44</sup> Palermo, T. (2018). Ontario police college: Then and now. *Blue Line*.

Public Safety Canada (2013). Economies of policing: Summary report of the police education and learning summit.

Shiple, P. (2019). The professionalization of police training in Canada. *Blue Line*.

<sup>45</sup> For example:

Engel, R.S., Corsaro, N., Isaza, G.T., & McManus, H.D. (2022). Assessing the impact of de-escalation training on police behavior: Reducing police use of force in the Louisville, KY Metro Police Department. *Criminology & Public Policy*.

Lavoie, J., Alvarez, N., Baker, V., & Kohl, J. (2023). Training police to de-escalate mental health crisis situations: Comparing virtual reality and live-action scenario-based approaches. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*.

White, M.D., Orosco, C., & Watts, S. (2023). Can police de-escalation training reduce use of force and citizen injury without compromising officer safety? *Journal of Experimental Criminology*.

<sup>46</sup> 9,332 reports were received and included in the analysis for this technical report, 1,597 of those were "Team Report" and 7,735 were "Individual Reports". The data collected about officers involved was different for Individual and Team Reports. This section focuses on the data collected about officers from the 7,735 Individual officer reports.

In Ontario in 2023, there were 28,569 sworn police service members, from Constables to police Chiefs (though this figure includes First Nation Police Services, even though they were not legally required to complete Use of Force Reports). Every officer must complete refresher training on use of force annually, regardless of whether they were involved in a use of force incident.

#### 4.4.1.1 Number of Other Officers

Officers were required to specify the number of other officers engaged with the individual when they applied force. The response had to be an integer between “0” and “99”; a response of “5” would be accepted, whereas a response of “five” would not.

This refers to the number of other officers who physically or verbally engaged with the individual at the time force was applied. Here, “engaged” could indicate, for example, officers attempting to de-escalate the situation, issuing verbal commands, or restraining the individual; indicating that other officers were engaged with the individual does not mean that any of the other officers used force. The count should not include other officers who were present on scene at the time but were not engaged with the individuals. For example, officers who were directing traffic, collecting evidence, taking statements, or assisting victims would not be included in these counts.

The count does not include the reporting officer themselves; if no other officers were involved during the use of force, the reporting officer should indicate “0.” Indicating that other officers were engaged with the individual does not mean that any of the other officers used force.

##### **Persons Present at Time Force Applied \***

Total number of subjects on whom you used reportable force?  Specify # \_\_\_\_\_

No interaction with subject  None (animal only)

Approximately how many other officers were engaged with the subject at the time you applied force? Specify

*Figure 6; Persons Present at Time Force Applied Report Question*

Overall, the number of other officers involved when force reported through an Individual Report, ranged from 0 (only the reporting officer) to 29 other officers.



## 4.4.2 Officer Rank Category

For Individual Reports, officers indicated their rank category: Commissioned Officer; Non-Commissioned Officer; and Constable (1<sup>st</sup> to 4<sup>th</sup> class)/Special Constable/Other.<sup>47</sup> Commissioned officers are senior officers such as an Inspector or Chief of Police. Non-commissioned officers have ranks that are higher than Constables, but lower than Commissioned officers, such as Sergeants.<sup>48</sup>

For 2023, the majority of Individual Reports were completed by Constables (7,287, 94.2 per cent). Comparatively fewer were completed by Commissioned (41, 0.5 per cent) or Non-Commissioned (407, 5.3 per cent) officers.

The percentage of reports from Constables is notably higher than the per cent of Ontario officers holding those ranks (approximately 75 per cent). Different ranks of officers work in different environments with different responsibilities. In most cases, constables and/or sergeants have the most interaction with members of the public. Commissioned Officers are likely to have significantly fewer interactions with members of the public that may lead to use of force than do frontline officers.

Because of how the response options are currently structured, there is not sufficient variability in the data to explore any correlations between rank and other variables.

## 4.4.3 Officer Length of Service

Length of service was collected on Individual Reports as an open-text variable and tracked in years of service completed. An individual who had been a police officer for four and a half years should have indicated four years of service completed. Built-in data validation required a response that was a number between “0” and “60.”

If an officer was involved in more than one use of force incident in 2023, their length of service would be counted once for each report submitted.

---

<sup>47</sup> The ranks that municipal police services may have were outlined in subsections 8 (1), (2), and (3) of the general regulation under the *Police Services Act* (PSA) (O. Reg. 268/10). OPP ranks are broadly similar; under the PSA, the ranks of police officers in the OPP were established by the Commissioner.

<sup>48</sup> For municipal police services, Commissioned officers include the ranks of Inspector, Staff Inspector, Superintendent, Staff Superintendent, Deputy Chief, and Chief. Non-commissioned officers include the ranks of Sergeant / Detective and Staff Sergeant / Detective Sergeant. In the OPP, Commissioned officers include the ranks of Inspector, Superintendent, Chief Superintendent, Deputy Commissioner, and Commissioner. Non-commissioned officers include the ranks of Sergeant / Detective Sergeant, Staff Sergeant / Detective Staff Sergeant, and Sergeant Major.

Responses in 2023 ranged from 0 (for less than one year service) to 38 years of service. Approximately half (49.7 per cent) of Individual Use of Force Reports were reported by officers with fewer than five years of service.

Care is needed when interpreting how length of service may be related to use of force. A more complete analysis would compare these results with the distribution of service lengths for all police officers in Ontario; however, the Ministry does not currently have access to the data required to conduct this comparison. A complete analysis would also include data on how years of service may correlate with contact with the public or propensity to be in situations that are the most likely to result in force being required. This would include, for example, performing frontline general patrol duties, the likelihood of working certain shift schedules or to be assigned to certain neighbourhoods or given particular assignment types.

#### 4.4.4 Assignment Type

Individual officers reported the type of assignment they were on during the use of force incident. They chose one response from a drop-down list. There was an option to select “Other” and provide a written response. Very few “Other” responses were received, so these were not recoded into existing or new response option categories.

##### E. Assignment Type

---

- Administrative (e.g., station duty)	- Drugs	- Off duty
- Canine	- Guns and Gangs, ROPE, other specialized units	- Patrol (e.g., general, foot, bicycle, ATV, snowmobile)
- Community liaison, school resource	- Hostage rescue	- Paid duty
- Community oriented/directed response	- Investigations (CIB, Major Crime)	- Prisoner transportation/care/control
- Containment	- Marine	- Public order
- Court appearance	- Mental Health Response Unit/ Mobile Crisis Response Team	- Tactical
- Court security	- Mounted	- Traffic
		- Other Specify

Figure 7; Assignment Type Report Question

The majority of Individual Reports were patrol (83 per cent, 6,417). Each of the other assignment type categories were noted in fewer than 3.5 per cent of reports.

It is possible that an officer’s assignment did not match the type of assignment during a use of force incident. For example, an officer who was assigned to a specialized assignment (e.g., Marine, Tactical) may be deployed to other types of incidents when additional personnel are required. As such, it is possible, for example, that an officer who reported Marine as their assignment type was assisting other officers during a force incident unrelated to that Marine assignment.

#### 4.4.5 Attire

Officer attire at the time of the use of force was captured for all Use of Force Reports. Reporting officers had to select either “Non-Uniform” or “Uniform”. Generally, all ranks except for detectives wear some kind of uniform, unless on special assignment. Detectives typically wear civilian clothes.

Officers in uniform and in civilian clothing are likely to be performing different types of public safety activities. In addition, a key difference between the two types of attire is the equipment officers will have. Officers in the standard uniform have standard equipment and duty belt. Officers with specialized assignments may have specific uniforms and equipment. The equipment that officers in civilian clothing have varies widely depending on their specific duties. Some detectives wear an adapted duty belt that includes different force options from frontline members and others will carry a small pistol and keep other items in a bag. Mobile surveillance teams may have additional equipment in vehicles, while officers on foot will have limited access to additional equipment.

Officers’ attire may also affect how members of the public interact with police and how they experience this interaction. There could be qualitative differences in how individuals react to and perceive an interaction with a detective in a suit, an officer with the standard uniform, or an officer wearing or carrying more extensive protective gear (e.g., helmet, shields) and/or possessing additional types of weapons.

In 2023, the vast majority of officers reported being in uniform during the incident (7,286, 94 per cent), though it is not clear what type of uniform they were wearing. The remaining six per cent were mostly officers involved in investigations or specialized units such as Guns and Gangs or Repeat Offender Parole Enforcement (ROPE).

Given nearly all officers were in uniform, it is not possible to identify differences in the use of force between officers in uniform or not in uniform.

#### 4.4.6 Attempts to Gain Compliance

For each individual upon whom the reporting officer used force, police indicated whether they issued directions to the individual to comply. These could be instructions to stop or change threatening behaviour, or how to avoid and/or end the application of force. The directions may be short, loud, easily understood phrases to tell an individual what the officer wants them to do (e.g., “stop resisting,” “get back,” and “get on the ground”). If the officer issued directions, they also indicated whether the individual complied.

Did you issue directions to the subject to comply? \*  Yes  No If yes, did the subject comply?  Yes  No

Figure 8; Instructions to Comply Report Question

The dataset includes only incidents in which reportable force was used; incidents in which individuals complied with orders and force was not used would not generate a Use of Force Report.

Reporting officers gave directions to comply to 83 per cent of individuals observed.<sup>49</sup> There are many reasons an officer may not direct an individual to comply. For example, another officer was already providing direction; the reporting officer was providing coverage and not directly interacting with the individual; there was imminent threat; or the individual complied immediately, before direction could be given.

In 80 per cent of incidents, every observed individual whom officers directed to comply, did so. In 13 per cent of incidents, none of the observed individuals were directed to comply, and the other seven per cent of incidents, some – but not all – observed individuals were directed to comply. In this latter group, it is possible that another officer was directing that individual to comply.

The majority of police services (73 per cent, 32 police services) indicated that they provided directions to comply to at least 90 per cent of observed individuals. For all police services, the proportion of observed individuals directed to comply ranged from 48 per cent (OPP) to 100 per cent (nine police services).

There were differences in directions to comply based on perceived race:

- Black: 88.4 per cent (2,532 observations)
- East/Southeast Asian: 83.7 per cent (660 observations)
- Indigenous: 70.7 per cent (608 observations)
- Latino: 84.0 per cent (242 observations)
- Middle Eastern: 84.6 per cent (785 observations)
- South Asian: 91.0 per cent (404 observations)
- White: 81.7 per cent (5,422 observations)

None of the disparities exceeded the 20 per cent threshold, though the disparities for individuals perceived as Indigenous or as South Asian may be worth noting:

- Black: 1.08
- East/Southeast Asian: 1.02
- Indigenous: 0.86
- Latino: 1.03
- Middle Eastern: 1.03

---

<sup>49</sup> As noted in Section 2.3.3, these may not be unique individuals.

- South Asian: 1.11

Observed differences may be related to perceived race or could be due to differences across services. For example, the four police services with the highest number of individuals perceived as Indigenous also had lower rates of directing individuals to comply. Further analysis would be required to identify the cause(s) of any differences for perceived race.

Most individuals were perceived by the officer to have complied with the directions given (70 per cent).

- Black: 72.0 per cent (1,824 observations)
- East/Southeast Asian: 74.4 per cent (491 observations)
- Indigenous: 60.7 per cent (369 observations)
- Latino: 66.5 per cent (161 observations)
- Middle Eastern: 76.9 per cent (604 observations)
- South Asian: 72.0 per cent (291 observations)
- White: 68.6 per cent (3,721 observations)

Disparities were as follows:

- Black: 1.05
- East/Southeast Asian: 1.08
- Indigenous: 0.88
- Latino: 0.97
- Middle Eastern: 1.12
- South Asian: 1.05

There are many factors which may have influenced officers' perceptions that an individual complied. It could how officers perceived behaviour or how individuals behaved. Differences in individuals' behaviour could also be influenced by systemic factors related to race, such as a history with police or factors associated with particular call types. Further data analysis would be required to determine if these types of factors explained variations in perceived compliance.

Overall, the rates of direction to comply and perceived compliance were similar across most perceived racial categories, with two exceptions. First, people perceived as South Asian were the most likely to be directed to comply, however this may be a result of the police services responding having higher rates of directing individuals to comply overall. In contrast, people perceived as Indigenous were the least likely to be directed to comply, and when directed, they were the least likely to be perceived to comply.

## 4.5 The Force Used

For each individual upon whom they used force, officers were required to report on the type of force used, why force was used, and whether the force was effective in controlling the individual's behaviour. As well, officers indicated whether de-escalation was used or attempted.

### 4.5.1 Distance from Individuals When Deciding to Use Force

Officers were required to indicate the distance between themselves and each individual at the time they decided to use force. Three response options were available: less than three metres; three to seven metres; and greater than seven metres. Officers could only choose one option for each individual upon whom they used force.

Distance between you and the subject (at the time decision was made to use force)

Less than 3 metres (approx. 10 feet)  3 to 7 metres (approx. 10 to 23 feet)  Greater than 7 metres (more than 23 feet)

*Figure 9; Distance Between You and Subject Report Question*

The distance between the officer and individuals when the decision to use force is made may impact the type of force used, its effectiveness, and the potential for injuries. There may be a difference in the level of risk, with smaller distances between the officer and individual potentially being riskier. For example, there is substantially greater risk to officers when an individual with a baseball bat is five feet away than when they are 20 feet away, while an individual with a firearm presents a substantial risk at even fairly long distances.

The force options that may be used will often depend on the distance between the officer and the individual. Physical control and intermediate weapons like batons are only useable when the officer is within a few feet of an individual. Conducted energy weapons (CEWs) and aerosols (i.e., pepper spray) also have an ideal range for use. In cartridge / probe mode, CEWs are most effective at temporarily immobilizing an individual when the two probes make contact with different muscle groups. This is unlikely to occur at very short distances. However, at further distances, there is a substantial risk that one or both probes will miss or not make effective contact with the individual. Similarly, aerosols may also affect an officer or others when the individual is too close and may not affect the individual if they are far away.

For one incident, the distance may vary for different officers and for different individuals. An officer might be less than three metres from one individual and three to seven metres from a second individual when deciding to use force. Another officer responding to the same incident may be greater than seven metres away from everyone when

determining that force is required. This may also be used strategically, with the officers able to provide different types of coverage for the incident at varying distances.

When considering the results, it is important to remember that officers are meant to be reporting the distance at the moment they decided to use force. This should not be interpreted as the closest or furthest distance between the officer and the individual during the use of force incident. An officer may determine that force is required as an individual is running towards the officer from a distance of seven metres while actual force may then be applied at less than three metres.

The 9,332 reports (Individual Reports and Team Reports) included 12,805 subject individual observations.<sup>50</sup> The majority of the time, officers decided to use force when they were within three metres of an individual (46 per cent, 5,880 observations) or three to seven metres from an individual (39 per cent, 5,050 observations). The decision to use force was less frequently made when the officer was more than seven metres from the individual (15 per cent, 1,875 observations).

There were no notable variations in the distance based on perceived race.<sup>51</sup>

#### **4.5.2 Type of Force Category**

Officers are expected to be continually assessing situations and choosing the most reasonable option according to the persons involved and the context of the situation. Interactions between police and individuals are fluid. As the interaction evolves, officers' choice of response options may change. As such, officers may use multiple force types in a single incident. This Use of Force Report does not indicate the order in which different force options were used.

Five categories of force type are captured on the Use of Force Report:

1. Physical Control
2. Intermediate Weapon (e.g., pepper spray, baton, CEW)
3. Less Lethal Firearm
4. Other (e.g., canine, horse, weapon of opportunity)
5. Firearm

When an officer selected one or more of these force categories, additional questions were presented to collect detail about the specific force types used. The image below

---

<sup>50</sup> A reminder that this does not indicate that there were 12,805 individuals upon whom force was used.

<sup>51</sup> Other exploratory analyses were conducted to identify whether there was any relationship between distance at the time the officer decided to use force and other variables. There were no results of note related to the number of observations made in the incident, number of officers involved, or the type of force used.

shows all possible questions that officers may complete, depending on the selected force categories and force types. Officers were required to select all force type categories and specific force types they used.

For each force type and officer response, officers also reported whether this assisted in controlling the individual's behaviour. As well, if officers reported pointing or discharging a firearm in their response, they indicated whether they issued the Police Challenge. If they did, they were asked whether the individual complied. If they did not issue the Police Challenge, they were asked why not.

**Type of Force Used \***

---

Physical Control (select all that apply)  Escort techniques  Grounding  Joint Locks  Pinning  
 Pressure Points  Strikes  Other Specify \_\_\_\_\_

Did this assist in controlling the subject's behaviour?  Yes  No

---

Intermediate Weapon (e.g., pepper spray, baton, CEW - check all that apply)

OC (pepper spray) Did this assist in controlling the subject's behaviour?  Yes  No  
 Baton  Hard (e.g. strikes)  Soft (e.g. prying) Did this assist in controlling the subject's behaviour?  Yes  No  
 Conducted energy weapon (CEW)  Drawn and Displayed with the intention of achieving compliance  Pointed  
 Discharged ▶  Cartridge / probe  Drive / push stun  3-point contact  
 Cycles  Single cycle (5 seconds)  Extended cycle (more than 5 seconds)  Multiple cycles  
 Did this assist in controlling the subject's behaviour?  Yes  No

---

If CEW did not assist in controlling the subject's behaviour, specify why (select all that apply)

Cartridge Malfunction  Disconnect  Insufficient Probe Spread  Operator Error  Probe Miss  
 Weapon Malfunction  Other Specify \_\_\_\_\_

---

Less Lethal Firearm (select all that apply)

Shotgun (e.g. bean bag round):  Pointed  Discharged

Figure 10; Type of Force Used Report Question



Did this assist in controlling the subject's behaviour?  Yes  No

Extended Range Impact Weapon:  Pointed  Discharged

Did this assist in controlling the subject's behaviour?  Yes  No

---

Other (e.g., canine, horse, weapon of opportunity)

---

Specify \_\_\_\_\_ Did this assist in controlling the subject's behaviour?  Yes  No

---

Firearm (select all that apply)

Handgun  Drawn  Pointed  Discharged Did this assist in controlling the subject's behaviour?  Yes  No

Rifle  Pointed  Discharged Did this assist in controlling the subject's behaviour?  Yes  No

Shotgun (Lethal)  Pointed  Discharged Did this assist in controlling the subject's behaviour?  Yes  No

---

Did you issue the Police Challenge?  Yes  No Did the subject comply?  Yes  No

If did not issue challenge, specify:  Not viable  Issued by another officer  Other Specify \_\_\_\_\_

Figure 11; Type of Force Used Question

Definitions of the five force type categories are as follows:

1. **Physical Control** includes any empty-handed techniques used to physically control an individual's actions and does not involve the use of a weapon. A Use of Force Report involving exclusively Physical Control is only required if an individual sustained an injury that required the services of a physician, nurse, or paramedic. There were seven types of Physical Control that officers could select (e.g., Grounding, Joint Locks, Strikes).<sup>52</sup>
2. **Intermediate Weapons** involves the use of weapons not intended to cause serious injury or death, such as pepper spray, baton, or CEW.
  - **Aerosol Weapons** are inflammatory agents typically delivered via spray and designed to temporarily impair an individual, often by inducing a burning sensation of the skin and painful tearing and swelling of the eyes.
  - **Batons** are roughly cylindrical clubs carried as weapons. In Ontario, police are issued fixed-length or expandable batons.
    - **Soft Application** involves using the baton to pry an individual loose (e.g., using a baton to pry an individual's arms off an object or out from under their body).
    - **Hard Application** involves using the baton to strike major muscle groups to cause compliance with the objective of changing the subject's intent and behaviour (e.g., striking an individual's upper leg to stop them from kicking).
  - **Conducted Energy Weapons (CEWs)** deliver a series of electrical pulses intended to temporarily immobilize and allow apprehension of subjects.

<sup>52</sup> One note: this requirement applies only if the officer is aware of the injuries and the necessity for this treatment prior to the end of the shift when the force incident occurred.

There are three ways a CEW can be used, all of which require a Use of Force Report to be completed: drawn and displayed (including showing a warning arc); pointed; and discharged. If the CEW is discharged, there are three ways in which it may have been used. Officers are required to indicate whether the CEW was used for a single five-second cycle, a single cycle that lasted over five seconds, or for multiple cycles.

- **Cartridge / Probe Mode:** Officers fire the CEW's metal probes to penetrate an individual's clothing or skin to deliver an electric current to attempt to achieve neuromuscular incapacitation. Reports are required even if the probes do not strike the individual.
  - **Drive / Push Stun Mode:** Officers use the CEW to make direct contact with the individual, without the use of probes, to deliver electrical energy, which causes pain and only localized muscular disruption.
  - **3-Point Contact:** Drive stun mode in conjunction with probe(s) to complete the circuit.
3. **Less Lethal Firearms** are firearms that fire bean bags or other types of less lethal projectiles. These fall into two general categories:
- **Shotgun** refers to a lethal firearm that has been adapted or repurposed for use with less lethal projectiles (e.g., sock rounds, bean bag rounds).
  - **Extended Range Impact Weapons** are a dedicated less lethal launcher that deploys less lethal impact and chemical munitions.
4. **Other Weapons** include canines, horses, weapons of opportunity (i.e., any object found on the scene that can be used as a weapon), or other types of weapons not specifically referenced on the report. Weapons of opportunity may be used by police when none of the approved options are available or appropriate.
5. **Firearms** are defined in the *Criminal Code* (and referenced in the Use of Force Regulation) as a barrelled weapon from which any shot, bullet or other projectile can be discharged and that is capable of causing serious bodily injury or death to a person. This includes any frame or receiver of such a barrelled weapon and anything that can be adapted for use as a firearm.<sup>53</sup> Three types of firearms may have been used by officers: **Handgun**,<sup>54</sup> **Rifle**, and **Shotgun (Lethal)**. An officer

---

<sup>53</sup> This definition also applies to "Less Lethal Firearms." For greater clarity, under the Equipment and Use of Force Regulation under the *Police Services Act*, the definition of "firearm" explicitly excludes CEWs. Other jurisdictions may classify CEWs as firearms.

<sup>54</sup> A handgun is defined as a firearm that is designed, altered or intended to be aimed and fired by the action of one hand. Under the Regulation, officers were required to complete a Use of Force Report if they unholstered their handgun in front of a member of the public, regardless of whether they discharged or pointed their handgun.

could report using more than one type of firearm. For each firearm type the officer selected, they must indicate how the firearm was used:

- **Discharged** means that the firearm was fired, whether it was fired at a person or not.
- **Pointed** means that the barrel of the firearm was directed towards an individual.
- **Drawn** (applies only to handgun) means that the handgun was removed from its holster.

#### 4.5.2.1 Aggregation

This technical report analyzes only the five broad categories of force types on the Use of Force Report: Physical Control, Intermediate Weapon, Physical Control, Intermediate Weapons, Less Lethal Firearm, Other Weapon, and Firearm. Analysis on the specific types of force within these broader categories was not conducted.

The categories of force type used were aggregated to the incident level to provide an overview of use of force incidents. An officer might have used multiple force type categories during an incident, on one individual or on different individuals, and an incident might have had multiple officers using different force type categories. Each force category used during an incident was counted once for that incident, regardless of how many times or by how many officers that force category was used during the incident.

For example, if Officer A drew a handgun and used physical control that caused an injury, and Officer B drew a handgun and used a baton, the force type categories for the incident would be firearm, physical control, and intermediate weapon. Because officers could use force types from more than one force type category in the same incident, the per cent of incidents that included force types from the five categories could add to more than 100 per cent.

With the exception of the firearm force type, the use rate of the subtypes of force within each type of force category were not analyzed by racial category in this technical report, though the data are available in the Ontario Data Catalogue. This means, for example, an incident in which an officer used an intermediate weapon could have involved the use of a baton, CEW, and/or aerosol weapon. Analysis was not conducted to determine if the use rates differed for the subcategories of force for a CEW vs baton; this incident would have been coded as “intermediate force type category.”

As well, the analysis considered only the categories of force. It did not account for the number of applications of force. If one officer used more than one of the intermediate weapons, that was counted as an incident involving at least one intermediate weapon. Similarly, if different officers used different intermediate weapons, the incident was

counted as an incident involving at least one intermediate weapon. For example, both of the following incidents would be counted in the analysis as involving at least one use of intermediate weapons. First, a single officer used a CEW and an aerosol weapon. Second, one officer used a CEW and another officer used a baton.

Further, if officers used one type of weapon multiple times, or in different ways, that was only counted once. This could include an officer using a baton, attempting de-escalation, then using the baton a second time. It could involve an officer using hard application and soft application of a baton. It could include one officer pointing a handgun and another officer discharging a rifle. For each, the category of force (i.e., intermediate weapon, firearm) would be noted.

As described in section 4.2, perceptions of race were also aggregated to the incident level. The counts for race category are the number of incidents that included at least one individual perceived as being part of that category. In approximately 9.5 per cent of incidents, there were two or more race categories perceived across reports and/or observations.

When calculating the force type used by incident, a modification was made to the method used to count the number of incidents involving a person perceived as being part of a racial category. When examining force used, the incident was counted only if the relevant force type was used against a person perceived as that racial category. For example, if an incident involved one person perceived as “race A” and one person perceived as “race B,” and a firearm was pointed at both individuals, then the incident would be included in the counts of incidents related to both race categories. If the firearm was only pointed at the person perceived to be “race A,” then the incident would only be included in the counts of incidents related to “race A.”

#### **4.5.2.2 Overall Counts of Force Type Categories**

Of the 6,269<sup>55</sup> incidents, almost two thirds (64 per cent, 4,001 incidents) had only one of the five categories of force type applied by officers; less than one third (29 per cent, 1,831 incidents) had two of the five categories of force type applied by officers; and a smaller share (seven per cent, 436 incidents) had three or more of the five categories of force type applied by officers.

---

<sup>55</sup> One incident was missing data on force type; thus, total adds to 6,268.

For each of the five categories of force type, the proportion of incidents that had at least one officer use at least one instance of force from the category on an individual were as follows:<sup>56</sup>

- Physical control: 26.2 per cent (1,645 incidents)
- Intermediate weapons: 50.6 per cent (3,169 incidents)
- Less lethal firearms: 4.0 per cent (252 incidents)
- Other weapons: 3.0 per cent (186 incidents)
- Firearms: 60.1 per cent (3,767 incidents)
  - This includes handgun drawn, firearm pointed, and firearm discharged

#### **4.5.2.3 Calculating the Disparity Index for Force Category**

Standard 29 of the ARDS requires PSOs to compute racial disproportionality and/or disparity indices for each unit of analysis. This technical report calculated disparity to identify possible differences in the category of force that was used between perceived racial groups.<sup>57</sup>

A racial disparity index is a measure of group differences in outcomes by comparing the outcomes for one racial group with those of another. A disparity index of 1.0 indicates no difference in outcomes between Group A and the reference or comparison Group B. An index less than 1.0 indicates that Group A had a lower likelihood of experiencing the particular outcome, and an index over 1.0 indicates a higher likelihood.

A notable deviation from 1.0 is required before it is reasonable to conclude that a disparity has been found. There is no established standard for determining whether a racial disparity in police use of force deviates enough to indicate a notable difference. The ARDS instructs PSOs to consider their own specific context to determine the threshold that indicates a noteworthy disparity. Assorted researchers in various fields including policing (e.g., traffic stops, police use of force) have used a range of thresholds, such as 20 per cent (i.e., index below 0.8 or above 1.2) or the 'four-fifths rule' (80 per cent of the ratio of the reference group, i.e., an index less than 0.8 or above

---

<sup>56</sup> The total number of incidents in the dataset was 6,269, with data on force type was 6,268. When counting each incident in each of the five force type categories used, the total count of force type categories applied during use of force incidents adds up to 9,019, as any incident may be counted in more than one force type category. Percentages are derived using the total number of incidents.

<sup>57</sup> "If the desired equity outcome is that individuals are receiving the same treatment or outcomes within a given program, service, or function, regardless of their race, then a racial disparity index is the appropriate measure to use to identify and track any potential racial inequalities."

1.25) to identify notable disparities.<sup>58</sup> These thresholds have been used as guidance in this technical report to highlight where disparity might be notable.

Finally, disparity analysis requires a reference group for comparison. The reference group provides the contrast needed for meaningful interpretations of group differences in outcomes within the dataset. Often, the appropriate reference group is the group least likely to experience systemic barriers or disadvantages in Ontario. Standard 31 of the ARDS notes that the White category will typically be the most appropriate reference group within the justice sector.

For more detail on how the indices are calculated, thresholds, and reference groups, refer to Standards 29 to 32 of the ARDS.

In this section, disparity indices were calculated to determine if one perceived racial group had a higher risk of a particular force category being used compared to use of force incidents involving individuals perceived as White. It is important to note that many factors may influence the likelihood of officers using particular categories of force. These include: the number of subject individuals, the number of other officers, whether individuals were believed or perceived to possess weapons, the type of incident officers were called to, the behaviour of the individuals during the incident, and whether any individuals appeared to be in crisis or intoxicated. Disparity indices compare the risk or likelihood of an outcome between the different racial groups and the reference group. Other analytic approaches, such as multi-level modeling, would be required to statistically control for these other factors that may influence the categories of force that were used. Re-calculating disparity indices accounting for these additional factors may alter the disparity index results.

#### **4.5.2.4 Physical Control**

Physical control was the third most common type of force officers reported using, with 26.2 per cent of incidents (1,645) involving physical control. The most common types of physical control were grounding (997 incidents), pinning (540 incidents), and escort techniques (462 incidents).

As per the Use of Force Regulation, the use of physical control techniques was only reportable if it resulted in injuries requiring the services of a physician, nurse, or paramedic. As such, any physical control that did not cause injuries requiring attention from these individuals were excluded. The exclusion could be for an entire incident, if physical force not requiring medical attention was the only force type used. The

---

<sup>58</sup> See also the 2020 report from the UK Government's Race Disparity Unit, [Research and Analysis: Using Relative Likelihoods to Compare Ethnic Disparities](#).

exclusion could be at the report level; if one officer only used physical force not requiring medical attention, that specific report would be excluded from the incident. Or the exclusion could be for the physical control elements on a specific report. For example, if a report included physical control that did not cause injuries, and the pointing of a firearm, the firearm force type would be included, the physical control would be excluded.

The percentage of force incidents that involved police use of physical control varied between 22 and 27 per cent across perceived race categories:

- Black: 26.2 per cent (369 incidents)
- East/Southeast Asian: 23.9 per cent (94 incidents)
- Indigenous: 22.9 per cent (122 incidents)
- Latino: 23.2 per cent (38 incidents)
- Middle Eastern: 27.0 per cent (116 incidents)
- South Asian: 22.3 per cent (49 incidents)
- White: 24.5 per cent (928 incidents)

The disparity index, calculated using the perceived race of White as the comparison group, was as follows:

- Black: 1.07
- East/Southeast Asian: 0.98
- Indigenous: 0.94
- Latino: 0.95
- Middle Eastern: 1.10
- South Asian: 0.91

When compared to White, none of the disparity indices for the six racial groups surpassed the 20 per cent threshold.

#### **4.5.2.5 Intermediate Weapon**

Intermediate weapons was the second most common category of force officers reported using, with 50.5 per cent of incidents (3,169) involving intermediate weapons. The vast majority of these incidents involved the use of CEWs (3,050 incidents, 96.2 per cent of incidents with intermediate weapons). There were three uses of a CEW that were provincially reportable: drawn and displayed (1,916 incidents, 62.8 per cent of CEW incidents), pointed (1,832 incidents, 60.1 per cent of CEW incidents), and discharged

(1,024 incidents, 33.6 per cent of CEW incidents).<sup>59</sup> Aerosol weapons (116 incidents) and batons (75 incidents) were not frequently used. There was variability in how frequently intermediate weapons were used in incidents associated with the different perceived race categories:

- Black: 39.5 per cent (556 incidents)
- East/Southeast Asian: 37.9 per cent (149 incidents)
- Indigenous: 54.4 per cent (290 incidents)
- Latino: 38.4 per cent (63 incidents)
- Middle Eastern: 32.9 per cent (141 incidents)
- South Asian: 30.9 per cent (68 incidents)
- White: 52.7 per cent (1,998 incidents)

The disparity index, calculated using the perceived race of White as the comparison group, was as follows:

- Black: 0.75
- East/Southeast Asian: 0.72
- Indigenous: 1.03
- Latino: 0.73
- Middle Eastern: 0.62
- South Asian: 0.59

Incidents with at least one individual perceived as Indigenous had a disparity index greater than 1.0 compared to incidents with at least one individual perceived as White. The remaining five racial groups had a disparity index lower than 1.0.

#### **4.5.2.6 Less Lethal Firearm**

Less Lethal Firearms are those that fire bean bags or other types of less lethal projectiles. These were not used by police very often (4.0 per cent, 252 incidents).

There was some variability in how frequently less lethal weapons were used in incidents associated with the different perceived race categories:

- Black: 2.4 per cent (34 incidents)
- East/Southeast Asian: 3.1 per cent (12 incidents)
- Indigenous: 5.3 per cent (28 incidents)
- Latino: 3.7 per cent (6 incidents)

---

<sup>59</sup> Note that when an officer discharges a CEW, they will necessarily have had to point the CEW as well. They may also have drawn and displayed the CEW to achieve compliance. As such, the percentages add to well over 100.



- Middle Eastern: 3.5 per cent (15 incidents)
- South Asian: 1.8 per cent (4 incidents)
- White: 4.3 per cent (162 incidents)

The disparity index, calculated using the perceived race of White as the comparison group, was as follows:

- Black: 0.57
- East/Southeast Asian: 0.71
- Indigenous: 1.23
- Latino: 0.86
- Middle Eastern: 0.82
- South Asian: 0.43

When analyzing by incidents involving people of a perceived race, the small number of incidents involving this force type category warrant caution when interpreting results. With this caution in mind, results suggest that when compared to the use of less lethal firearms in incidents involving people perceived as White, there is a higher likelihood of less lethal firearms being used in incidents involving people perceived as Indigenous and a lower likelihood in incidents involving people perceived as Black.

#### **4.5.2.7 Other Weapon**

Very few incidents involved the use of an “Other” weapon by police (3.0 per cent, 186 incidents).

When “Other” weapon was used it was most frequently a police canine (133 incidents) followed by police shield (eight incidents), chemical munitions (eight incidents), and police vehicle (three incidents).

When analyzing by incidents involving people of a perceived race, the small number of incidents involving this force type category (ten or fewer incidents for four of the perceived racial categories) discourage the calculation of a disparity index and warrant caution when interpreting results. Percentages of incidents involving force from this category ranged from one to four per cent for all perceived races.

- Black: 2.9 per cent (41 incidents)
- East/Southeast Asian: 2.3 per cent (9 incidents)
- Indigenous: 2.6 per cent (14 incidents)
- Latino: 3.7 per cent (6 incidents)
- Middle Eastern: 1.6 per cent (7 incidents)
- South Asian: 2.7 per cent (6 incidents)
- White: 2.9 per cent (110 incidents)

#### 4.5.2.8 Firearm

Firearms were the most commonly used category of force (60.0 per cent, 3,767 incidents). Firearms mean a handgun, rifle, or shotgun firing lethal projectiles. When firearms were used, this was frequently drawing a handgun from its holster in the presence of a member of the public (2,294 incidents, 60.9 per cent of incidents where a firearm was used) or pointing a firearm (3,274 incidents, 86.9 per cent of incidents where a firearm was used). Incidents that included discharging a firearm were rare (50 incidents, 1.3% of incidents where a firearm was used).<sup>60</sup>

There was variability in how frequently firearms were used in incidents associated with the different perceived race categories:

- Black: 71.1 per cent (1,001 incidents)
- East/Southeast Asian: 70.0 per cent (275 incidents)
- Indigenous: 54.6 per cent (291 incidents)
- Latino: 63.4 per cent (104 incidents)
- Middle Eastern: 73.9 per cent (317 incidents)
- South Asian: 75.5 per cent (166 incidents)
- White: 57.4 per cent (2,178 incidents)

The disparity index, calculated using the perceived race of White as the comparison group, was as follows:

- Black: 1.24
- East/Southeast Asian: 1.22
- Indigenous: 0.95
- Latino: 1.10
- Middle Eastern: 1.29
- South Asian: 1.31

Five of the six racial groups had a disparity index greater than 1.0 compared to incidents with at least one individual perceived as White. Individuals perceived as Indigenous had a disparity index lower than 1.0, meaning incidents with at least one individual perceived as Indigenous were less likely to involve the use of a firearm as a force category by police, compared to incidents with at least one individual perceived as White.

---

<sup>60</sup> For the use of firearms, cases add up to 100 per cent, as an incident was only counted once based on the most serious force type. For example, if an incident involved both firearm pointed and firearm discharged it was only counted in the firearm discharged category.

Using the 20 per cent threshold to indicate disparity of potential note, incidents with at least one individual perceived as Black, East/Southeast Asian, Middle Eastern, or South Asian were over 20 per cent more likely to involve the use of a firearm as a force category by police compared to incidents with at least one individual perceived as White.

This means that incidents involving at least one individual perceived as Black were 1.24 times more likely to involve a firearm used on an individual perceived as Black, compared to the rates firearms were used on individuals perceived as White in incidents involving individuals perceived as White. Similar patterns were found when individuals perceived as Middle Eastern (1.29 times more likely) or South Asian (1.31 times more likely) were compared to individuals perceived as White. Finally, incidents involving at least one individual perceived as Indigenous were slightly less likely to involve a firearm used on an individual perceived as Indigenous, compared to individuals perceived as White in incidents involving individuals perceived as White.

Disparity indices were not calculated for the incidents that included at least one firearm being discharged because there were too few incidents to generate reliable indices. Simple counts of the number of incidents are included below,<sup>61</sup> though these should be used with caution because of the small number of incidents that involved the discharge of firearms.

- Black: 8 incidents
- East/Southeast Asian: 4 incidents
- Indigenous: 2 incidents
- Latino: 3 incidents
- Middle Eastern: 2 incidents
- South Asian: 1 incident
- White: 34 incidents

Particularly relevant for understanding disparities in firearm force type would be the officer perception of an individual's access to a weapon. Further analyses examining to what extent these disparity indices remain when factoring in perceived weapons of the people involved as well additional contextual variables is recommended.

## 4.6 Outcomes of Force

Officers are required to indicate whether their use of force resulted in physical injuries to subject individuals and/or to themselves. Instructions noted that any injuries an officer

---

<sup>61</sup> There were 50 incidents involving firearm discharge force type. Because an incident could include an officer discharging a firearm at more than one person, the totals for each race category add to 54.

reported must be as a direct result of their use of force. They were not to report injuries caused by other events, including force applied by other officers or from individuals purposefully or accidentally injuring themselves. These fields were mandatory for each subject upon whom force was used and for each individual officer who submitted a report. Officer injuries were not collected on officers who were part of a Team Report.

**Person(s) Injured** \* Were physical injuries sustained because of the use of force applied?

---

Subject:  Yes     No     Fatal     Don't Know (e.g., subject fled/escaped)

Officer:  Yes     No

---

Was treatment required? (select all that apply)

---

Subject:  No     First aid     Medical attention by personnel at scene     Admission to medical facility

Medical attention at facility     Don't Know     Other Specify

---

Officer:  No     First aid     Medical attention by personnel at scene     Admission to medical facility

Medical attention at facility     Don't Know     Other Specify

Figure 12; Persons Injured Report Question

There is no requirement to report non-physical injuries on the report.

#### 4.6.1 Injuries to Individuals upon Whom Force was Used

For each individual upon whom they used force, officers were required to report whether physical injuries occurred as a result of their use of force. The options were “Yes,” “No,” “Fatal,” and “Don’t Know.” If officers were not aware of whether there were injuries by the end of the shift during which the force event occurred, they could select “Don’t Know.” The figures could be an undercount of the number of injuries to individuals because officers may be unaware of injuries at the time they are completing the Use of Force Report.

If an officer used only physical force, a canine, or horse, and the resulting injury did not require the services of a physician, nurse, or paramedic, there was no requirement to submit a Use of Force Report. Injuries from physical force were only required to be reported if the injuries required medical treatment. Any injuries caused by the use of weapons (e.g., baton) were always required to be reported, regardless of whether medical attention was required.

If the officer reported that there were reportable injuries to individuals, they were required to note, for each individual, what treatment was provided. For this question, officers were to select all options that applied. As such, the percentages of incidents that required the different types of treatment will add to over 100 per cent.

In 90.6 per cent (5,677) of use of force incidents, none of the individuals upon whom force was used sustained reportable physical injuries as a result of the force applied.

There were no racial disparities identified for incidents in which there were no physical injuries.

In 8.8 per cent (551) of incidents, there were non-fatal physical injuries to at least one individual involved.

In 0.1 per cent (seven) of incidents, the injury to at least one individual was fatal.

In 0.6 per cent (37) of incidents, the injury status was unknown for all or at least one individual involved (and any additional individuals involved in the same incident were not injured).

#### **4.6.1.1 Non-Fatal Physical Injuries**

The percentage of use of force incidents that resulted in non-fatal physical injuries varied by perceived race, ranging from four per cent for Middle Eastern to 14 per cent for Latino:

- Black: 6.8 per cent (96 incidents)
- East/Southeast Asian: 6.4 per cent (25 incidents)
- Indigenous: 8.3 per cent (44 incidents)
- Latino: 14.0 per cent (23 incidents)
- Middle Eastern: 4.2 per cent (18 incidents)
- South Asian: 7.7 per cent (17 incidents)
- White: 8.9 per cent (339 incidents)

The disparity index, calculated using the perceived race of White as the comparison group, was as follows:

- Black: 0.76
- East/Southeast Asian: 0.71
- Indigenous: 0.92
- Latino: 1.57
- Middle Eastern: 0.47
- South Asian: 0.86

Use of force incidents involving at least one individual perceived as Latino were 1.57 times more likely to have resulted in non-fatal physical injuries compared to incidents involving at least one individual perceived as White.

#### **4.6.1.2 Fatal Injuries**

In total, there were seven individuals who were fatally injured as a result of police use of force. Each fatality occurred in a separate incident.

In all seven incidents, there was a single individual, armed with a weapon, who was threatening to harm either themselves or others, or was acting in a threatening manner. For four of the seven incidents, officers perceived the individual to be experiencing a mental health crisis at the time of the incident; for two incidents, officers reported the individual was expressing suicidal ideation. In two of the seven incidents, the individual had murdered or attempted to murder at least one other person prior to the encounter.

In five of seven incidents, police attempted de-escalation (including communication, distancing, time, repositioning, etc.) prior to engaging in lethal force. In the other two, officers indicated that de-escalation was not attempted because the individual presented an imminent threat.

All seven individuals who died were perceived as males between the ages of 25 and 64. Five individuals were perceived as White, one was perceived as Latino, and one was perceived as Indigenous. With such a small number of incidents, it is not possible to make any conclusions about how perceived race may or may not be related to fatalities from use of force.

#### **4.6.1.3 Injury Status Unknown**

At the time they completed the Use of Force Report, officers might not have known whether their use of force resulted in injuries for the individuals upon whom they used force. Officers were required to report injuries they were aware of before the end of the shift when the force incident occurred. Some situations may make it more difficult for officers to know if the individuals sustained any injuries. For example, when the officer did not detain the individual or the person fled the scene, the officer might not have known if the individual sustained injuries. If the only type of force used was drawing a handgun or pointing a weapon at the individual with the intention of achieving compliance, officers might have been confident that no injuries occurred as a result of their use of force, even if the individual fled the scene. The likelihood of uncertainty is higher for other types of force, such as physical control and the use or discharge of a weapon.

In 37 incidents (0.6 per cent of incidents), it was unknown whether one or more of the individuals involved sustained a physical injury. These incidents may have included individuals who were known to have no physical injuries, but for at least one individual involved their injury status was unknown and so the incident as a whole was coded as injury status unknown.

These 37 incidents were more likely to involve multiple subjects and multiple officer Use of Force Reports compared to the pattern for overall incidents.

Due to the small number of incidents involved (37 total) which result in very small numbers when analyzed by perceived race, race-based analysis is not conducted on these incidents.

#### **4.6.2 Injuries to Officers**

The Individual Use of Force Report also tracks physical injuries to officers because of their own use of force. The response options are “Yes” or “No”. These questions were not included on the PDF Team Report, so the analysis in this section includes only Individual Reports. If the officer was injured, they were required to report if they received treatment.

One example of injury caused by using force is an officer using physical control techniques and being punched by the individual. It is not fully clear how officers interpreted the requirement that the injury should be “because of the force applied” as noted on the Use of Force Report. For example, if the reporting officer discharges a firearm at an individual, then the individual fires back and strikes the officer, it is up to the officer to determine whether the injury was as a result of their own use of force.

Injuries to officers during the incident that were not caused by their use of force are not captured on the Use of Force Report. For example, in 2023, there were use of force incidents in which officers involved were seriously injured during the incident, however their injuries were not captured as the injured officers themselves were not required to complete Use of Force Reports. As such, the figures here are an undercount of the number of officers injured during use of force incidents.

The Use of Force Report tracks only physical injuries.

The majority of Individual Use of Force Reports (97.5 per cent) did not result in any physical injuries to the reporting officers.

Because each officer submits their own Individual Report, it is possible to determine the number of reporting<sup>62</sup> officers (for Individual Reports) who were physically injured in an incident. Across all Individual Reports, 195 (2.5 per cent) officers reported having sustained physical injuries.

---

<sup>62</sup> These are not unique counts of officers, since a single officer might have been injured in multiple use of force incidents; due to the absence of identifying information about the officers, it could not be determined if any officers were injured during more than one incident in 2023.

# **Section 5:**

# **Conclusions**

EMBARGOED COPY



Police in Ontario receive approximately four million calls for services a year, over 99 per cent are resolved without the use of force. Use of force by police remains an issue of substantial public interest.

The Ministry has made significant strides, including recognition from the Ontario Ombudsman for its effort to educate and reduce, where possible, instances of force across the province.

Under the *Anti-Racism Act* (ARA) and the ARA Regulation, the mandated Use of Force Reports have included questions about the officer's perception of the race of individuals on whom they used force that required a report.

Updates the Ministry made to the Use of Force Report enabled the Ministry to enhance its data analysis. Overall, use of force incidents most frequently involved individuals who were perceived as White, Black, or Indigenous, in that order. The disparity analysis showed differences in officers' use of firearms between perceived race groups.

However, the disparity scores presented in this technical report were computed using use of force incident data that did not account for other factors which may have influenced the use of force incident and resulting disparity scores. For example, the racial disparity results do not provide an explanation for observed differences; any disparities do not necessarily imply racial discrimination or racial bias by police. Multivariate analysis that included the important contextual factors would address this limitation. For example, multi-level modeling could factor in the effect of an officer perceiving that an individual possessed a weapon when exploring any relationship between perceived race and the use of force. The disparity results would likely change if such contextual factors were included. This could include disparities becoming smaller or disappearing, reversing, or becoming larger.

Further improvements could expand the ability to identify areas of concern, demonstrate successes, and provide a more comprehensive analysis of use of force incidents and any influence of perceived race. Of particular interest is collecting additional information to explore whether incidents involved individuals in crisis or under the influence of drugs or alcohol; the role that officer training and experience may have; and any relationship with officer demographics, such as race and gender. The lack of an appropriate benchmark population also remains a key limitation. Without this benchmark, the Ministry cannot calculate racial disproportionality on police use of force that accounts for the frequency of police contact. Disproportionality, which is an indicator of whether the representation of racial groups is higher or lower than their proportion in the benchmark population, is a useful measure for police use of force. Disproportionality would indicate whether individuals perceived as members of particular racial groups are involved in

use of force incidents at a higher rate than would be expected based on the proportion of police contacts with individuals from those groups.

The results presented herein are an overview of the data, rather than a record of every analysis that could be computed using the data.

EMBARGOED COPY

# Section 6: Appendices

## 6.1 Appendix A: Ontario Use of Force Report 2023

[Link to Use of Force Form](#)

## 6.2 Appendix B: Summary of the Principles Governing the Use of Force by Police

Police officers face situations where they may use force in carrying out their duties, and to ensure their own safety and that of the community. The parameters governing the use of force by police officers are contained in the *Criminal Code*, other federal and provincial legislation and regulations, the common law, and the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. The broad principles governing the use of force by police may be summarized, as follows:

1. **THE USE OF FORCE BY POLICE MUST BE AUTHORIZED BY STATUTE OR THE COMMON LAW:** Police officers may use force in the execution of duty only if permitted by statute or the common law. More particularly, the statutory or common law authority on which an officer relies when using force must apply to the particular duty that the officer is carrying out. Unless an officer possesses such authority in any particular case, the use of force by the officer may be unlawful, and, accordingly, the officer could be liable for assault or other related offences, as may be applicable.
2. **THE USE OF FORCE BY POLICE IS GOVERNED BY THE PRINCIPLES OF NECESSITY, PROPORTIONALITY, & REASONABLENESS:** Even when the use of force may be authorized to carry out a particular type of duty, a police officer does not possess an unrestricted right to use force. The lawful use of force by police is constrained by the principles of necessity, proportionality, and reasonableness. That is, an officer may use force only if the harm sought to be prevented could not be prevented by less violent means, and that the injury or harm done by, or which might reasonably be anticipated from the force used, is not disproportionate to the injury or harm it is intended to prevent. Section 25(1) of the *Criminal Code* provides a police officer with justification to use force in accordance with these principles.

Section 25(3) of the Criminal Code specifically addresses the use of lethal force by police, in accordance with the same principles. The section specifies that an officer is not justified in using lethal force (that is, force that is intended or is likely to cause death or grievous bodily harm) unless they believe on reasonable grounds that such force is necessary to avoid the death or grievous bodily harm of themselves or a person under their protection.

3. THE MEANING OF “EXCESSIVE FORCE”: An officer’s use of force may be excessive if the officer did not have the authority to use force, or otherwise if it violates the principles of proportionality, necessity, and/or reasonableness. Under s. 26 of the Criminal Code, a police officer who uses force is “criminally responsible for any excess ...” It bears emphasis that under the principle of “necessity”, an officer may not use force if there are reasonable non-violent tactical options available to the officer, by which their lawful objective would likely be accomplished.
4. THE IMPORTANCE OF DE-ESCALATION AS A TACTICAL OPTION: “De-escalation” is a term that refers to non-use-of-force tactical options that a police officer may use when confronting a violent or non-compliant individual. (This term is also sometimes used to refer to use-of-force options designed to obtain compliance on the part of a subject, but to avoid confusion the term should be restricted to non-use-of-force options: See “National Consensus Policy and Discussion Paper on Use of Force” (2020), International Association of Chiefs of Police et. al.). De-escalation techniques have the purpose of resolving or stabilizing a volatile situation without the use of force, or with a reduction in the amount of force that would otherwise be needed. De-escalation seeks to slow the dynamics of an encounter, thereby gaining time to allow for the arrival of further resources and tactical options which may further minimize or eliminate the need to use force. Generally speaking, de-escalation seeks to pacify a non-compliant individual by means of building personal rapport with the police officer.

Whether de-escalation may be effective or even feasible in any particular case will depend on an assessment of the circumstances at hand. Police are trained to assess, plan and act, based on existing circumstances, but also to reassess and adapt as circumstances evolve. Key considerations include, for example, the tactical options immediately available to police; whether further tactical options will be arriving at the scene; and the nature and degree of risk posed by the non-compliant individual. A situation may begin with de-escalation being a reasonable tactical option, but it can reverse in an instant.

In situations where it is feasible, de-escalation may be particularly effective in dealing with individuals who are in a state of crisis or suffering from an apparent mental illness. De-escalation may also be particularly effective when dealing with members of Indigenous and Black communities, as well as members of other marginalized or racialized communities; but the importance of de-escalation is not restricted to members of those communities.

There is no legal duty that requires an officer to employ de-escalation techniques in every case. However, an officer may not use force if there are non-violent tactical options available to the officer, by which the officer's lawful objective can reasonably and likely be accomplished. Accordingly, in circumstances where an officer uses force when de-escalation is an objectively reasonable alternative, such use of force may be excessive.

5. THE SCOPE OF AN OFFICER'S DISCRETION IN USING FORCE: Police officers possess a measure of reasonable discretion in determining whether force is required, and if so, to what degree. Police engage in dangerous work, and, on occasion, must act quickly in emergencies. Assessments regarding the use of force need not be based on a "standard of perfection", nor calibrated with the precession of a "jeweller's scales". Moreover, an officer is not required to use only the least amount of force which might achieve their objective. However, the use of force which objectively violates the principles of proportionality, necessity, and/or reasonableness, in light of the circumstances known to the officer at the time, may leave the officer liable for excessive force.

## **6.3 Appendix C: Disproportionality & Disparity Equations**

See pages 47 to 48 of the ARDS

[Link to Data Standards for the Identification and Monitoring of Systemic Racism](#)

[Link to Standard 29. Racial Disproportionality and Disparity Indices](#)

## **6.4 Appendix D: Glossary of Terms**

See pages 67 to 73 of the ARDS

[Link to Data Standards for the Identification and Monitoring of Systemic Racism](#)

[Link to ARDS Glossary](#)